

Exiles and Constituents:  
Baltic Refugees and American Cold War Politics, 1948-1960

Jonathan H. L'Hommedieu

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Turku in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctorate of Social Sciences in the Department of Contemporary History

Turku  
2011

Serial: Humaniora B 338  
ISBN 978-951-29-4811-6  
ISSN 0082-6987

## Abstract

Jonathan H. L'Hommedieu: Exiles and Constituents: Baltic Refugees and American Cold War Politics, 1948-1960

This dissertation explores the complicated relations between Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian postwar refugees and American foreign policymakers between 1948 and 1960. There were seemingly shared interests between the parties during the first decade of the Cold War. Generally, Eastern European refugees refused to recognize Soviet hegemony in their homelands, and American policy towards the Soviet bloc during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations sought to undermine the Kremlin's standing in the region. More specifically, Baltic refugees and State Department officials sought to preserve the 1940 non-recognition policy towards the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States. I propose that despite the seemingly natural convergence of interests, the American experiment of constructing a State-Private network revolving around fostering relations with exile groups was fraught with difficulties. These difficulties ultimately undermined any ability that the United States might have had to liberate the Baltic States from the Soviet Union.

As this dissertation demonstrates, Baltic exiles were primarily concerned with preserving a high level of political continuity to the interwar republics under the assumption that they would be able to regain their positions in liberated, democratic societies. American policymakers, however, were primarily concerned with maintaining the non-recognition policy, the framework in which all policy considerations were analyzed. I argue that these two motivating factors created unnecessary tensions in American policy towards the Baltic republics in the spheres of psychological warfare as well as exile unity in the United States and Europe.

Despite these shortcomings, I argue that out of the exiles' failings was born a generation of Baltic constituents that blurred the political legitimacy line between exiles who sought to return home and ethnic Americans who were loyal to the United States. These Baltic constituents played an important role in garnering the support of the United States Congress, starting in the 1950s, but became increasingly influential after the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, despite the seemingly less important role Eastern Europe played in the Cold War. The actions of the Baltic constituents not only prevented the Baltic question from being forever lost in the memory hole of history, but actually created enough political pressure on the State Department that it was impossible to alter the long-standing policy of not recognizing the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States.

## Acknowledgments

To say that completing a doctoral dissertation is never full proof and impossible without plenty of support from a litany of individuals is as much a truth as it is a cliché. While it is impossible to give ample credit where it is due to everyone over the past decade, I would be remiss to not acknowledge several important groups of people.

I have benefited academically from a handful of dedicated faculty and staff members at Armstrong Atlantic State University and the University of Turku. I would particularly like to thank Marko Lehti, Kimmo Rentola, Timo Soikkanen, and Vesa Saarikoski for their advisement during my graduate studies at the University of Turku. I would also like to thank Olavi Arens and Michael Hall for their continued support and interest over the last decade - not only as an undergraduate student but also throughout my entire academic career. Additionally, Louis Clerc, Markku Jokisipilä, Auvo Kostainen, and Vesa Vares have played an important role in helping me develop the ideas and concepts behind this project.

Research for this project and my entire postgraduate studies was supported by the University of Turku's Graduate School on Integration and Interaction in the Baltic Sea Region. I would particularly like to thank the Graduate School's Advisory Board for their support the last five years as well as Coordinator Heli Rantala's relentless pursuit in organizing seminars and assisting all doctoral candidates in best funding their research endeavors. An international, multi-archival project simply would not have been possible without their generosity.

The nature of this project's research necessitated a significant amount of time in various archives away from both of my homes. I am fortunate to have been assisted by a vast number of friendly and knowledgeable archivists who allowed me to navigate finding aids and sometimes byzantine organizational structures in order to find my research material. In particular, I would like to thank David Jacobs and Anatol Shmelev of Stanford University's Hoover Institution; Daniel Necas of the University of Minnesota's Immigration History

Research Center; Mary Burtzloff of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library; and the Lithuanian American Council for access to their organization's papers.

There remains a long list of colleagues, advisers, and friends that has played an integral in supporting me in this work, not only in the last five years, but also over the decade. I owe the staff of Baltic Sea Region Studies Programme at the University of Turku, particularly Tarja Hyppönen, my gratitude for allowing me to teach the last five years. This experience has been profound in many ways. I would like to thank John Hiden and Jussi Hanhimäki for their comments on my project during the assessment process. They have both helped in sharpening my arguments. I am particularly grateful to Erkka Railo and Ville Laamanen for their assistance in taking care of my defense's practical requirements while being abroad. All of my fellow doctoral candidates in the Graduate School deserve words of praise for their support and comradeship during seminars in Finland and abroad. I would also like to Matthew Adams and Adam Seipp for their friendship over two continents and their challenging of me to do my best.

Finally, there are some debts to close friends and family that cannot be repaid in coin or words. Among all of my close friends, nobody comes close to the care and support that Andrea Sinn has provided over the last few years. Over my lifetime, my parents Michael and Marylu, as well as my siblings Lauren and Nicolas have helped in celebrated my successes and offered a never-ending supply of support in my shortcomings. For their honesty concerning ill-conceived initiatives and encouragement to always be ambitious, I am forever thankful.

## Table of Contents

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>   | <b>1</b>   |
| <i>SOURCE MATERIAL.....</i>  | <i>22</i>  |
| <i>HISTORIOGRAPHICAL DISCUSSION.....</i>   | <i>24</i>  |
| <b>CHAPTER 1: LEGACIES OF THE INTERWAR PERIOD AND WORLD WAR II..</b>   | <b>32</b>  |
| <i>SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN THE INTERWAR BALTIC REGION.....</i>   | <i>32</i>  |
| <i>TOTAL WAR: ANNEXATION AND DISPLACEMENT.....</i>   | <i>36</i>  |
| <i>THE AMERICAN RESPONSE TO AGGRESSION IN THE EAST BALTIC.....</i>   | <i>38</i>  |
| <i>WORLD WAR II AND ITS IMPACT ON NON-RECOGNITION POLICY.....</i>  | <i>44</i>  |
| <i>DISPLACED PERSONS.....</i>  | <i>52</i>  |
| <i>CONCLUSION.....</i>   | <i>60</i>  |
| <b>CHAPTER 2: AMERICAN POLICY TOWARDS EASTERN EUROPE AFTER<br/>WORLD WAR II AND CONTINUATION OF BALTIC POLICY.....</b> | <b>62</b>  |
| <i>TENANTS OF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARDS THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE.....</i>                                     | <i>66</i>  |
| <i>CONTINUATION OF THE NON-RECOGNITION POLICY AND ACCREDITATION OF DIPLOMATS.....</i>                                  | <i>71</i>  |
| <i>IMMIGRATION POLICY AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BALTIC POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS.....</i>                                 | <i>81</i>  |
| <i>ESTABLISHMENT OF RELATIONS WITH THE FREE EUROPE COMMITTEE.....</i>  | <i>92</i>  |
| <i>LIBERATION POLICY VERSUS LIBERATION RHETORIC.....</i>   | <i>103</i> |
| <i>CONCLUSION.....</i>   | <i>108</i> |
| <b>CHAPTER 3: THE QUEST FOR CONTINUITY AND COOPERATION.....</b>  | <b>113</b> |
| <i>BALTIC DIPLOMATIC SUCCESSION: THE DEATHS OF ALFREDS BILMANIS &amp; JULES FELDMANS.....</i>                          | <i>116</i> |
| <i>THE ESTONIAN EXILE GOVERNMENT: EXILE POLITICS IN AN UNWELCOMING ENVIRONMENT..</i>                                   | <i>126</i> |
| <i>THE SUPREME COMMITTEE FOR THE LIBERATION OF LITHUANIA AND THE LITHUANIAN<br/>    DIPLOMATIC SERVICE.....</i>        | <i>141</i> |
| <i>EXPANSION OF BALTIC DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS ABROAD: THE BONN DEBATE.....</i>  | <i>159</i> |
| <i>CONCLUSION.....</i>   | <i>178</i> |
| <b>CHAPTER 4: CONTAINMENT AND CONTACTS: PURSUING PSYCHOLOGICAL<br/>WARFARE AND PROPAGANDA.....</b>                     | <b>182</b> |
| <i>THE ROLE OF CONTAINING THE SOVIET UNION AND THE DESIRE TO MAINTAIN CONTACTS.....</i>                                | <i>185</i> |
| <i>THE VOICE OF AMERICA AND RADIO FREE EUROPE DEBATE.....</i>  | <i>188</i> |
| <i>BROADCASTING TO THE BALTIC REPUBLICS.....</i>   | <i>199</i> |
| <i>INTERNAL EXILE POLITICS AND THE VOICE OF AMERICA.....</i>   | <i>210</i> |
| <i>ASSESSING BROADCAST FEEDBACK AND POLICY CORRECTIONS.....</i>  | <i>219</i> |
| <i>CONCLUSION.....</i>   | <i>229</i> |
| <b>CHAPTER 5: DOMESTIC IMPLICATIONS OF BALTIC POLITICAL ACTIVISM.....</b>  | <b>235</b> |
| <i>ANTI-COMMUNISM, AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND ETHNIC ANTI-COMMUNISM.....</i>  | <i>237</i> |
| <i>THE COMMEMORATION OF HOLIDAYS AND ANNIVERSARIES.....</i>  | <i>244</i> |
| <i>PUBLICATIONS AND THE MONOPOLIZATION OF INFORMATION.....</i>   | <i>254</i> |
| <i>BALTIC CONSTITUENTS AND THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS.....</i>   | <i>266</i> |
| <i>CONCLUSION.....</i>   | <i>292</i> |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>CHAPTER 6: 1956 REVOLUTIONS AND REAPPRAISAL OF POLICIES.....</b>                             | <b>295</b> |
| <i>THE PERCEIVED FAILURE OF RADIO FREE EUROPE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DIRECTIVES .....</i> | <i>298</i> |
| <i>REASSESSMENT OF FEC EXILE RELATIONS.....</i>   | <i>302</i> |
| <i>THE FATE OF THE NON-RECOGNITION POLICY.....</i>  | <i>308</i> |
| <i>REDUCING DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS ABROAD.....</i>   | <i>313</i> |
| <i>CONCLUSION .....</i>   | <i>319</i> |
| <br>  |            |
| <b>EPILOGUE: THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES.....</b>  | <b>330</b> |
| <br>  |            |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>   | <b>345</b> |

## INTRODUCTION

Its deeper significance lay in the fact that the United States had been presented with a choice and had made a decision. The Russian action had forced the issue of whether the same yardstick should be applied to international morality in all cases or only against governments with which the United States had clashed.<sup>1</sup>

This excerpt from the *New York Times* on 24 July 1940 describing the American refusal to recognize the 23 July 1940 Soviet annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania offers insight into how the “Baltic Question” would be interpreted in the American political discourse through World War II and the Cold War.<sup>2</sup>

The failure to reach an amicable settlement between the United States and the Soviet Union over the political and territorial status of Eastern Europe was but one, of many discrete reasons that resulted in the Cold War. The Soviet Union was not only portrayed as an ideological enemy, but as a state that was willing to impose its political, economic, and social will upon its neighboring countries through overtly meddling in the internal political affairs of a country, such as Czechoslovakia, or if necessary, the military annexation and annexation of territory, such as in the Baltic case.

The 1939 Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact demonstrated Stalin’s willingness to change borders by the use of force. Within this Soviet-Nazi German non-aggression treaty, secret protocols existed that assigned the Soviet Union’s neighbors, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, to a Soviet sphere of influence. Although Finland was able to maintain its independence through the 1939-1940 Winter War, over the summer of 1940, the Soviet Union militarily occupied Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania resulting in the annexation of these independent nations into the Soviet Union.

---

<sup>1</sup> By BERTRAM D. HULEN Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.. 1940. U.S. LASHES SOVIET FOR BALTIC SEIZURE :Welles Sees Three States 'Deliberately Annihilated' by 'Devious Processes' TEXT OF THE STATEMENT U.S. LASHES SOVIET FOR BALTIC SEIZURE Comments on Chilean Issue Important U.S. Decision Ministers to London Protest Three Envoys Protest in Berlin. *New York Times* (1923-Current file), July 24, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed August 9, 2010).

<sup>2</sup> For a description of the legalistic, historical, and political definitions of the “Baltic Question” see: John Hiden, Vahur Made, and David J. Smith, eds. *The Baltic Question During the Cold War* (New York: Routledge, 2008). 1-5.

The territorial changes made in the east Baltic littoral were shocking in two aspects. First, it was one of the first instances where the world witnessed what the Soviet Union was capable of in respect to intimidating its neighbors. Second, in the early years of the Cold War, the elimination of independent Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania represented a nightmare scenario for policymakers concerned with hypothetical future Soviet aggression. In Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the Soviet Union sought not only to establish friendly regimes on its borders, but also to incorporate unfriendly nations as constituent members of the Soviet Union. Soviet actions against Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, compared to maneuvers before, during, and after World War II in other strategically important areas, were singular in their scope and brutality. The international response to the annexation in 1940 was singular and concise, compared to the rather ambivalent position to the political situation in postwar Eastern Europe. The vast majority of western nations, led by the United States, refused to recognize the Soviet annexation of the three Baltic States. Second, despite the principled position that the United States assumed when Under Secretary of State Sumner E. Welles and President Franklin D. Roosevelt decided to not recognize the Soviet annexation, the political and military realities of World War II exposed the limits to what the Americans were willing to do in order to uphold their principled attitudes towards the situation in East Europe.

As the east Baltic littoral became a contested region between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, many Baltic elites had hoped that the forthcoming world war would have a similar outcome to World War I. The signing of the treaty of Brest Litovsk in 1917 and the defeat of Germany by the Entente had created enough of a political vacuum in immediate post-World War I Europe for independent Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian states to come into being. In the early years of World War II, the defeat of both the Soviet Union and Nazi



Germany seemed to be the most viable way for the three Baltic States to regain their independence.<sup>3</sup>

When Churchill, Stalin, and Roosevelt met at Yalta in 1945, each wartime leader obtained what they had sought. The United States gained a Soviet promise to enter the war in Asia and an American-centric United Nations; the British sought a seat at the table for France and some level of protection for its colonial holdings; and the Soviets were able to impose reparations on wartime belligerents and guarantee that the Soviet Union could not be invaded by a revanchist Germany in the future. After the failure of the Soviets to hold free elections in their occupied zones, Yalta became a rallying cry for those who sought to blame the Roosevelt administration for selling out East Europe. In reality, however, “the ‘consensus’ at Yalta reflected the military and diplomatic realities at the moment.”<sup>4</sup> Only through a third world war would it seem possible that the occupied Baltic republics could regain their independence.

Curiously, the United States continued to stand by their 1940 policy towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. One important feature of the history of World War II in the Baltic States was the creation of a large postwar diaspora spread throughout Western Europe, the Americas, and Australia, but largely focused in the United States. The continuation of the non-recognition policy created a situation where aspects of American foreign policy and the interests of the Baltic émigrés became inherently intertwined.

Traditionally, the significance of the non-recognition policy has been marginalized. Throughout the late Cold War period, the importance of the policy was seen as being merely symbolic and was only sustained to placate domestic political audiences. In the immediate post-Cold War period, the non-recognition policy has been used as an important piece of the

---

<sup>3</sup> For a description of the Baltic Independence Process after World War I see: Toivo U. Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, 2d. Ed. (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2001), 99-111; Andrejs Plakans, *The Latvians: A Short History* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1995), 113-120; David Kirby, *The Baltic World 1772-1993: Europe's Northern Periphery in an Age of Change* (London: Longman, 1995), 276-292.

<sup>4</sup> Thomas G. Paterson, *American Foreign Relations, A History since 1895*, 203.

narrative that the Soviet occupation was indeed illegal and there exists an explicit level of continuity between the interwar independent Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the independent nations that reemerged with the collapse of the Soviet Union.<sup>5</sup>

Indeed, the non-recognition policy played a role in American domestic politics. The 1976 Presidential debate between Jimmy Carter and President Gerald Ford where Ford proclaimed that Poland was not under Soviet domination resulted in widespread criticism from the American media, the polity at large and most certainly from all East European ethnic groups in the United States.<sup>6</sup> One can only imagine the political repercussions of an American administration during the Cold War conceding to recognize the Soviet annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. It is also true that the continuity narrative has since significantly elevated the importance of the non-recognition policy. To date, however, a historical middle-ground has yet to be reached in the understanding of what broader American policy towards the Baltic republics during the Cold War consisted, and to what extent Baltic exiles had on the creation, sustaining, and cancelation of policy initiatives that impacted their homelands.

Exploring the Baltic question through the larger prism of American policy towards East Europe as well as exploring the relationship that developed between American policymakers and relevant actors and organizations firmly places this marginal, yet important issue in a larger historical narrative in American foreign relations. Further, through exploring the interaction and development of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians while in exile during the early Cold War fills in a missing blank in the national histories of the three small nations.

---

<sup>5</sup> Since regaining independence, there has been a strong “restorative” narrative in the three Baltic States claiming that new independent countries had not been created, but there existed a legal continuity between the post-1991 governments and the pre-1940 governments. Most notably this “restorative” narrative has focused on citizenship policies in Estonia and Latvia. See: David J. Smith “Estonia: Independence European Integration,” 72-74 and Artis Pabriks & Aldis Purs “Latvia: The Challenges of Change,” 72-73 in David J. Smith, et. al. eds. *The Baltic States: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania* (New York: Routledge, 2002).

<sup>6</sup> See: Leo P. Ribuffo “Is Poland a Soviet Satellite? Gerald Ford, the Sonnenfeldt Doctrine, and the Election of 1976,” *Diplomatic History* 14 no. 3 (1990): 385-404.

The framework of this study has several layers, beginning with the layer consisting of the interaction between American policymakers in various government agencies as well as the policymaking process. Although the Baltic issue became an important debate among interested audiences in the general public and Baltic émigré circles, American policy towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania was ultimately decided in rather insular bureaucratic circles. A special Baltic Desk under the Office of Eastern European Affairs handled Day to day policy decisions towards the Baltic republics. Baltic desk officers intimately knew the important exile circles within the United States, but were occasionally neglected when it came to larger policy initiatives led by the State Department's Policy Planning Staff; the National Security Council; or other agencies such as the CIA. This is a story not only of the decision-making process within the United States, but also of the occasionally chaotic and bureaucratically unwieldy nature of American foreign policymaking.

The second layer deals with the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian nations in general and the postwar national diasporas more specifically. For the Baltic nations, World War II was a war of annexation, occupation, total destruction, and widespread population displacement. During the first Soviet occupation from 1940-1941, property, businesses, capital, and services were nationalized while people who were viewed as enemies of the state were deported into the hinterlands of the Soviet Union or executed. During the German occupation from 1941-1944, the Jewish populations became Holocaust victims; everyday citizens were conscripted into the German Army or into forced labor service; and people were deported to central Europe. The return of the Red Army in 1944 ultimately resulted in more deportations and executions, but also the exodus of people to the West. Ultimately tens of thousands of Balts would reside in exile during the early Cold War years and would be directly impacted by the foreign policies of individual nations towards the Soviet Union. This

is the story of a generation of exiles who truly believed they could have a demonstrable impact on the future of their homelands and sought to return home.

The final layer is that of anti-Communist America during the Cold War. Despite the willingness of almost all western nations to refuse recognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States, the singularly most important country for Baltic exiles was the United States. Not only was the United States the first country to make such a principled statement about their homelands, but also the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans provided a sense of distance from the dangerous Soviet Union. Most important, however, was the non-partisan durability of anti-Communism in the United States among both policymakers and the general public during the early Cold War.

The Democratic Party that had condoned and even promoted cooperation with the Soviet Union during World War II had shifted towards promoting a policy of containing Soviet expansion in the “universal struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.”<sup>7</sup> The conservative anti-communists ultimately advocated the rollback of communism and the liberation of Eastern Europe. Although some politicians, such as Senator Glen Taylor, justified the annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as a response by Soviet Russia to reclaim breakaway areas integral to the Russian state, making comparisons of the potential future reaction by the American federal government reaction of a state seceding from the Union;<sup>8</sup> the broader American political spectrum created space for the Baltic émigrés to feel safe and work towards assimilation, while simultaneously working towards promoting policies that would help their homeland. This is the story of how immigrant communities were able to guide and eventually monopolize public opinion on an increasingly marginal foreign policy issue.

---

<sup>7</sup> Richard Gid Powers, *Not Without Honor: The History of American Anti-Communism*, (New York: The Free Press, 1995), 191.

<sup>8</sup> Gabriel Almond, *The American People and Foreign Policy* (New York: Praeger, 1960), 58.

The primary concern of the dissertation is to attempt to fully describe and analyze the features of American foreign policy towards the Baltic republics during the first two decades of the Cold War. What did American policy towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania consist of? Who were the most important actors in the initiation and implementation of policy? What transformations occurred in policy over the course of the early Cold War?

The few scholars that have attempted to deal with American policy towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania during the Cold War have almost exclusively focused on the non-recognition policy.<sup>9</sup> Frequently, only the non-recognition policy is addressed and is seen as an idiosyncratic anomaly in the history of American foreign relations that only has implications in the field of international law. While it is true that the central theme that guided all American initiatives directed towards the Baltic republics was the non-recognition policy, the Baltic issue cannot be separated from the larger policy that the United States had towards East Europe during the Cold War.

This study attempts to present a comparative approach to how the American Baltic policy augments our basic understanding of policy towards East Europe as a whole. Although, the policy towards the Baltic republics should be seen as one component of the larger policy towards Eastern Europe, the non-recognition policy indeed resulted in one crucial distinction - to whom were diplomatic credentials extended and to whom they were not?

The principal component of the non-recognition policy was to maintain diplomatic relations with the existing Latvian and Lithuanian ambassadors in Washington and the Estonian Consul General in New York. In addition, the United States shuttered all diplomatic missions to the Baltic republics and prohibited senior American diplomats in the Soviet Union from traveling to or establishing contacts with senior officials in the Soviet Baltic

---

<sup>9</sup> Specific reference to these works will be made in the section addressing existing literature further in the introduction.

republics. In contrast, The United States extended diplomatic relations to the majority of all East European countries including the Soviet Union, regardless of their political makeup.

This notion of diplomatic recognition had far-reaching consequences beyond where diplomats could be sent or who would be welcomed into the ranks of foreign diplomats in the United States. The non-recognition policy laid the groundwork for what the United States was not able to do with respect to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. This carried both positive and negative implications. While the refusal of American diplomats clearly demonstrated that the United States opposed Soviet territorial aggrandizement, and this fact could serve to bolster the morale of Baltic nationals trapped behind the Iron Curtain; cultural and economic interaction between East Europeans and Americans that became a staple of American policy towards countries such as Poland, were initially precluded in the case of the Baltic republics.

Equally important was the vast potential that the United States had to combat communist aggression in the Baltic republics in a way that it was not able to do in the rest of East Europe due to diplomatic protocol. For instance, the United States technically had the opportunity to continually use their position towards the Soviet annexation against the Soviet Union in the United Nations General Assembly.<sup>10</sup> Most important was the willingness of the U.S. Government to engage with Baltic exiled politicians and diplomats in a public manner. Each people's republic had a corresponding group of exiles that sought to establish governments-in-exile. Diplomatic protocol prohibited the U.S. Government from any overt negotiations with exiled leaders. While the United States refused to recognize any exiled government from the Baltic republics, the continued relationship between the diplomats and the State Department provided exiled leaders, in a broader sense, access that other émigré communities simply did not have.

---

<sup>10</sup> The issue of whether or not to take the Baltic situation to the UN is just one example of many potential ideas that were discussed by policy makers, but were ultimately not used.

While the United States waged cold war in Europe during the late 1940s and 1950s, the Baltic policy was well within one aspect of mainstream policy towards East Europe - the use of political exiles in the attempt to undermine Soviet influence in Eastern Europe. George Kennan, one of many Soviet experts in the U.S. State Department is most well known for the doctrine of containment. Recent literature has also enlightened us that Kennan was an adamant proponent of using exiles in covert actions designed to rollback the influence of communism. Throughout the early years of the Cold War, exiles from all East European countries and the Soviet Union became dynamic actors in American covert paramilitary and psychological warfare activities. Although the coalition between American officials and émigrés failed to liberate East Europe due to greater geopolitical considerations, dysfunctional bureaucracies by the Americans, and lack of cooperation by the exiles, this relationship implied the tacit American acceptance of Eastern European émigré groups in the United States to promote their own policy interests within the United States.

Political Scientist Steven Garrett has argued “East European ethnic groups in this country have been exploited more often than they themselves have been exploitative as far as foreign policy is concerned and that their conscious efforts to influence diplomacy have been largely irrelevant.”<sup>11</sup> Through an analysis of the relationship between the U.S. Government and the East European ethnic groups in the 1950s, the degree to which one group was being exploited and another group was exploiting ultimately becomes blurred. It cannot be argued that the United States was mainly altruistic in developing relationships with Eastern European émigré groups. Émigrés, however, were willing participants and while they attempted to maneuver the contours of American foreign policy as best as they could to assist the Americans, all émigrés, particularly Balts, had their own agenda separate from the United

---

<sup>11</sup> Stephen Garrett, “The Ties that Bind: Immigrant Influence on U.S. Policy Toward East Europe” in Said *Ethnicity and U.S. Foreign Policy*, 108.

States that they aggressively pursued. As the rather close relationship that was cultivated during the late 1940s began to unravel during the late 1950s, this process only accelerated.

Despite a wealth of literature that attempts to assess the effectiveness of ethnic groups lobbying the U.S. Government on behalf of foreign policy initiatives, there is not yet any perfect theoretical framework for assessing this phenomenon. The most vivid and varied selection of literature that addresses ethnic lobbying emerged during the 1980s, within the context of the growing interest in studying multiculturalism and the perceived increase in hyper-pluralism. During this period, there are two very important academic works that address the ethnic question in American foreign policy making. The first study is *Ethnic Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, edited by Mohammed E. Ahrari.<sup>12</sup> The second work is entitled *Ethnicity and U.S. Foreign Policy*, edited by Abdul Aziz Said.<sup>13</sup> Both volumes attempt to advance the understanding of the relationship between ethnicity, specifically ethnic groups, and the role they play, or do not play in the making of American foreign policy. They begin with a set of assumptions that are tested, the bulk of the volumes include chapters dealing with specific case studies, and try to find common threads among the case studies in the conclusion. It is vitally important, however, to consider the period when these works were written.

During the late 1970s and early 1980s, the Cold War still dominated the international political landscape and the fall-out from Vietnam and the Watergate scandal dominated the American political mosaic. As a result, Ahrari is correct in his introduction that “the American political system underwent significant alterations in the decision making apparatus itself. In the foreign policy process, the traditional domination of the president has long been considerably modified by an enhanced participation in congress.”<sup>14</sup> He continued, “long gone are the days when presidential predominance in foreign policy, as contrasted with sharing of

---

<sup>12</sup> Mohammed E. Ahrari ed., *Ethnic Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1987).

<sup>13</sup> Abdul Aziz Said ed., *Ethnicity and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1981).

<sup>14</sup> Ahrari, XII.



this participation with Congress on virtually all domestic policy issues, creating an impression of ‘two presidencies.’”<sup>15</sup> The long gone days that were referred to, however, proved to be ephemeral at best. Indeed, since the early 1980s, the executive branch has reasserted supremacy in foreign policy making.

Nevertheless, in the détente and immediate post-détente period, political conditions in the United States allowed for ethnic lobbies to renew their efforts to promote their particular agendas. Two well-known examples took place in 1972 and 1976. In 1972, Jewish-American groups played an important role in Congress’ passing of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. This legislation was aimed at tying the granting of Soviet Most-Favored Nation trade status to the Soviet Union’s willingness to allow Russian Jewish emigration to their country of choice.<sup>16</sup>

In *Ethnic Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, Stephen L. Spiegel takes a generally contradictory attitude towards the importance of ethnic groups in his chapter: “Ethnic Politics and the Formation of U.S. Policy Toward the Arab-Israeli Dispute.” He argues two main points. First, ethnic lobbies have only a muted and indirect influence on decision making in the executive branch.<sup>17</sup> Their primary influence is on Congress and on the public debate. Second, their own advisers, their own personal experiences, and the global philosophies prevailing in the administration more directly influence policy makers.<sup>18</sup>

The end of the Cold War brought about a renewed interest in studying the role of ethnicity in foreign policy. The most important recent academic work on the topic is Tony Smith’s *Foreign Attachments: The Power of Ethnic Groups in the Making of Foreign Policy*.<sup>19</sup> In his introduction, Smith states that he is attempting to advance three major propositions. First, that ethnic groups play a larger role in the making of American foreign

---

<sup>15</sup> Aaron Widavsky quoted in in Ahrari, XIV.

<sup>16</sup> See Henry L. Feingold. *Silent No More: Saving the Jews of Russia, the American Jewish Effort, 1967-1989*. (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2006), 109-148.

<sup>17</sup> Stephen Spiegel, “Ethnic Politics and the Formation of U.S. Policy Toward the Arab-Israeli Dispute in Ahrari, *Ethnic Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, 24.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>19</sup> Tony Smith, *Foreign Attachments: The Power of Ethnic Groups in the Making of American Foreign Policy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).

policy than is widely recognized. Second, the negative consequences of ethnic involvement may well outweigh the benefit. Third, the contradictions of a pluralist democracy are particularly apparent in the making of foreign policy.<sup>20</sup>

Although Smith goes into detail about the philosophical attributes of a multicultural society and the historical development of ethnic lobbies in the United States, his most important contribution is attempting to “lay out the framework on which ethnic group preferences for American foreign policy can be subjected to open and rational debate.”<sup>21</sup> In a manner similar to Ahrari’s, Smith applies general features of gaining influence in Washington DC to ethnic group lobbies. He argues that ethnic groups are able to exert their influence on American politics, and in turn foreign policy, through their efforts to “get out the vote”; actively participating in campaign financing for candidates who support their causes; strong organizational leadership; and finally – building coalitions and setting specific agendas for action. The most significant problem in establishing a workable framework for assessing the effectiveness of groups is brought up in Ahrari’s conclusion: “What both Congress and the President are likely to do is to consult with an influential ethnic group in the future, as they have done in the past, and use it to build support when the objectives of that ethnic group are in harmony with ones promoted by other branch.”<sup>22</sup> A more cynical interpretation of the statement would imply that ethnic groups would be used more to mobilize public opinion for a policy decision that they had little role in influencing.

Inherently related to the issue that Ahrari addresses is the period when his volume was published. The case studies ranging from the Middle East to Eastern Europe were all contemporary issues where the source material was limited to what was available in the public record. Simply, it was impossible to gain archival access to attempt to establish any

---

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>22</sup> Ahrari, p. 155.

way of determining how government bureaucracy truly managed relations with ethnic lobby groups.

Outside of the well-studied relationship between American Jewish groups and the U.S. government, in the long scope of relations between ethnic groups and the American foreign policy making establishment, it has generally been clear that there has been little positive impact of ethnic groups on the making of foreign policy. Smith outlines three main stages of the historical development of ethnic involvement in foreign policy making. The first stage began in the early twentieth century where the most active ethnic groups – coming from Germany, Scandinavia, Ireland, and eventually Italy acted had a net negative impact on foreign policy making. Although they were not the primary reason for American neutrality and so-called isolation from European affairs in the interwar period, there was concern among policy makers that the activities of ethnic groups would be inimical to American interests. Before American entry in World War I, the Ambassador to England, Walter Hines Page had rhetorically wanted to “hang our Irish agitators and shoot our hyphenates.”<sup>23</sup>

Smith’s third stage in the historical development of ethnic groups in American foreign policy takes place after the end of the Cold War where ethnic group internationalism has become quite pronounced – particularly concerning the relationship between the growing diasporas coming from the developing world. There has been concern that the interests of such groups are again inimical to the larger interests of the United States.<sup>24</sup>

There are three similar trends to the early twentieth century and post-Cold War periods. First, there existed an explicit level of skepticism among politicians about whether or not the interests of ethnic groups should be taken into consideration in the making of policy. Second, there has been little interest in the broader polity in the activities and plight of the

---

<sup>23</sup> Alexander DeConde, *Ethnicity, Race, and American Foreign Policy: A History* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1994), 86.

<sup>24</sup> Smith, 48

ethnic groups. Third, the ability of groups to monopolize the creation and maintenance of information has been relatively weak.

One particular time period and one particular group of ethnic lobbies is simultaneously of great interest and very difficult to study are East European groups during the Cold War. When describing his second stage, Smith succinctly states: “the imponderable question is the extent to which the confluence of ethnic group commitment to the Cold War fueled Washington’s determination to stay the course, driving the competition to a successful conclusion that made impossible a global condominium with Moscow.”<sup>25</sup>

During the Cold War, virtually all American ethnic groups concerned about foreign policy were internationalists; they backed an assertive American effort to stand up to Soviet communism, and promoted national self-government abroad. Most importantly, however, was that there was a high-level of convergence between the interests of the United States and the interests of the Eastern European ethnic groups on the highest order – the collapse of the Soviet Union. The existing literature that specifically addresses the relationship between Eastern European ethnic groups and the U.S. Government during the Cold War is even more suspect. There are two traditional viewpoints that emerge in this literature. The first viewpoint argues that Eastern European groups have had little to no influence on the making of foreign policy during the Cold War. The second viewpoint argues that particular groups were effective in influencing the U.S. government.

The historical record is clear that neither the Americans nor the Eastern European diasporas played a primary role in the Soviet Union’s collapse. This gives credence to the arguments espoused by those most skeptical about the role that Eastern European ethnic groups played on foreign policy during the Cold War. Stephen Garrett is perhaps the most prolific scholar that has dealt with the topic. In several articles, Garrett outlines the reasons

---

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 59.

for the failure of the Eastern European lobbies during the Cold War and the true dynamic in the relationship between émigré group and the U.S. Government.

Garrett relies on a study by Bernard Cohen who surveyed the opinions of high officials in the State Department and noted the multitude of their contacts with ethnic group demands. Cohen argues that the contacts are largely formalistic in character and designed to actually mute ethnic demand or to manipulate them rather than to respond positively to them.<sup>26</sup> Garrett elaborates on the Cohen's study by claiming there are three structural issues that prevent the ethnic groups from having any real influence. First, there is built-in reluctance to give a really concrete role in policymaking to groups that press for the attention of professionals. Second, there is a professional disdain for interest group activity as it relates to matters of information. While there is such a vast range of domestic policy problems that it is not improbable for Congress to allow a group to establish a monopoly of information, foreign policy professionals are usually less open such groups that might importune them. Third, the government is responsive to interest groups partially in terms of how directly such groups can demonstrate that a given policy or its alternative really does help or hurt its interests.<sup>27</sup>

Opposing Garrett's position is literature that argues that particular Eastern European organizations have had success at having an impact on American foreign policy. The most studied organization is the Polish American Congress. One symptomatic article about the Polish American Congress is present in Ahrari's volume entitled, "The Polish American Congress, East West Issues, and the Formulation of American Foreign Policy" by Z.A. Kruszewski. The article points to successes in the United States Congress through the Katyn Massacre Congressional Committee, the promotion of a positive attitude towards Poles and Poland, and high-level contacts with policy makers as proof that "the close cooperation

---

<sup>26</sup> Garrett, "Eastern European Ethnic Groups and American Foreign Policy," *Political Science Quarterly* 93 (1978): 301-23.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

between the Polish American Congress and the U.S. Government allows for considerable policy input.<sup>28</sup>

Although Garrett is correct that between the mid-1950s and the mid-1970s, Eastern European ethnic groups in the United States had little ability to influence U.S. policy as it was not in the American interest to actively roll back communism in East Europe; and that Kruszewski is correct that the Polish American Congress most likely did have close cooperation with many members of the U.S. government, there are some flaws in the manner that the studies have been conducted.

First, Garrett treats all East European ethnic groups as a monolithic bloc. Although, he does rely on the Assembly of Captive European Nations (ACEN), which was a consolidating house, funded by the CIA, for the interest of East Europeans residing in the West during the Cold War; it does a disservice to individual groups that functioned outside of the ACEN. Even within particular nationalities, there were competing factions for authority to speak on behalf of the group. Due to the vast number of nationalities and the expansive number of groups who spoke for each nationality, it is improbable to state that all Eastern European ethnic groups were unsuccessful.

Second, Kruszewski almost exclusively relies on sources from the Polish-American media and the Polish American Congress' publications. James S. Pula states, "The Polish American Congress publicized at great lengths its ability to gain presidential audiences and appointments to 'blue ribbon' committees, but the committees were largely ceremonial."<sup>29</sup> Although Kruszewski does state that there were structural problems that the Polish American Congress would eventually have to overcome in its relationship with the U.S. Government, he only describes how the Polish American Congress perceived its relationship with the U.S. government, not vice-versa.

---

<sup>28</sup> Z.A Kruszewski, "The Polish American Congress, East West Issues, and the Formulation of American Foreign Policy" in Ahrari, 92

<sup>29</sup> James S. Pula, *Polish-Americans: An Ethnic Community*. (New York: MacMillan, 1995), 135.

To address the problematic frameworks that existing literature have attempted to establish, this dissertation will focus on two specific phenomena that seem to be easily apparent to Baltic ethnic groups during the first two decades during the Cold War. First, there is the process of transforming foreign policy issues into domestic political issues. Second, there is the process of managing expectations through taking advantage of influencing marginal aspects of American foreign policy from a group's own marginal position.

The primary relationship that the leaders of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exiled ethnic groups had with the U.S. Government was with the State Department. While this relationship was useful when exile politics were seen as useful to policymakers, once fomenting revolution was dropped as a policy prescription, the State Department contacts were significantly marginalized. In correlation with the eventual assimilation of Baltic exiles into American society, the foreign policy issues that were important to the Baltic diasporas were gradually transformed from the domain of foreign policy to the domain of domestic politics. More specifically, the consciousness of the exiles shifted from dealing with the State Department in diplomatic terms to dealing with the U.S. Congress on electoral terms.

Although in the post-war period the U.S. Congress has traditionally been seen as a secondary actor in the making of foreign policy, the institution became very useful in guaranteeing that aspects of American foreign policy that appeared to have little day-to-day value in the late 1950s remained in force. The non-recognition policy was by far the most important issue. The relationship that Baltic American organizations curated with members of the U.S. Congress applied enough pressure on the executive branch of government that there would be a heavy political cost for abandoning policies that were ultimately deemed as unimportant in the broad spectrum of American foreign policy priorities.

The second concern of this dissertation addresses the question of political and institutional continuity from the interwar Baltic republics to the Cold War Baltic diasporas in

the United States. The initial question is to what extent did the political makeup of the interwar republics transfer to the diasporas? Second, did political continuity serve as a hindrance or a benefit to the interests of the Baltic ethnic groups in assisting their homeland? Finally, did the political activities of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exile groups place them within the broader Baltic nations or merely show that they were promoting their own self-serving interests?

A key feature of the understanding of many Balts living in exile was that the Soviet occupation was not only illegal but was a deviation from the traditional historical trajectory of their homelands. As a result, a historical narrative developed where the exiles were sustaining the homelands until the political atmosphere was right for them to return home. They carried the political memories of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania with them into exile, supposedly recreated while residing in displaced persons camps in the immediate post-war years, and then transplanted with them in a perpetual state of exile. To carry the analogy farther, the collapse of the Soviet Union, reemergence of independent states, and the close relationship developed between the diaspora and the homeland resulted in the full restoration of Baltic independence.

Continuity for the Baltic exiles can be seen through the prism of individuals and institutions as well as historical narrative. Many influential members of émigré communities inevitably were influential members of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian society during the interwar period. The development of both domestic and international politics for the Baltic States during the interwar period can be broken down into two main phases. From the time of independence to the early 1930s, institutions were highly democratic and were plagued by weak coalitions and infighting between political factions. Further, diverging interests in regional politics prohibited close rapprochement among the three states. During the late



1930s, all three Baltic governments slid into right-wing authoritarian regimes that resulted in a minimal amount of regional cooperation.

Despite the fact that most Baltic exiles viewed their main objective to be the eventual liberation of their homelands, this potential convergence of interests did not prevent the revitalization of disagreements among old political groupings in the broader diaspora. Equally important was the ability of former elites to start recriminations against former members of the authoritarian regimes that most western countries continued to maintain some sort of relationship with through the diplomatic representatives.

During the late 1940s and 1950s, continuity was not only rhetorically important to the Baltic exiles, but was a true reflection of reality. Political continuity, however, did not serve as a net advantage for the exiles who sought the liberation of their homeland. Instead it placed them at a disadvantage in earning favor with American policymakers. The mid-level bureaucrats that the exiles had to work with on a regular basis failed to grasp the historical gravity of old political disputes among the Baltic groups they worked with. Additionally, they were unwilling to play the role of mediator between competing groups.

The development of a specific historical narrative was used by Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exile groups to support their claims that they were the rightful heirs of future independent Baltic States. The axis that this narrative rotated around was the 1940 annexation of the Baltic States and that all exiles represented the democratic nature of the Baltic peoples. This carefully constructed narrative was particularly useful in promoting their usefulness to U.S. Government officials in combatting communism and in curating a positive image among the American people.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> This became particularly important in the immediate postwar years and in the 1970s when the issue of Baltic collaboration with Nazi Germany were hot political issues. See: Ieva Zake “‘The Secret Nazi Network’ and Post-World War II Latvian Émigrés in the United States” *Journal of Baltic Studies* I #41 (March 2010) 91-117.

However, through critically assessing the historical narrative that was developed, it exposes significant holes in this notion of continuity. The émigré communities attempted to white wash the authoritarian regimes of the 1930s by comparing them directly to the puppet governments that were installed in 1940. It is important to note that certain elements of the diaspora that were in marginal positions attempted to promote their own historical narratives that amplified the authoritarian regimes in order to bolster their standing with western governments.

A central theme of this dissertation addresses the question of whether Baltic exiles were seen as active participants in American activities against the Soviet Union or whether they were seen merely as domestic pressure groups who were trying to exert pressure on the American foreign policy establishment. It's self-evident that this is entirely dependent on the period of time that is being studied and what particular policies are being implemented. Throughout the duration of the Cold War, Baltic groups naturally viewed themselves as active participants in the struggle towards the restoration of independence for their homelands. This does not mean that an evolution in thinking about how their relationship with the U.S. Government developed did not occur. To analyze this issue, this study is deploying the terms "exiles" and "constituents" to focus on the most important dynamics in the relationship between the makers of foreign policy and those who were trying to play a role in the making of foreign policy.

The term "exile" is used to describe Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian émigré diaspora members who initially saw no reason to assimilate into the nation in which they had settled in after fleeing the Baltic region. Such individuals and organizations perceived themselves as political leaders who were responsible for fighting for the liberation of their homelands; establish provisional governments-in-exile; and ultimately return home in order to reestablish governmental institutions that resembled those of the interwar period. They

were highly motivated to pursue policies that not only provided them with political legitimacy among their fellow émigrés, but also created an aura of political and social continuity. Finally, they were more than willing to assist any government that was also fighting for the liberation of Eastern Europe from the Soviet Union so long that such cooperation did not interfere with maintaining political legitimacy and continuity.

The term “constituent” is used to describe Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian émigrés who happened to live in the United States. Generally, such individuals and organizations were naturalized American citizens who participated in the American political process through voting, lobbying, and attempting to monopolize information related to their particular political cause - the political and diplomatic status of the Baltic republics. While American bureaucrats drew concrete lines between their relations with American constituents and exile groups, to the general public, there was little to separate the activities of exiles who happened to live in the United States and Balts who had become naturalized citizens and shared a similar political agenda.

The failure of America’s liberation policy could have meant the permanent marginalization of Baltic ethnic groups residing in the United States and the subsequent abandoning of the non-recognition policy as Americans sought to bring about evolutionary change behind the Iron Curtain. This did not happen mainly because a fundamental transformation took place in the leadership in the Baltic emigrations. Indeed, the exiled diplomats and older members of the diaspora continued to see themselves as people who were political exiles. More important to the making of foreign policy, however, was the growing role of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in domestic political circles.

Contacts with the State Department and White House continued into the 1960s, but as Cold War moved away from Europe, so did the importance of the Baltic question. As a result, Baltic groups began to diversify their activities and began to heavily involve members of

Congress in promoting interests that were important to them - ranging from maintenance of the non-recognition policy to hiring members of their own ethnic groups to government positions. Simply, the role of Baltic immigrants as constituents in the American political process became more significant than actively engaging in activities against the Soviet Union.

The dissertation consists of six chapters. Chapter One describes political developments in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania during the two decades of independence which they enjoyed between the two world wars; the basic relationship that was developed with the United States and the rationale for the 1940 non-recognition policy. Chapter Two analyzes the basic tenants American policy towards Eastern Europe during the early Cold War period and the impact that it had on policy towards the Baltic republics. Chapter Three analyzes the relationship between American policymakers and Baltic exile groups residing abroad and the issue of diplomatic continuity. Chapter Four addresses the role that Baltic émigré groups played in American psychological warfare activities directed at the Soviet Union. Chapter Five describes the role that Baltic émigré groups had on the development of anti-Communism in the United States and the establishment of contacts with the U.S. Congress. Chapter Six analyzes the changes in policy towards Eastern Europe after the Hungarian Revolution in 1956 and looks at the effectiveness of the experiment in creating rather strong relations between Baltic émigré groups and American policymakers during the early Cold War.

#### Source Material

Nearly twenty years after the end of the Cold War, now is an appropriate time to revisit the themes that started to be studied in earnest over thirty years ago. Although Stephen Garrett was able to use surveys of government bureaucrats and the publications from the ACEN to make his arguments, he lacked access or the interest in going through the

publications and organizational papers of individual national groups. Garrett, Kruszenski, and indeed most of the early scholars on the topic have lacked access to U.S. government archival material. To date, there is not an academic study that looks at the combined Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian efforts towards lobbying the United States during the Cold War. One of the major aims of this study is to correct some of the sourcing problems that have plagued work on the issue of ethnic lobbying. The majority of source material is unpublished archival documents. The three most important archives are as follows: The United States National Archives at College Park, MD. and Washington DC, where the U.S. State Department documents and Congressional documents are maintained; The Hoover Institution Archives at Stanford University where the Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Corporation documents and the personal papers of several Baltic exiled diplomats are housed; finally the Immigration History Research Center at the University of Minnesota where the organizational papers of the Joint Baltic American Committee, American Latvian Association, Estonian American National Council, Assembly of Captive European Nations, and Lithuanian American Council are kept. Additionally, archives from the Truman, Eisenhower, F.D. Roosevelt Presidential Libraries and the National Archives of the Republic of Estonia were used.

The intent and rationale for such sources should be clear. Only through looking at how the individual lobbying organizations attempted to influence the U.S. government and how the U.S. government reacted or did not react to such overtures can we get a clearer picture of how the relationship ultimately functioned and evolved. Several of the themes addressed in this study remain sensitive to American national security, particularly surrounding events in Hungary in 1956. As a result, some sourcing remains necessarily incomplete. Nevertheless, I believe I have collected enough material to accurately portray the relationships between exile organizations and American policymakers as well as the strategic thinking behind such plans.

### Historiographical Discussion

There are two main historiographies relevant to this dissertation: literature that addresses American foreign policy towards the Baltic Republics during the Cold War and the activities of Baltic émigré groups during the Cold War; and the role that East European exiles played in American foreign policy - particularly during the 1950s.

There is a notable lack of literature concerning the general history and related historical implications of the American policy of non-recognition. Most scholars have focused on the legal aspects of non-recognition. Perhaps the most well known study is William Hough's book on the relationship between the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States and international legislation. Hough convincingly traces the origin of the non-recognition policy back to the Stimson Doctrine.<sup>31</sup>

Additional literature that addresses the Baltic question from the perspective of international law are represented by the works of Robert A. Vitas and James T. McHugh and James S. Pacy. Vitas primarily addresses the legal implications of the non-recognition policy from the American perspective while dabbling in some of the historical origins of the policy. McHugh and Pacy focus specifically on the implications that the non-recognition policy had on exiled diplomats; the specific policies that countries had towards Baltic diplomats, and useful biographic essays on the most important diplomats.<sup>32</sup>

More recent literature has attempted to add significantly greater academic rigor to the debate on the Baltic diplomatic situation during the Cold War. Lauri Mälksoo has specifically concentrated on the debate over state continuity and has attempted to ask the question as to

---

<sup>31</sup> William J. Hough. *The Baltic States and its Effect on the Development of Law Prohibiting Forcible Seizure of Territory*. F. Rothman, 1985; For an interesting study applying the Baltic annexation case study to Hawaii see: Kuhio Vogeler, *For Your Freedom and Ours: The Prolonged Occupations of Hawaii and the Baltic States*, (Unpublished dissertation) 2009.

<sup>32</sup> Robert A. Vitas. *The United States and Lithuania: The Stimson Doctrine of Nonrecognition*. Westport: Praeger 1990; James T. McHugh and James S. Percy. *Diplomats without a Country: Baltic Diplomacy, International Law and the Cold War*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001.

what was more important in the restoration of Baltic independence, great power politics or the principled non-recognition policy taken by many countries during the Cold War. From a more historical perspective, Kristina Spohr Readman has greatly contributed to the knowledge of how German foreign policy viewed the situation of the Baltic republics during the Cold War. Additionally, the edited volume by John Hiden, Vahur Made, and David J. Smith attempts to paint the “Baltic question” in as broad a historical landscape as possible, offering a survey of various international positions towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.<sup>33</sup>

Traditionally the history of American Baltic political activity has largely rested within the domain of those who were active participants in the struggle for independence. Although the monographs and memoirs written by the most important individuals and actors are useful in constructing a timeline of the activities that they were engaged in, the historical and scholarly quality of the works are inevitably mixed. Not only do they fail to account for alternative reasons for why American policy makers took certain positions, but quite frequently lack historical distance from events. Further, they are largely based on individual nations, failing to bring a comparative perspective to the three diasporas.<sup>34</sup>

In recent years, however, there has been a greater amount of attention paid to the political activity of Baltic immigrants in the United States during the Cold War. Latvian immigrants, or as sociologist Ieva Zake insists, American Latvians, despite being a much

---

<sup>33</sup> Lauri Mälksoo, *Illegal Annexation and State Continuity: The Case of the Incorporation of the Baltic States by the USSR*. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 2003; Kristina Spohr Readman. *Germany and the Baltic Problem after the Cold War: The Development of a new Ostpolitik, 1989-2000*. London: Routledge, 2004, “Between Political Rhetoric and Realpolitik Calculations: Western Diplomacy and Baltic Struggle for Independence in the cold War Endgame,” *Cold War History* 6 1, 2006, and “The Baltic Question in West German Politics, 1949-1990,” *Journal of Baltic Studies* 39, 2, 2007; John Hiden, Vahur Made, and David J. Smith, eds. *The Baltic Question during the Cold War* New York: Routledge, 2008.

<sup>34</sup> For Latvians See: Bruno Albats and Visvaldis Klīve. *ALA 35 1951-1986 Amerikas latviešu apvienība*, 1986; Anita Tērauda, Irēne Karule, *ALA 1986-2000. Amerikas latviešu apvienība*, 2001. Daunis Auers, *Latvia and the USA: From Captive Nation to Strategic Partner*. 2009; For Estonians See: Ernst Jaakson. *Eestile*, Tallinn: SE & JS, 1995. Toivo Miljan. *Historical Dictionary of Estonia* New York: The Scarecrow Press, 2004. Rutt Hinrikus *Estonian Life Stories*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2009. For Lithuanians see: Algirdas Budreckis Martin. *Lithuania 700 Years* New York: Maryland Books, 1969; David Fainhauz. *Lithuanians in the USA: Aspects of Ethnic Identity*. Chicago: Lithuanian Library Press, 1991. Linas Saldukas. *Lithuanian Diaspora*. Vilnius: VAGA Publishers, 2002. Aleksandras Gedmintas, “Organizational Relationships in the Development of the Binghamton Lithuanian Community” *Journal of Baltic Studies* (Winter 1980); Algirdas M. Budreckis, *The Lithuanians in America, 1651-1975: A Chronology and Factbook*;

smaller group than the Lithuanian community played an important role in Baltic diaspora political activities in the United States. Zake's most recent monograph *American Latvians* significantly advances the scholarly understanding of the experience of Latvian refugees in the United States during the Cold War. First, it demonstrates that there are clear differences between traditional immigrants to the United States and refugees that arrived in the United States during the Cold War. Second, it uses a multi-archival approach to look at how American Latvians navigated the American political landscape. Although Zake's work exclusively focuses on Latvians and does not emphasize the diplomatic historic aspect of Balts during the Cold War; her current and former work on this topic is most relevant.<sup>35</sup>

Since the end of the Cold War, historians have gained access to archival material that has shed new light on the early years of the ideological conflict, particularly regarding the question of whether the United States actually sought to liberate Eastern Europe during the 1950s or whether it was merely domestic electioneering. In the last fifteen years, there have been enormous strides in demonstrating that within the highest ranks of the American foreign policy establishment that a prolonged struggle with the Soviet Union was not desirable and that the political and territorial situation in East Europe should be changed utilizing all resources at disposal to the United States.

This growing body of literature that addresses the creation and implementation of American overt and covert actions against Soviet hegemony focuses on three specific themes. First, that containment was only the first step in a concerted effort to destroy Soviet power around the world. Indeed more aggressive activities that involved clandestine paramilitary actions, economic warfare, and psychological warfare were deployed against the Soviet Union. Second, that despite the eagerness of both Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D.

---

<sup>35</sup> Ieva Zake. *American Latvians: Politics of a Refugee Community*. New York: Transaction Publishers, 2010. See also *Anti-Communist Minorities in the US: Political Activism of Ethnic Refugees*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. "The Secret Nazi Network' and Post-World War II Latvian Ēmigrés in the United States" *Journal of Baltic Studies* I #41 (March 2010) Zake with Graham Gormley, "Integration of Separation? Nationalities and the Republican Party's Ethnic Politics, 1960s-1980s *Nationalities Papers*, 2010.



Eisenhower to take more aggressive actions against the Soviet Union, bureaucratic infighting, the inability to create sustained policy proposals, and the geopolitical realities doomed any attempts to break Soviet hegemony in East Europe.<sup>36</sup>

Although paramilitary actions were part of American policy of liberating East Europe,<sup>37</sup> the more significant activities can be classified as psychological warfare or public diplomatic activities. By 1949 there were two main vehicles for combatting Soviet propaganda, the overt Voice of America radio broadcasting and the covert Radio Free Europe broadcasting. To date, the history of these two organizations primarily consist of monographs and memoirs of former bureaucrats of the United States Information Agency (USIA) or National Committee for a Free Europe (NCFE).<sup>38</sup> The most important scholarly work that deals with American public diplomatic efforts during the Cold War is Nicholas J. Cull's history of the USIA from 1945-1989. Cull gives an excellent overview of the internal operations of USIA, the bureaucratic struggles that it has had with the State Department, U.S. Congress, and private-public organizations such as the NCFE; and pushes the scholarly information of the organization beyond the 1950s when the *raison d'être* of American broadcasts were called into question.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Sarah Jane Corke. *U.S. Covert Operations and Cold War Strategy: Truman, Secret Warfare, and the CIA, 1945-53*. New York: Routledge, 2008. Walter L. Hixson. *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945-1961*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997); W. Scott Lucas *Freedom's War: The American Crusade Against the Soviet Union*. (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1999). Gregory Mitrovich. *Undermining the Kremlin: America's Strategy to Subvert the Soviet Bloc, 1947-1956*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000). Richard J. Aldrich "Liberation: Rolling Back the Frontiers of Clandestine Cold War History?" *Cold War History* 1 January 2007; Laszlo Borhi "Rollback, Liberation, Containment, or Inaction? US Policy and Eastern Europe in the 1950s" *Journal of Cold War Studies* 1 Fall (1999).

<sup>37</sup> See Peter Grose. *Operation Rollback: America's Secret War behind the Iron Curtain*. (Boston/New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2000).

<sup>38</sup> Richard H. Cummings *Cold War Radio: The Dangerous History of American Broadcasting in Europe, 1950-1989*. (New York: McFarland, 2009); Alan L Heil, Jr. *Voice of America: A History*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003). Sig Mickelson, *America's Other Voice: The Story of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*. (New York: Praeger, 1983); Michael Nelson, *War of the Black Heavens: The Battles of Western Broadcasting in the Cold War*. (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1997). Arch Puddington, (*Broadcasting Freedom: The Cold War Triumph of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2003). Gene Sosin, *Sparks of Liberty: An Insider's Memoir of Radio Liberty*. (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999). George R. Urban, *Radio Free Europe and the Pursuit of Democracy: My War within the Cold War*. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997).

<sup>39</sup> Nicholas J. Cull *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945-1989*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

One aspect that is revealed in recent literature dealing with American policy towards East Europe and the Soviet Union, and particularly literature dealing with covert broadcasts is the role that refugees and exiles played in the actual implementation of these clandestine activities. There are two significant points that reach a level of convergence in describing the relationship that developed between refugees and American policy makers. First, as early as 1947 senior American officials actively sought out exiles for campaigns against the Soviet bloc. Frank Wisner, a Mississippi native and head of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in Southeast Europe during World War II had a long interest in the activities of refugees that culminated in touring DP camps in occupied Germany in 1947. In 1948, Wisner was selected to oversee the State Department's Office of Policy Coordination (OPC). Wisner's contacts with émigrés would be the perfect preparation for the covert pursuit of liberation in East Europe.<sup>40</sup> Second, it has been argued that one of the main reasons that covert actions against the Soviet Union failed was due to the lack of cooperation among the various exile groups that had earned the patronage of the Americans. There were concerns that the exiles were more interested in supporting their own self-serving interests and would do anything to earn the trust of the Americans, that they were unwilling to cooperate with each other, and even worse were accused of "probably selling the U.S. Government a dangerous bill of goods."<sup>41</sup>

Literature that deals with the longer lasting historical significance of the generally considered failed policy of using exiles during the early years of the Cold War has focused on the implications that it had on American policy and the pursuing debate about whether liberation was just a domestic political concern or a legitimate foreign policy objective.<sup>42</sup>

Literature has also focused on the impact that America's liberation policy had on East Europe

---

<sup>40</sup> Lucas, 61.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 200.

<sup>42</sup> See Chris Tudda. *The Truth is Our Weapon: The Rhetorical Diplomacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles*. (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2006) and "Reenacting the Story of Tantalus: Eisenhower, Dulles, and the Failed Rhetoric of Liberation" *Journal of Cold War Studies* 7 (Fall 2005) 3-35. A. Ross Johnson

following the failed 1956 Hungarian Revolution.<sup>43</sup> The historiography of the period has not significantly addressed the role that the exiles residing in Western Europe and the United States had in the implementation of covert actions nor has it addressed the myriad other activities that East European ethnic groups pursued during the early years of the Cold War. While Liberation has been demonstrably proven to have played a more important role in the making of American foreign policy than had previously been realized, there was a domestic component. While activities in pursuit of liberation did help in fomenting dissent in Hungary in 1956, ultimately it was a Hungarian activity. The history of those on the frontline of American liberation policies from 1947-1956 has yet to be told in detail.

Another general gap in the existing literature on the relationship between the exiles and the Americans was what were the precise dynamics of this relationship? Were the exiles mere clients of the American government and strictly beholden to American interests or did the exiles predominantly manipulate the American policy makers and pursue their own agenda? Hugh Wilford's excellent analysis on the private-public network that the CIA created in both the domestic and international arenas of the Cold War attempts to address this very issue. Wilford argues that more often than not, collusion with the CIA afforded groups the possibility to pursue their own interests, much to the dislike of the CIA - as opposed to the traditional interpretation that the CIA was most responsible for all activities taken by its patron organizations.<sup>44</sup>

This dissertation fills a gap in the existing literature by analyzing American foreign policy through the perspective of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian ethnic groups during the 1950s. This is important since this aspect of American foreign policy not only impacted American prestige and the communist territories that it was geared towards, but the

---

<sup>43</sup> Charles Gati. *Failed Illusions: Moscow, Washington, Budapest and the 1956 Hungarian Revolt* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006). Urgan, "Hungary, 1957-1961: Background and Current Situation" *Radio Free Europe Special Report* 1961.

<sup>44</sup> Hugh Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.)

individuals and organizations that willingly participated in American liberation efforts. It will demonstrate that although Baltic exiles were more than able to align their own interests with those of American policy makers, more often than not, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians pursued their own agenda towards the liberation of their homelands. It will show that the access that the Americans gave to the Baltic organizations allowed access to other institutions, such as the United Nations. It will demonstrate that the regular contacts that Baltic exiled cold warriors had during the 1950s was a major component in the continuation of political activities by American Baltic constituents during the 1960s. Finally, it will argue that although the non-recognition policy of the Soviet annexation was one component of American policy towards East Europe, there was an inherent disconnect between what the non-recognition policy permitted and forbade the United States to do with regards to the Baltic Republics and what the United States actually pursued in the Baltic region.

Excluded from this study's analysis are the developments of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian organizations that revolved around cultural and linguistic development. A major component of the émigré communities' vibrancies was the high-level of cultural and language training that took place in the United States. This is due to the existence of literature that focuses on cultural developments, the limits on the length of a dissertation, and the need to confine the research.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> See Astra Apsistis, "Documenting the Postwar Baltic Diaspora: The Gap Between DP and American Resettlement," *Spectrum* 6, 34-37. Maija Hinkle "Latvian-Americans in the post-Soviet Era: Cultural Factors on Return Migration in Oral History Interviews" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #37 (Spring 2006), Wsevolod W. Isawijw "Ethnic Identity Retention in Four Ethnic Groups: Does it Matter?" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #21 (Autumn 1990) 289-304. Iva Ivask, "Baltic Literature in Exile: Balance of a Quarter Century" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #3 (Spring 1972); Astride Ivaska Ivaska, Astride, "IS the Voice in me a Maimed Whisper? Young Latvian Exile Poets of the Seventies" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #5 (Spring 1974), 26-33. Ilze Miežitis-Matiss and Solveiga Miežitis "Changing Profile of Latvian School Students: A Fifteen-Year Follow-Up." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #21 (Autumn 1990); Algis Norvilas "Which Language Shall we Speak" Language Choice Among Young Lithuanian Bilinguals." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #21 (Autumn 1990); Aldis Putnins "Latvian Identification: Second Generation youth in Australia and North America" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #10 (Spring 1979); Alfred Erich Senn, "American Lithuanians and the Politics of Basketball in Lithuania, 1935-1939." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #19 (Summer 1988) and "Lithuanian in America and the Lithuanian National Movement before 1914" *Journal of American Ethnic History* 6; Juris Silenieks, "Latvian Literature in Exile: The Recycling of Signs." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #2 Issue 3 (Autumn 1971)

Although the Baltic exile experience in the United States was in many ways unique compared to other East European émigré groups, due to relatively small numbers of people involved and a specific U.S. Foreign policy directive focused on their home countries, their story within the political landscape of the United States should be brought forward to fill in a missing piece in the history of the three small nationalities. Equally important is that the approach taken in this study will foster debate on the role of exiles in American foreign policy, the nature of the symbiotic relationship between American policymakers and exiles, and stimulate new studies on the other larger nationalities that established vibrant political communities in the United States.

# CHAPTER I

## LEGACIES OF THE INTERWAR PERIOD AND WORLD WAR II

### *Security and Cooperation in the Interwar Baltic Region*

One of the most significant outcomes of World War I and the Russian Revolution was the emergence of small states in Central and Eastern Europe, notably independent Finnish, Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian countries on the eastern littoral of the Baltic Sea. The singular foreign policy concern of these newly independent states was how to address security.<sup>1</sup> During the interwar period, the Baltic countries had a wide range of possibilities to satisfy their security concerns. Individual states could declare neutrality in the event of renewed conflict in Europe. Small states could place their security in the promise of international organizations, such as the League of Nations. States could try to establish very cordial relations with stronger European powers. The most promising means of meeting security concerns, however, was through the creation of strong regional institutions around the Baltic Sea.

In 1917, newspaper editor and future Estonian Prime Minister Jaan Tõnisson talked about the possibility of a Scandinavian-Baltic bloc that would have a union of 30 million people. Such a hypothetical union would have had significantly greater influence at the Paris Peace Conference and represented an enviable military position around the Baltic Sea. 500,000 soldiers would have been at its disposal, compared to the 100,000 infantrymen that Germany was restricted to. From a geographical situation, such a union including Poland, Sweden, and Finland would have represented a radical redistribution of power in Europe. Tõnisson's grand dream, however, proved to be illusory. The failure of a "Greater Baltic

---

<sup>1</sup> Toivo U. Raun, *Estonia and the Estonians*, (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2001), 123. A perpetual state of insecurity existed due to the precarious relationship with Bolshevik Russia and the ever present concern of German revanchism.

Union” was partially a function of the region’s geopolitical realities and individual states’ actions.<sup>2</sup>

Finland and Poland, the region’s two largest states, assumed a reluctant approach towards regional security, which severely undermined the success of Tõnisson’s vision of a large Baltic Union. Despite Finland facing many of the same security challenges as Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, its orientation towards the more risk-averse Scandinavian countries severely restricted any overtures of cooperation with its southern neighbors. The territorial dispute over Vilnius between Lithuania and Poland, and the fear of Polish hegemony in any Baltic Union prevented significant advances in a greater Baltic union.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, historian Georg von Rauch points to three main periods where regional cooperation flourished: 1920-1925, 1925-1934, and 1934-1940.<sup>4</sup> As time progressed and interests became more defined, the scope of negotiations around the Baltic Sea on regional cooperation became more and more narrow – with Estonia and Latvia assuming the leading position.

1921-1925 proved to be the most invigorating period of activity in working towards Baltic cooperation. As the newly independent nations were trying to determine their foreign policy paths and since the Locarno period was seen as a transition period in European politics, regular conferences – particularly among Estonians, Latvians, and Finns – developed. This “conference diplomacy” as vividly described by Marko Lehti clearly demonstrates that the process of working towards regional cooperation is as interesting as the results of regional cooperation.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 124. See also: John Hiden and Thomas Lane, *The Baltic and the Outbreak of the Second World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 7. Tõnisson’s opinion represented a maximalist vision for Baltic regional cooperation.

<sup>3</sup> For an analysis of Lithuania’s perspective on regional cooperation see: Alfonsas Eidintas, Vytautas Žalys, Edvardas Tuskenis, *Lithuania in European Politics: The Years of the First Republic, 1918-1940*. (New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 1999), 99-107.

<sup>4</sup> Georg von Rauch, *The Baltic States: The Years of Independence 1917-1940*, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1995), 108.

<sup>5</sup> Marko Lehti, *A Baltic League as a Construct of a New Europe*. (London: Peter Lang Publishing, 1998)

Despite the periods of negotiations and conferences, however, the only concrete result of Baltic regional cooperation was the Baltic Entente's establishment. The Baltic Entente's predecessor was the establishment of a military alliance between Estonia and Latvia in 1923.<sup>6</sup> The final manifestation included Lithuania with a consultative treaty signed by the Estonian Foreign Minister, Julius Seljamaa, the Latvian Foreign Minister, Vilhelms Munters, and the Lithuanian foreign minister Stasys Lozoraitis on 12 September 1934.<sup>7</sup> The Baltic Entente called for collaboration in foreign affairs, mutual support in international questions, and regular foreign ministers' meetings. The latter resulted in a general streamlining and synchronization of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian foreign policies. Members of the international community even seemed willing to recognize the entente as a viable entity. Latvia was asked to represent the Baltic States as a non-permanent member of the League of Nations Council in October 1936. The Soviet Union even invited the general staffs of the Baltic armies to Moscow to attend a May Day Parade.<sup>8</sup>

The two fundamental problems with the Baltic Entente, however, rested in its inability to foster solidarity among the three nations' polities and the lack of any concrete joint military plans. Cultural and economic projects were planned, but rarely implemented. Those that were implemented were often delayed. The *Baltic Review*, based on a periodical dating back to 1918-1919 was supposed to be published, using the three Baltic languages as early as 1934, but did not make its debut until February 1940.<sup>9</sup> Cultural, political, and perhaps most importantly, linguistic problems hampered deep military cooperation throughout the entente.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Raun, 125. A customs union was proposed between Estonia and Latvia in 1923, but it ultimately never materialized.

<sup>7</sup> Von Rauch, 182.

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

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> For more on the Baltic Entente see Bronis J. Kaslas, *The Baltic Nations: The Quest for Regional Integration and Political Liberty: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland*. (Pittston, PA: Euroamerica Press, 1976).



In addition to fostering some level of regional cooperation, the nascent Baltic republics placed their hopes in pursuing policies of neutrality, as well as participating in international institutions and building relations with powerful global players. The weakness of the League of Nations, tentative efforts towards regional cooperation, and the precarious geopolitical situation left Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania seeking the assistance of great power states to secure their independence. Although individual countries had differing attitudes towards the nascent states, the Western Allies valued stability over the national aspirations of small nations in Central East Europe. Despite Woodrow Wilson's 14 Point Address and his position on supporting national independence, the United States was the last major nation to grant *de jure* recognition towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. While the United States recognized Poland and Finland – two countries that gained territory from the former Russian Empire, the United States maintained its policy of non-dismemberment towards that same empire. After the departure of Secretary of State Robert Lansing, this policy manifested itself again in the Colby Note (named after Lansing's successor.) It was not until there appeared to be no realistic way to reconstruct a viable, democratic Russian confederation that the United States extended recognition to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on 25 July 1922.<sup>11</sup>

Despite the delayed recognition of the Baltic States, the most important feature of relations between the United States and the three countries was that the American government viewed them as regular European nations and maintained normal, albeit minimal, relations with them. Immediately following the granting of recognition, the unofficial representatives of the new states were received as *chargé d'affaires*. Throughout the interwar period, the United States maintained diplomatic representatives in Tallinn, Riga, and Kaunas, with an embassy in Riga. In addition, most favored nation trade status along with myriad other treaties were signed between the two states. Equally important was the perception that

---

<sup>11</sup> Raun, 124. For a detailed study on the diplomatic question surrounding the American policy towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania see: Albert N. Tarulis, *American-Baltic Relations 1918-1922: The Struggle Over Recognition*, (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1965).

Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians had towards the United States regarding their own security. Regardless of the small but important role the American Lithuanian Diaspora has historically played in Lithuania, widespread thinking was that the United States was not a country that would secure their sovereignty. This contrasted with the Baltic assumption that the British view was always in favor of an independent Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the east Baltic littoral.<sup>12</sup>

### Total War: Annexation and Displacement

Between 1935 and 1939, Baltic State diplomacy conducted through the prism of the increasingly assertive foreign policies of the Soviet Union and Germany.<sup>13</sup> Within the context of Hitler's *Ostpolitik*, Soviet Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov offered Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania bilateral mutual assistance pacts. In response, Germany attempted a similar approach, seeking to conclude non-aggression pacts with all European states with the exception of Lithuania.<sup>14</sup> The Baltic States rejected overtures of bilateral agreements with either the Soviet Union or Germany, preferring to maintain a policy of neutrality. Such policies of neutrality proved only to be effective as long as overt hostilities between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany did not occur.

The conclusion of a Soviet-German non-aggression treaty on 23 August 1939 sent shockwaves throughout Europe. The immediate surprise was that two nations that were seen as being in direct competition for the deepening of their influence in Eastern Europe were not formal allies. More surprising in the long-term were the secret protocols attached to the treaty. The Molotov-Ribbentrop Agreement allowed for the Germans and Soviet Russians to

---

<sup>12</sup> See: Olavi Hovi, *The Baltic Area in British Policy, 1918-1921: From the Compiègne Armistice to the Implementation of the Versailles Treaty* (Finnish Historical Society, 1980).

<sup>13</sup> von Rauch, 189.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 190.

divide all of East Europe into German and Soviet spheres of influence.<sup>15</sup> Ironically, by the time that the Baltic Entente reached a level of intense and systematic collaboration during the winter of 1939-1940, the fate of their nations' sovereignties were no longer controlled by Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. The inclusion of the Baltic States into the Soviet sphere meant that the "fate of all three Baltic States depended on the unpredictable whims of Stalin."<sup>16</sup>

The military successes of Germany in Northern and Western Europe throughout 1940 and the inability of the Baltic governments to manage their policy of neutrality vis-à-vis the Soviet and German governments created an instant change in Moscow's policy towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania that would geopolitically define the trajectory of these states for the next 50 years. From May through July 1940, the Soviet Union embarked upon a concerted effort to absorb Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

On 30 May 1940, the Lithuanian government informed Molotov that the Lithuanian foreign minister was willing to travel to Moscow to clarify the situation, but was ultimately rebuffed on the grounds that it would serve no useful purpose. As a result, the Kremlin instigated of a border dispute with the Lithuanian where the Lithuanian government was accused of arresting Soviet soldiers and coercing Soviet state secrets from them.<sup>17</sup> At the end of May 1940, the Lithuanian Foreign Ministry distributed a document to its missions abroad, saying, "If a catastrophe occurs here, then consider Stasys Lozoraitis as the chief of the residual diplomatic representation abroad."<sup>18</sup> Latvian President Karlis Ulmanis extended

---

<sup>15</sup> The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact's secret protocol divided Northern and Eastern Europe into Soviet and German spheres of influence. Finland, Estonia, and Latvia were assigned to the Soviet sphere. Lithuania would belong to the German sphere. Poland was to be partitioned. In September 1939, Lithuania was reassigned to the Soviet sphere of influence.

<sup>16</sup> von Rauch, 209.

<sup>17</sup> Eidintas, Žalys, and Tuskenis, 182. On the night of 14 June on the border close to Alytus, Red Army troops shot at a Lithuanian border guard post, lobbed grenades at it, and killing a Lithuanian in the process. At other borders, Red Army troops seized and interrogated Lithuanian guards and harassed civilians. This should be seen in similar lights to the provocation at the Finnish-Soviet border before the outbreak of the Winter War in 1939.

<sup>18</sup> Alfred Erich Senn, *Lithuania 1940: Revolution from Above. (On the Boundary of Two Worlds: Identity, Freedom, and Moral Imagination in the Baltics)* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), 73.

similar credentials to the Latvian Ambassador to the United Kingdom Karlis Zarins to ensure that Latvian diplomatic representation would continue should the Latvian government be unable to continue to function. The Estonians, however, failed to establish any extraordinary credentials for its senior diplomats abroad.<sup>19</sup>

On 14 June, the Lithuanian foreign minister received word from the Kremlin that the Soviet Union was prepared to settle the conflict, demanding that a new government be formed and immediate approval be granted for more Soviet troops to be garrisoned in Lithuania. Despite initial negotiations about whether or not to lead an armed resistance against the Soviets, Smetona instructed the commander of the Lithuanian Army, General Rastikis to form a new cabinet. The hopes of all three Baltic governments by the middle of June 1940 were that the steps that were taken would somehow placate Soviet ambitions in the East Baltic.

#### *The American Response to Aggression in the East Baltic*

Meanwhile, American diplomats in Moscow, Kaunas, Tallinn, and Riga, were sending regular diplomatic notes to the State Department in Washington, D.C. about the events transpiring on the Soviet Union's western border. In the afternoon of 15 June, the American Ambassador to Lithuania informed the State Department that Russian armored divisions had crossed the Lithuanian border following Molotov's rejection of Rastikis.<sup>20</sup> The arrival of Soviet troops on 15 June triggered the first high profile political displacement from the Baltic States when Smetona fled Lithuania via Germany to Switzerland, eventually to reside in the United States.<sup>21</sup> With the Red Army fully stationed in Lithuania, Molotov made

---

<sup>19</sup> This would ultimately become a contentious issue in Estonian exile political circles in the late 1940s and 1950s.

<sup>20</sup> The Minister in Lithuania (Norem) to the Secretary of State (Hull). *FRUS* 1940 I, 368.

<sup>21</sup> For a detailed account of Smetona's flight into exile as a political refugee see Senn, *Lithuania 1940: Revolution from Above*, 104-119.

similar ultimatums to the governments of Estonia and Latvia, with a time limit set at 8 hours.<sup>22</sup>

The primary charge levied against the Estonians and the Latvians was that they broke their non-aggression pacts of 1932 and the 1939 mutual assistance pacts by amending the 1923 Latvian-Estonian agreement to include the Lithuanians. An article in the March 1940 *Baltic Review* on the Baltic Foreign Ministers' Meeting of December 1939 was used as evidence that the governments in Kaunas, Riga, and Tallinn were plotting against Soviet interests. The Estonian and Latvian governments were forced to accept the Soviet ultimatum and the Red Army began to move into their territories. Within a few days, all areas of strategic importance were occupied.<sup>23</sup>

John C. Wiley, the American Ambassador to Latvia played a pivotal role in analyzing the situation in the Baltic States during June 1940. Before his arrival in Riga, Wiley served as a diplomat in Austria in 1938 and Czechoslovakia in 1939, witnessing at first hand the territorial annexations that had taken place by the Germans. It is no coincidence that when describing the situation in Latvia he stated: "Conjectures regarding the future are pessimistic. It is possible that the new governments of the Baltic States will be so constituted that *Anschluss* with the U.S.S.R. can be voted in due course in an endeavor to forestall any Hitlerian "new order in Eastern Europe."<sup>24</sup> Wiley continued, "It might be well for the Department to foresee the possibility that the Soviet authorities might shortly assume charge of the diplomatic and consular representation of the Baltic States and our entire establishment here might have to be liquidated on fairly short notice."<sup>25</sup>

Following the dissolution of the Baltic governments and the arrival of special representatives of Molotov to Estonia and Latvia, Andrei Zhdanov and Andrei Vishinski,

---

<sup>22</sup> von Rauch, 220.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 221.

<sup>24</sup> The Minister in Latvia (Wiley) to the Secretary of State (Hull), *FRUS* 1940 I, 377.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

respectively, the Soviet Union held parliamentary elections over the course of 14-15 July 1940. The electoral laws were changed by decree, electoral procedures were cut short, and the principle of the secret ballot was abolished. As a result, the turnout and results of the fraudulent elections were highly favorable to Stalin. On 14 July 1940, Wiley informed the State Department that the Soviet Union has decided on incorporating the Baltic States and that Molotov has said, “that the new Lithuanian Parliament will have only one question to decide, namely *Anschluss*.”<sup>26</sup>

Based on the memoranda arriving from Tallinn, Kaunas, and Riga, American policymakers at the State Department were busy deciding how to interpret the Soviet Union’s actions within the broader context of American policy on the outbreak of war in Europe. In an attempt to bridge the gap between domestic political opinion forcing the United States to maintain a policy of neutrality and the harsh reality that the United States government had to do something to at least have some moral claim on the situation in Europe, President Franklin D. Roosevelt instructed the State and Treasury Departments to begin a policy of freezing the assets of militarily occupied European states.<sup>27</sup> Assistant Chief of the Division of European Affairs, Loy Henderson, was charged with establishing a set of principles in dealing with the events in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, based on the situation on the ground and a string of critical correspondences received from the Latvian Ambassador in Washington, Alfreds Bilmanis.

Henderson’s approach to handling American policy towards the Baltic situation revolved around three basic questions of principal that were explicitly tied to the rapidly degenerating situation in Europe. First, Henderson asked: “Is the Government of the United States to apply certain standards of judgment and conduct to aggression by Germany and

---

<sup>26</sup> The Minister in Latvia (Wiley) to the Secretary of State (Hull), 14 July 1940 *FRUS 1940* III, p. 387.

<sup>27</sup> Following the 9 April invasion of Denmark and Norway, the President issued Executive Order 8389 ‘regulating transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit, and the export of coin and currency.’ Under this policy, the Treasury froze all financial assets in the United States.

Japan which it will not apply to aggression by the Soviet Union? In other words, is the Government of the United States to follow one policy with respect to, say, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, and the German-occupied Poland, and another policy with respect to Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Finland, which before the end of the year is likely to suffer the same fate as the Baltic States?"<sup>28</sup> Second, "Does the Government of the United States desire to take steps to restrain the export of funds in this country belonging to the States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, as it has done recently in the case of countries taken over by Germany?"<sup>29</sup> Third, "Are vessels of the Baltic States in American harbors to be permitted to depart freely or are they to be held up like the vessels of a number of countries which have been taken over by Germany?"<sup>30</sup>

Prior to this enlightening memorandum, Roosevelt amended EO 8389 on 10 July stating:

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 5(b) of the Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411) as amended, and by virtue of all other authority vested in me, I, FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, PRESIDENT of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, do hereby amend Executive Order No. 8389 of April 10, 1940, as amended, so to extend all the provisions thereof to, and with respect to, the property in which Latvia, Estonia, or Lithuania or any national thereof has at any time, on or since July 10, 1940, had any interest of any nature whatsoever, direct or indirect.<sup>31</sup>

The presence of 500,000 Soviet troops on the territories of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, along with the fact that Smetona fled Lithuania while Ulmanis and Pāts were essentially prisoners in their own countries created a situation where the United States Government treated the Baltic States like the European nations that were under German military occupation.

---

<sup>28</sup> Memorandum by the Assistant Chief of the Division of European Affairs (Henderson) 15 July 1940 *FRUS I*, 389-390.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 391.

<sup>31</sup> U.S. Office of the Federal Register, *Code, 1939-1943*.

On 21 July, the new Estonian parliament met for its first session with four main planks to its agenda: the Sovietization of Estonia; *Anschluss* with the Soviet Union; nationalization of land in Estonia; and nationalization of large industries and banks.<sup>32</sup> Meanwhile the new Estonian President Johannes Vares proposed that the new Estonian Soviet should apply for membership to the Soviet Union.<sup>33</sup> The new Latvian and Lithuanian parliaments ultimately undertook similar actions on 21-22 July, with formal declarations for admission to the Soviet Union made on 23 July 1940. The prepared text from the Estonian Parliament read:

To request that the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. receive the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic as a union republic into membership with the U.S.S.R. on the same basis with the U.S.S.R. as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the White Russian Soviet Socialist Republic, and other union republic. Long live Soviet Estonia. Long live the U.S.S.R.”<sup>34</sup>

Simultaneously, Päts and Ulmanis submitted their coerced resignations and were deported to the Soviet Union’s interior.<sup>35</sup>

As American policymakers had linked the Baltic issue with the broader European problem of military occupations, the news that the Soviet Union sought outright annexation fundamentally changed how the United States had to react to these developments. The United States was not in a position to offer any concrete assistance to change the geopolitical situation in the Baltic States, but neither were the Americans in a position to allow Soviet territorial aggrandizement to proceed without any renunciation – particularly as the legitimacy of American Baltic policy was intrinsically linked to the legitimacy of the larger American European policy. As a result, Roosevelt, his under-Secretary of State Sumner E. Welles, and Henderson reinstated the Stimson Doctrine of Non-Recognition and applied it to

---

<sup>32</sup> The Chargé in Estonia (Leonard) to the Secretary of State 21 July 1940. *FRUS* 1940 I, 399.

<sup>33</sup> von Rauch, 226.

<sup>34</sup> The Chargé in Estonia (Leonard) to the Secretary of State (Hull) 23 July 1940. *FRUS* 1940 I, 400.

<sup>35</sup> Misiunas and Taagepera, 22. On 22 July, Ulmanis was sent to Voroshilovsk and Päts was exiled to Ufa on 30 July. The Former Lithuanian Acting President, Antanas Merkys was deported on 16 July.



the Soviet annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.<sup>36</sup> On 23 July 1940, Welles, serving as Acting Secretary of State, issued a press release stating “The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however, powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.”<sup>37</sup> Simply, the United States refused to recognize the territorial and political changes made in the Baltic States.<sup>38</sup>

The non-recognition policy did not prevent the Estonian Chamber of Deputies from convening on 24 August 1940 to consider a new constitution and to establish the future form of government for the Estonian SSR.<sup>39</sup> The policy also did not prevent the nationalization of private property, banks, large industries, and the educational system. It did not even prevent the eventual liquidation of American diplomatic missions in the Baltic States.<sup>40</sup> Nevertheless, the non-recognition policy was immediately consequential, and in a profound way.

For the United States, the non-recognition policy had potentially far-reaching consequences for the duration of World War II. Before the German invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Agreement formally created an alliance between Germany and the Soviet Union. It is through this prism of an alliance between two aggressor states that the United States viewed the European situation in 1940. A major component of

---

<sup>36</sup> The situation that most closely resembled the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States was the Japanese expansionist policy toward China in the late 1920 and early 1930s. Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson declared in 1932 that the United States Government would not recognize any territorial or administrative changes the Japanese might impose upon China.

<sup>37</sup> Press Release Issued by the Department of State on 23 July 1940 “Statement by the Acting Secretary of State” *FRUS* 1940 I, 401.

<sup>38</sup> For a detailed study on the origin of the Non-Recognition Policy see Jonathan H. L’Hommedieu, “Roosevelt and the Dictators” in *The Baltic Question During the Cold War* eds. John Hiden, Vahur Made, and David J. Smith. 38-41.

<sup>39</sup> See Raun, 149.

<sup>40</sup> The Kremlin mandated that all foreign diplomatic missions in Kaunas, Riga, and Tallinn by 25 August 1940. On 13 August, Welles instructed the U.S. Embassy in Moscow to request that the Embassy in Riga function until 1 October 1940 – until all American interests in the region were liquidated. In addition, there was consideration taken by senior American officials of terminating several Soviet consulates in the United States based on the premise of reciprocity. Ultimately a compromise was reached where the American diplomats were able to function until September 1940 and the United States did not expel any Soviet diplomats from the country.

EO 8389, EO 8484, and the Baltic non-recognition policy were to deny Germany or the Soviet Union from assets held in the United States. The idea of former Estonian, Latvian, or Lithuanian flagged merchant ships in American ports being turned over to the Soviet Union was indeed a matter of national security interests.<sup>41</sup> In addition, despite the minimal role that the Baltic question had in forging a wartime alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union, Roosevelt collected an additional East European question that would have to be mitigated – both domestically and internationally – at the conclusion of the war.

For the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, the non-recognition policy allowed their diplomatic missions to continue to function in exile throughout World War II in any country that stood with the Americans.<sup>42</sup> The continued existence of the diplomatic missions allowed for a sense of legal continuity to exist during the uncertain wartime years and gave a sliver of confidence to the former political elite that should the World War I experience repeat itself, with Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania emerging as independent countries again, that the wealth that they had acquired abroad would be preserved.

### *World War II and Its Impact on Non-Recognition*

Tony Judt has described World War II as primarily a civilian experience, as formal military combat was limited to the beginning of the war and the end. Indeed, it was a “war of occupation, of repression, of exploitation, and extermination.”<sup>43</sup> Judt continued that for some countries the occupation lasted for most of the war.<sup>44</sup> For Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, however, it transcended the war. Due to the strategic importance of the Baltic Sea and the territory along the Baltic littoral, there were significant military campaigns throughout the

---

<sup>41</sup> See Jonathan H. L’Hommedieu, “Latvian Merchant Ships in the Summer of 1940: Non-Recognition and its Impact on Inter-American Trade and Security”

<sup>42</sup> Countries that continued to recognize the Baltic republics include: United States; Uruguay, Brazil, the Vatican, Spain, France, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, Colombia, Norway, Denmark, and Switzerland.

<sup>43</sup> Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), p. 13-14.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

Baltic region, but the over-arching theme of the war for the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians was occupation. From July 1940 through July 1941, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania had become constituent republics in the Soviet Union, and during this period of occupation experienced the slow Sovietization of its political, economic, educational, and civil societies.

By July 1941, however, the war forced the Red Army to evacuate the Baltic republics, opening the way for the arrival of the German Wehrmacht. Despite initial hopes by local populations that the Germans were liberating the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians from the Soviet Union, it became clear that Nazi Germany was also aiming for the complete annexation of the east Baltic coast to the greater German Reich.<sup>45</sup> Long-term German policy was to expel two-thirds of the population and to forcibly settle ethnic Germans into the region. The first priority, however, was to win the war.<sup>46</sup> As a result, the German occupation focused on supplying human and material resources for the Axis war effort. Feeding on the local anti-Communist sentiment, yet never promising autonomy or independence, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians had experience to the exploitation of both resources and humans. The Reich viewed the Baltic lands as a resource for agricultural goods and traditional industrial production. Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were subjected to forced labor and forced conscription into the German Army – another experience that would have long-lasting implications. Finally, the German occupation brought with it the Holocaust – decimating the large historical Jewish community in Lithuania and Latvia, and ruling Estonia the first country to be declared as free from Jews.<sup>47</sup>

The German occupation proved to be temporary, and German plans for forced migration were supplanted by yet another Soviet occupation beginning on 20 January 1944 as

---

<sup>45</sup> Misiunas and Taagepera, 49.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> The Most thorough study on the Holocaust in Estonia is Anton Weiss-Wendt, *Murder without Hatred: Estonians and the Holocaust* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2009).

the Red Army reentered Narva.<sup>48</sup> The Red Army's return marked the continuation of another feature of World War II for the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians – the experience of deportations and displacement. Although the Baltic States were annexed into the Soviet Union after the great Soviet purges, plans for mass deportations had been planned for the Baltic republics. The first Soviet mass deportation in the Baltic republics took place on the evenings of 13-14 June 1941.<sup>49</sup> Although specific numbers are difficult to calculate, numerous studies quote that 15,081 Latvians, 10,205 Estonians, and 34,260 Lithuanians were forced into boxcars and sent to the interior of the Soviet Union.

Displacement and deportation only intensified once the Red Army crossed the Narva River in 1944. Unlike the calm and systematic annexation process that took place in 1940, the return of the Soviets was marked by chaos. On several occasions, the reoccupation was met with strong German resistance in an attempt to stabilize the eastern Front, but retreating German soldiers and Baltic citizens fleeing west with the Germans marked the scene. Unlike in 1940, the Baltic experience under Soviet occupation from 1940-1941 was a precedent for those who might face recrimination or future deportation by the Soviet Union. From 1942-1945, roughly 60,000 Estonians, 100,000 Latvians, and 50,000 Lithuanians fled westwards and became one chapter in the very complicated story of displaced individuals in postwar Europe.<sup>50</sup>

Despite the series of minor demarches that occurred between the United States and the Soviet Union during 1940 over the legality of the American and Soviet positions on the status of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, in a broad sense, the Baltic question did not hamper the wartime alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union. The wartime status of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania should be clearly seen with the context of the East European question as a whole. John Gaddis has argued that officials in Washington knew exactly what

---

<sup>48</sup> Misiunas and Taagepera, 71.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 354.

they wanted in East Europe: maximum self-determination for the peoples in the region, while not undermining the wartime alliance.<sup>51</sup> The problem was that the two goals proved to be incompatible given that one of the wartime aims of the Soviet Union was to secure territorial gains in East Europe. America's wartime leaders were placed in the precarious situation of trying to win the war and balance the domestic opposition to allowing Stalin to become dictator over large portions of Europe. Like the rest of the region, Roosevelt hoped to deal with the territorial situation at the conclusion of the war. Nevertheless, discussions over Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania at the wartime conferences shed light on how Roosevelt felt about the status of East Europe.

By 1943, the military situation on the ground made it impossible for the United States or Great Britain to consider fighting for outright territorial independence for East Europeans that were in the path of an expanded Soviet hegemonic presence in the region. As a result, American diplomatic efforts concerning the region were greatly limited. Partly out of principle and partly out of domestic politics, Roosevelt attempted to thread the needle on the Baltic question with Stalin. This is most evident at the Teheran Conference where the status of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were briefly discussed between the two heads of state. On 1 December 1943, Roosevelt gave his tacit acceptance of a Soviet sphere of influence over the Baltic States. He made it clear that the United States had no intention of going to war to prevent the Russians from reoccupying the country. Roosevelt, however, insisted, "the big issue in the United States, would be the question of referendum and the right of self-determination."<sup>52</sup>

Later on in the exchange, Roosevelt stated that the Baltic States would, in any future plebiscite, cheerfully ratify their incorporation into the Soviet Union as they had been

---

<sup>51</sup> John Lewis Gaddis, *The United States and The Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000) 133.

<sup>52</sup> Roosevelt-Stalin Conversation, 1 December 1943, *FRUS The Conferences at Cairo and Teheran, 1943*, 594-595.

formerly been part of the Russian Empire.<sup>53</sup> It is impossible to know whether or not Roosevelt truly believed that Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians would vote to ratify their incorporation into the Soviet Union or if it was mere politicking with Stalin. What is clear is that the major issue that surrounded the status of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania was not spheres of influence or Baltic independence, but the means by which the Soviet Union exerted its will upon the Baltic States without a legitimate referendum. What is also clear, as Gaddis has argued is that Roosevelt admitted that the United States was not going to oppose territorial changes in East Europe and that Stalin left Teheran with the impression that Roosevelt's main concern was putting Russia's foreign policy in a more positive light before the American people.<sup>54</sup>

The principle of self-determination played an important role in two aspects of American domestic policy during the war. First, important members of the United States Senate explicitly linked American membership in a new international organization in the postwar period to the peace settlement reflecting the principles of the Atlantic Charter.<sup>55</sup> Second, conflicts between the attitudes of policymakers and American electoral politics proved to be problematic for the administration

The long-standing tension between American foreign policy makers and American ethnic groups continued through World War II. Although Polish-Americans, represented through the Polish American Congress were the most vocal and the group that the State Department was most concerned with, the Lithuanian-American communities, and smaller Estonian and Latvian communities in the United States were equally disenfranchised by the ambivalent attitude that Roosevelt and the Democratic establishment had taken towards the foreseeable political problems in Eastern Europe. The potential for deeper disillusionment

---

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>54</sup> Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War* 139.

<sup>55</sup> For a detailed analysis of the Senate, Atlantic Charter, and Peace Settlement see Gaddis *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War*, 149-157.

within Eastern European ethnic groups was used during the 1944 Presidential campaign as a wedge issue. Senator Arthur Vandenberg quickly realized this dynamic and proposed to candidate Thomas E. Dewey the inclusion of a plank in the foreign policy platform affirming that: “because this is the point at which the Roosevelt administration is deserting the hopes and prayers of all American nationals from Poland, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, etc.”<sup>56</sup> Although Dewey failed explicitly to play the Poland card during the election, it caused enough concern to Roosevelt that the issue had to be neutralized.

From 4-11 February 1945, Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill met in Yalta on the Black Sea. Despite the Cold War critique of the conference that was similar to the reaction against the Munich Accords, the agreements made at Yalta represented the realities of wartime Europe in 1945. Great Britain sought to protect its imperial holdings; the United States sought post-war cooperation through the establishment of the United Nations; and the Soviet Union sought reparations and further acceptance of Soviet hegemony over Eastern Europe.<sup>57</sup> Much of the concern about a postwar international organization rested on the shoulders of public opinion in the United States. As such, the issue of East Europe in general and Poland specifically, played a major role in allowing all parties at Yalta to “save face” politically. Despite the fact that the United States and Great Britain continued to recognize the Polish Exile Government in London, the Soviet Union refused to accept any agreement that did not involve the Communist government based in Poland. The American-led compromise allowed the Lublin Government to serve as the basis of the future Poland under the precondition that elections take place in the near future.<sup>58</sup>

The Yalta Agreements over Poland and the subsequent “Declaration on Liberated Europe” – that was agreed to at Yalta allowed Roosevelt to go back to Washington and state

---

<sup>56</sup> Quoted in Gaddis 146.

<sup>57</sup> Thomas Paterson, et. al. *A History of American Foreign Relations, Vol 2, Since 1895*. (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2005), 202.

<sup>58</sup> Paterson, 203.

that despite reaffirming his earlier acceptance of Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe at Teheran in 1943, he had persuaded Stalin to agree to hold elections in Eastern Europe.<sup>59</sup> For the time being, the administration had made the situation in Eastern Europe palatable to a majority of the American polity, and more importantly, to the United States Senate. Before Congress on 1 March 1945, Roosevelt argued “the Declaration of Liberated Europe had halted a trend toward the development of spheres of influence which, if allowed to go unchecked... might have had tragic results.”<sup>60</sup>

Roosevelt’s death on 12 April 1945 may have secured passage of the United Nations Treaty but the deteriorating situation in Eastern Europe, coupled with President Harry S. Truman’s reliance on the State Department on matters concerning the Soviet Union, created a situation where the failures of Roosevelt in East Europe became a crucial component in the origin of cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union and a moment where the Baltic question remained quite alive. After a delay, similar symbolic one party and one candidate elections that had occurred in Poland, Romania, and Hungary in 1945 took place in the Baltic Republics from 1946-1948, with upper-90 percentiles voting “yes” for the Kremlin-backed candidates.<sup>61</sup> The perception among American policymakers was that the Baltic republics had yet to voice their opinion about the future of their nations so the non-recognition policy continued.

The failure of the Yalta Agreements to produce any meaningful and legitimate reflections of self-determination in Eastern Europe ultimately meant for senior officials in the State Department that the illegality of the Soviet presence in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania had still not fundamentally been mitigated in 1945. Paul Goble has argued, “... the USA never assumed that the non-recognition policy was something eternal. At the outset, Washington took the position it did on the basis of the clear argument that the people of

---

<sup>59</sup> Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War*, 163.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 165.

<sup>61</sup> Misiuanis and Taagepera, 76.



Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania had not had the opportunity to freely express their views about occupation.”<sup>62</sup> Had the Soviet Union held referendums in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania that were perceived by American officials as legitimate, the principle that served as the underpinnings of the doctrine would have been undermined. Since the situation that brought about the non-recognition policy had not fundamentally been altered, even through warfare, maintaining non-recognition became a useful moral and political tool.

The new realities of the Cold War offered a new incentive for the United States to continue the policy of non-recognition. This new American rationale offered new legitimacy to the Baltic diplomats. In reality, they served as the legitimate protectors of Baltic state assets during World War II. In the immediate postwar years, they viewed themselves as not only the legitimate individuals responsible for the memory of the interwar republics, but as the main mechanism for continuity between the interwar republics and some future independent state.

### *Displaced Persons*

Although Antanas Smetona might have been one of the first prominent Lithuanian to flee the east Baltic region due to the threat of the Soviet annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, population displacement became a central feature of the Baltic experience during World War II. Over the course of World War II, thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians made the conscious decision to leave their homeland rather than await an uncertain future in the Baltic republics. While nearly 45,000 Balts succeeded in making it across the Baltic Sea hoping to be granted refuge in Sweden in Denmark, the majority of Balts ultimately made their way to occupied Germany by the end of the war. A small number of Balts moved to Germany in 1941 and constituted a group of individuals who feared Soviet

---

<sup>62</sup> Paul A. Goble “The Politics of a Principle” in Hiden, et. al *The Baltic Question During the Cold War*, 49.

deportation to Siberia after the first round of deportations had been carried out. Throughout the German occupation, thousands of Balts were forcibly moved to Greater Germany for use as slave labor.<sup>63</sup>

The largest number of Balts fled when the Red Army began its offensive against the Baltic region in January 1944. Hundreds of thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were well aware of what the political situation would be with the return of the Soviets and made the decision to confront an uncertain future as a refugee rather than the future that most likely awaited those that stayed in the Baltic republics. The flight west, whether on board a German naval vessel in the Baltic Sea or over land, was inherently dangerous. Although the individuals who personally experienced life as a postwar refugee have often been hesitant to document their experience, historians do have access to memoirs and personal accounts of the exodus.

Harry G. Kapeikis, an American Latvian recounts his family's flight from Riga to the West in October 1944 via a German naval vessel in his 2007 memoir. Kapeikis writes:

We fled from Riga by truck to a water-driven flour mill in the country, and from there to Liepaja. we crossed the Baltic Sea on October 14, 1944, on a German battle ship, arriving in Germany the following day. The crossing was an adventure for me and a scare for my mom. Our ship, one of five destroyers, was attacked by British Spitfires and a Lancaster dropped bombs that fell close to the ship on both sides. My mom screamed, and frankly, I, too, was scared. It was good to be on a solid shore, again. If I was to die, I preferred the land over the sea.<sup>64</sup>

For those that did not have access to a German naval ship or some other vessel, entire families traveled over land for over eight months eventually arriving in central Europe. In 1995, George Berzins, Latvian Service Desk Chief of the Voice of America recounted his experience leaving Latvia as a child to his colleague, Alan Heil:

---

<sup>63</sup> It is difficult to ascertain the exact number of individuals who were forcibly relocated as slave laborers since Balts were often classified as Soviet citizens in German records. According to Misiunas and Taagepera, 15,000 Estonians, 35,000 Latvians, and 75,000 Lithuanians were involved in Nazi Labor Mobilization. See Table 3 in *Baltic States: Years of Dependence*, 356.

<sup>64</sup> Harry G. Kapeikis, *Exile from Latvia: My World War II Childhood - From Survival to Opportunity* (New York: Trafford Publishing, 2007), 16.

Throughout their eight month flight to freedom, George and his one year old brother Gunars, were sitting atop a farm cart full of household possessions. His father pulled that green cart across Central Europe as his mother Austra pushed it... It was winter most of the time. His father had to hide during the day for fear of being drafted into the German Army and sent to the Russian front. At one point, he even buried himself in a snowbank to escape detection. The Front, it seemed, was never that far away. Should the Russian forces overtake them, the Berzins parents knew that his father probably would be deported to Siberia. His name had been spotted on a list of prospective exiles prepared by the Soviets when they briefly occupied Latvia until 1941.<sup>65</sup>

One thing that Baltic refugees shared regardless of how they arrived in Central Europe was how they were going to survive the remainder of the war on the run in a Germany that was under a constant military barrage from the allies. In particular, the memories of Dresden were etched into the memories of both Berzins and Kapeikis. The reason why Berzins shared his story with Heil was that American National Public Radio had been airing a documentary commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the firebombing in Dresden, and Berzins exclaimed "That's exactly the way it was."<sup>66</sup> Kapeikis remembers leaving Dresden on 12 February 1945 on a crowded train and hearing the British and American bombers flying overhead on 13-14 February.<sup>67</sup>

Perhaps the greatest fear that Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian refugees shared was the lack of knowledge about what would happen to them when the war ended. Would the Red Army occupy the whole of the European continent rendering the decision to flee merely a tactic to delay the inevitable? If they were captured by the French, the Americans, or the British, would they forcibly repatriate them to the Soviet Union? After all, Stalin was Roosevelt and Churchill's main ally in the war against Germany. Would they universally be categorized as Nazi sympathizers since they had fled from the Soviet Union and be punished?

At the end of the war, the eleven to twelve million displaced individuals were originally supposed to be quickly repatriated to their home country, but due to the physical

---

<sup>65</sup> Alan Heil Jr., *Voice of America: A History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 387.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.* Berzins recalled being five years old at the time of the Dresden tragedy and that his family was passing through.

<sup>67</sup> Kapeikis, 19.

condition that many displaced persons were in (malnourishment, various ailments, and harsh living conditions) the rapid repatriation of displaced persons did not occur. Displaced Persons (DPs) were ultimately sorted by their nationality, given medical treatment, and those that were able and willing to be rapidly repatriated, were. The remaining DPs were interviewed to ascertain where they had come from, whether or not they had collaborated with the Germans during the War, given identity cards, and assigned to camps, which were based on particular nationalities.<sup>68</sup>

In 1945, the interests of Eastern European DPs and the American occupying forces were in virtual opposition. Wartime planners had hoped to repatriate refugees and DPs in a quick and orderly fashion following the war, in part to reduce the burden in resources and personnel that caring for DPs posed for the postwar reconstruction effort. At the end of 1945, the repatriation of DPs had been seen widely as a great success of allied cooperation. Nearly 85% of all DPs were repatriated and agreements at the February 1945 Yalta Conference set in place the process of repatriating over two million Soviet citizens. A significant number of Polish, Ukrainian, Jewish, as well as non-Jewish Baltic DPs, however, refused to return to their Soviet occupied homeland. This tendency was exacerbated by the American understanding of the Yalta Agreements. American officials provided exceptions in the determining of Soviet citizenship, which excluded some Poles, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians.<sup>69</sup> By 1946 it became evident that the continued presence of non-repatriable DPs in the western occupation zones would require a shift in policy.

---

<sup>68</sup> See Mark Wyman, *DPs: Europe's Displaced Persons, 1945-1951* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 38-85. and Ben Shephard, *The Long Road Home: The Aftermath of the Second World War* (New York: Random House, 2010), 78-96.

<sup>69</sup> The 23 July 1940 Sumner Welles Statement declaring that the United States would not recognize the Soviet annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania became the cornerstone of American policy towards the Baltic republics until they regained independence in 1991 and should be viewed as the main framework through which the State Department made all policy decisions towards the Baltic republics.

Throughout 1946 and 1947, the status of DPs who refused to repatriate steadily became a contentious issue between the United States and the Soviet Union and was as much an early Cold War issue as it was a humanitarian matter. The continued presence of hundreds of thousands of displaced persons clearly burdened reconstruction efforts, yet it was politically untenable for the United States to forcibly repatriate Eastern European DPs to Soviet controlled territories. As a result, the debate shifted towards resettling these DPs in Western Europe or elsewhere.

In the American occupation zone, 39,000 Latvians, 28,500 Lithuanians, and 14,000 Estonians resided in DP camps.<sup>70</sup> General Eisenhower held the opinion that Estonian, Latvian, and Estonian DPs should repatriate, and attempted to persuade them to trust the Russians.<sup>71</sup> The Soviet Union and its satellite states led a swift propaganda campaign in the DP camps to persuade “Soviet” citizens to return to the Soviet Union, and applied pressure to both the Americans and the United Nations to forcibly repatriate their citizens. Nevertheless, Baltic DPs refused to return to their home. UNRRA conducted a repatriation poll in May 1946 demonstrating that only 25 Latvians in the American zone agreed to return to their Soviet controlled nation.<sup>72</sup> By and large, the primary reason why Baltic DPs refused to return was political fear. Representing the tone of Balts who were able to escape their homeland, Jules Feldmans, Latvian Charge d’Affaires to the United States stated in the *Chicago Tribune* in 1947: “I’d go back to Latvia immediately, and so would every other exile, if we didn’t know that we’d be sent straight to Russia as slave laborers.”<sup>73</sup>

---

Jew were also another notable exception and were placed in a special category known as “persecutees.” This was decided, in principle, in June 1943.

<sup>70</sup> *Monthly Report of the Military Governor*, U.S. Zone, 20 November 1945, No. 4, 22.

<sup>71</sup> Laura Hilton, *Prisoners of Peace: Rebuilding Community, Identity, and Nationality in Displaced Persons Camps in Germany, 1945-1952* (Dissertation: The Ohio State University, 2001), 384.

<sup>72</sup> “Results of Repatriation Poll.” Folder: 014.1/A, Box 6, PAG-004, 3.0.11.0.0, UNA Cited In Hilton, 385.

<sup>73</sup> Feldmans quoted in *Chicago Daily Tribune* 1 January 1947, Folder: Latvia, Miscellaneous, Box 6: Displaced Persons, Jules Feldmans Papers, Hoover Institution Archives.

The refusal to repatriate coupled with the indecisiveness of the occupying powers and international organizations created a situation where the non-repatriable DPs resided in DP camps much longer than UNRRA ever anticipated in 1945. The most important feature of Baltic DP life in the late 1940s was the self-perception of being exiled and the related activities of establishing cultural and political institutions that offered a semblance of continuity to life in the pre-1940 Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Anniversaries, however, were the easiest commemorations possible, and proved to be very important. On the anniversaries of the declarations of independence of each nation, national councils passed resolutions to commemorate the date. One such resolution was passed on 26 February 1949 at the Fellbach camp commemorating Estonian independence, declaring that it was their “sacred duty to protest against the inhuman savagery of the bloody Soviet regime in the occupied Baltic States.”<sup>74</sup>

On the political side, national councils were created that were composed of 1/3 representatives of the parties from the interwar parliaments; 1/3 composed of delegates of various social organizations, and 1/3 from the national central councils that were chosen directly by the refugees. The national central committees were based on the principles of democratic representation and free elections. Some of their responsibilities included cutting firewood, working in carpentry, providing basic services such as shoe and clothing repair, and participating in civic groups such as the police and fire-fighting. The creation of the Estonian National Assembly Centre (ENAC) was yet another means of maintaining cohesion of the group. Created on 15 October 1945 of various groups of Estonian DPs, the aim of the organization was to “organize a self-administration which, based on democratic principles and directed by the usage of traditions and principles of the Estonian period of

---

<sup>74</sup> “Fellbach Resolution” of 26 February 1949, Folder: Protest of Exiled, Box 6: Displaced Persons, Jules Feldmans Papers, Hoover Institution Archives.

independence.”<sup>75</sup> More specifically it was charged with the tasks of making education available in their mother-tongue, advance national culture in all possible fields and activities, and keep Estonians as a singular community and preserve the feeling of intimate union among Estonians.

One priority of the independent interwar republics was to move towards promoting education. In basic literacy, Estonia had made gradual improvements throughout the 1920s and 1930s. In 1922, 89.1% of Estonians were able to read and write. By 1934, 94% of the nation’s population could read and write.<sup>76</sup> When Estonia’s main university, Tartu University, was reorganized as a new Estonian institution in 1919, the student enrollment was held at 374. Although the student population increased rapidly to 4200 by 1926, by 1939 the student body stabilized to be consistent at 3,000.<sup>77</sup> The Soviet annexation naturally had a cumulatively negative effect on the agenda of the Baltic intelligentsia, academics, and the university’s ability to function. The widespread displacement during the war resulted in high-levels of academics residing in DP camps.

In October 1945 near Hamburg, a group of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian professors held a meeting to assess the situation of higher education of Baltic DPs. With consent of the military government in December 1945, a Baltic University, officially known as the Pinneberg Study Centre was created.<sup>78</sup> Despite little resources and no remuneration for the staff, the first courses were held in March 1946. Over the next several years, the teaching staff reached 200 members, with an average of 700-1300 students enrolled.<sup>79</sup> Further expansion of the program was limited only due to the lack of accommodations at the Pinneberg DP camp. The traditional structure of Baltic universities was replicated at the

---

<sup>75</sup> “Estonian National Assembly Centre Memo” in UNRRA Estonian DP Yearbook, Folder: Yearbook, UNRRA, Estonian DP, Box 1, UNRRA Estonian Displaced Persons Collection, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>76</sup> Raun, 134.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 134-135.

<sup>78</sup> “Main Facts about the Baltic University” *Information Bulletin*, Pinneberg, 15 June 1948. Folder: Displaced Person, Box 6 Jules Feldmans Papers, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

Baltic University. Eight faculties comprising of seventeen departments were organized, with disciplines ranging from philosophy to medicine.

Despite holding nearly 30,000 lectures from 1945-1948, the university lacked accreditation from Germany and lacked the ability to confer degrees. As a result, students were merely issued certificates that were generally accepted by fully accredited universities in Germany. The Baltic University at Pinneberg represented a high point of cooperation among the Baltic DPs that should be viewed as representative of prior moments of intra-Baltic cooperation and a model for cooperative efforts over the following decades. The experience of the Soviet occupation and subsequent flight served as a uniting element among the three nationalities. This, however, never replaced the strong national ties that each group had. The individual nationalities were well represented at the university through their languages, cultures, and academic traditions.

The success and diversity of the university created a situation where discussions began as to whether the university should be moved if the DPs were to be moved from the camps. One early committee in the United States took up this cause. Started by David Martin of New York, who was the Secretary of the American Refugee Defense Committee, the “American Committee for the Baltic University in Exile” sought to assist in the transfer of the university to the United States. Martin’s committee was joined by an appeal from fifty university presidents, headed by Christian Gauss of Princeton and Rev. Robert I. Gannon of Fordham. In correspondences between the Baltic University and members of the Committee it became clear that the idea that the continuity of the Baltic University would play a crucial role in the development of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations in exile. In a press release, Gauss stated:

It would be a terrible tragedy if this unique institution were to go of existence... It is imperative that the cultures of the Baltic peoples, which are today being destroyed by a genocidal foreign regime, should be kept alive, and that there should be at least a



small body of Baltic intellectuals prepared and able to assist in their countries' recovery when they regain their independence.<sup>80</sup>

Although the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian DPs were modestly successful in establishing a set of institutions that mimicked a sense of normality in everyday life, like the future of the Baltic University at Pinneberg, the DP camps from their very beginning, were ephemeral. By the late 1940s, a question of "what now?" had to be asked by the DPs and the occupation governments.

Through actions and words, the non-repatriable Baltic DPs made it clear that they would not voluntarily return to their homelands and the implication of the non-recognition policy made it clear that neither the Americans nor the British were going to forcibly repatriate the Baltic DPs. Balts, however, could not just stay in camps in occupied Germany and Austria. Resettlement, however, became a function of both domestic politics for the occupying authorities and of the changing international situation. Baltic DPs, particularly Latvians, were faced with the accusations of collaboration with the Nazis. During the German occupation, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians indeed did collaborate with the Germans (partly due to fighting the Soviets, rarely due to pure ideology). The problem, however, for the American and British authorities was determining which Baltic nationals volunteered to collaborate with the Germans and those who were forcibly conscripted into the Wehrmacht. When Eisenhower attempted to persuade Baltic DPs to return home in 1945, he remarked: "I do not think that Canada wants immigrants who collaborated with the Germans or who believed Goebbels's lies about our Allies or were too unpatriotic to rebuild their own country. I do not think that South America wants such people. I am sure that the United States does not."<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Gauss "Prominent Educators Appeal for Baltic DP University" Jules Feldmans Papers, Box 6, Folder: "Displaced Persons" Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>81</sup> Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Proclamation" issued on October of 1945. Cited in Hilton, 385.

## Conclusion

The end of World War II might have created a tenuous peace on the European continent through the total defeat of Nazi Germany, but it did not bring about a satisfactory settlement for the parties that were interested in the political, economic, and social developments in Eastern Europe. The Baltic refugees who were residing in UNRRA administered DP Camps still faced an uncertain future since they had refused to be repatriated to the Soviet Union. American diplomacy had not been able to create the political climate in Eastern Europe that was required for the Baltic republics to truly demonstrate whether their populations sought a future as part of the Soviet Union or not. As a result, the Baltic refugees began to perceive themselves as political exiles and the American policy of non-recognition towards the Soviet annexation of the Baltic republics continued.

Throughout the years that Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians spent in the DP camps, they had carried many of the political and cultural practices that were important in the interwar republics with them. Political organizations were created around preexisting political parties. Academic traditions reasserted themselves through institutions such as the Baltic University at Pinneberg. Participating in choirs and other cultural activities provided a sense of community for the Balts as they waited what their future would hold. Equally important though were the new political traditions that were born in the DP camps. The anniversaries of declarations of independence remained important, but new commemorations, such as those surrounding the 1940 annexation of their homelands and the 1941 mass deportations were more important in establishing certain political traditions that were unique to the Baltic exile community that developed in the first few years after leaving their homelands. Political and cultural continuity to the interwar republics became a central goal of the DPs, but at the same time, something new had been created.

By the late 1940s, the United States continued to recognize the exiled Baltic diplomats who were residing in Washington D.C. and New York City. The conflicts between the United States and the Soviet Union that took place during this period of time were as much a battle for maintaining international credibility and winning hearts and minds as they were about the discrete topic of the conflict. As a result, it was inconceivable that the United States would decide to abandon its policy of non-recognition or allow Baltic DPs to be repatriated to the Soviet Union.

The experience of the Baltic exiles from 1945 until 1948 and the experience of American policymakers during the same period of time resulted in the convergence of interests in the two parties. The non-recognition policy was useful to both Baltic exiles and American policymakers, not only on the symbolic level, but also on the practical level. Further, a shared vision would emerge that a determined effort should take place to try to reduce the influence of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe as well as a shared rejection that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were truly constituent republics of the Soviet Union. The following chapter analyzes the main features of American policy towards the Baltic republics during the early Cold War years.

## CHAPTER II

### AMERICAN POLICY TOWARDS EASTERN EUROPE AFTER WORLD WAR II & CONTINUATION OF BALTIC POLICY

The traditional power relations that had dominated Europe in the first half of the twentieth century were shattered as a result of World War II. Despite its role as a victor, the United Kingdom had entered a state of decline since it took the totality of the British state and its resources to win the war. The United Kingdom's customary guardian of continental affairs, France, ceased to play the role of a continental power. Germany was under military occupation. The United States and the Soviet Union emerged from the European conflict as the two most powerful states in the international system. Unlike the Soviet Union, however, the United States suffered no material damage and possessed nearly fifty percent of the world's productive capacity.<sup>1</sup>

Despite the "preponderant power" that the United States had accumulated by 1945, American demobilization in Europe, coupled with the unwillingness of the Soviet Union to participate in postwar organizations designed during the war, resulted in senior American policymakers taking a pessimistic view of American power and future relations with the Soviet Union. By 1948, the U.S. Army had reduced its presence in Europe to a mere ten divisions and the American nuclear arsenal had yet to reach sufficient quantities to defeat the Soviet Union.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, analysts did not question the Soviet ability to overrun Western Europe and the Middle East, but the ability of the United States to rapidly mobilize compared to the Soviet Union was seen to be an adequate deterrent. Meanwhile, American officials hoped to create a postwar order that was absent of political blocs with convertible currencies, and free trade, as envisioned at the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference. The 31 December 1945 rejection

---

<sup>1</sup> Melvyn Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, The Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), 2. Leffler juxtaposes the situation in Europe with the situation in the United States "where the American people did not experience the suffering, the hardship, and the profound upheaval that beset most of humanity during the early 1940s."

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 221-226.

of the Bretton Woods system by the Soviet Union reinforced the growing feeling that the Kremlin was unwilling to cooperate in such a postwar order.<sup>3</sup>

From 1945-1948, the administration of Harry S. Truman shifted from a policy of maintaining World War II's grand alliance and incorporating the Soviet Union into a postwar order to engaging the Soviet Union in a cold war and attempting to contain Soviet influence.<sup>4</sup> The most important aspect of American policy towards Europe during this period of time was shoring up American points of strength in Western Europe. Truman's speech before Congress on 12 March 1947 provided military and financial support to combat the influence of communism in Turkey and Greece.<sup>5</sup> Secretary of State George Marshall's speech at Harvard on 5 June 1947 laid the groundwork for the European Recovery Program, which proved to be instrumental rebuild Europe – materially, politically, and psychologically.<sup>6</sup> Finally, the CIA successfully undermined a possible communist coup in Italy during the 18 April 1948 elections.<sup>7</sup>

American successes in obtaining some sort of diplomatic advantage in Eastern Europe, however, were far fewer. Although there was initial interest by Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania to participate in the Marshall Plan, the Kremlin's political

---

<sup>3</sup> See Robert A. Pollard, "Economic Security and the Origins of the Cold War: Bretton Woods, the Marshall Plan, and American Rearmament, 1944-1950" *Diplomatic History* 9, Issue 3 (1985): 273-279. Pollard argues that perhaps the main reason for the Soviet repudiation of Bretton Woods was the general breakdown of relations over the future of Eastern Europe as general and political interests are insufficient to explain why the Kremlin agreed to enter into negotiations in 1944.

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion on containing the Soviet Union through cooperation see Gaddis *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy During the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 9-13.

<sup>5</sup> Elizabeth Edwards Spalding, *The First Cold Warrior: Harry Truman, Containment and the Remaking of Liberal Internationalism* (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 2006), 61-80.

<sup>6</sup> See Robert L. Beisner, *Dean Acheson: A Life in the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 66-79. Beisner discusses the process of developing the Marshall Plan. Beisner argues that the number of U.S. officials who were working on related issues indicates why it was futile to try identifying a single author of the Marshall Plan. Everyone from Truman himself to Dean Acheson, James Forrestal, and Will Clayton played important roles.

<sup>7</sup> Wilson D. Miscamble, *George F. Kennan and the Making of American Foreign Policy, 1947-1950* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 103. On March 8 1948, the NSC authorized NSC 1 / 3 which permitted the CIA to begin operations in Italy, which included covert funding of the Christian Democrats and Saragat's Socialists.

pressure ultimately vetoed any such participation.<sup>8</sup> At the same time, the February 1948 Czechoslovakian Coup demonstrated inherent American limitations to influence political events in Central and Eastern Europe. Throughout the entire postwar period, the Soviet Union's desire for security through establishing a geopolitical stranglehold in Eastern Europe proved to be a source of immense conflict with the American desire to create a postwar world free of zones of influence and maintain its rhetoric about the advancement of democracy and free trade.

The status of the Baltic States was just one of many issues that defined American-Soviet relations over Eastern Europe after World War II. While preparing for the Paris Peace Conference, Llewellyn Thompson discovered that the Soviet delegation planned on including the three foreign ministers of the Baltic republics, indicating that the question of recognition of the three countries into the Soviet Union may be raised at the conference.<sup>9</sup> Thompson conceded:

It appears that we must sooner or later recognize *de jure* this development which has long since been accomplished *de facto*. In view of the categoric [sic] and uncompromising statement made by the Secretary of State at the time the Baltic States were absorbed, it would be easier for us to go along with the states represented at a large international conference in recognizing this development than to do so by independent action on our part.<sup>10</sup>

Thompson, as well as John Hickerson and Dean Acheson thought that it would be logical and advantageous for the United States to settle the whole question in connection with concluding a peace treaty with Germany.<sup>11</sup> The inability of deputies to reach an agreement with regard to

---

<sup>8</sup> Beisner, 74.

<sup>9</sup> Llewellyn Thompson drafted memo signed by Acting Secretary of State John Hickerson to the United States Delegation at the Council of Foreign Ministers at Paris, 27 July 1946, *FRUS* 1946 Paris Peace Conference Proceedings, 23-24.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* Thompson argued that the United States should also avoid any action which would allow for separate Baltic representation in the United Nation; that the Soviet government could agree that nationals of the Baltic States outside the Soviet Union could be allowed freely to opt whether or not to return to the Soviet Union; the United States should afford recognition on the basis of determining European frontiers by international action; and that any act of recognition should be contingent upon the Soviet Union's agreement to compensate American citizens for their claims for property confiscated in the Baltic States since they were incorporated into the Soviet Union.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

the publication of the texts of the draft treaties resulted in a situation where the Baltic question had yet to be answered and would be incorporated into broader American policy towards Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union during the early years of the Cold War.

This chapter will examine the three main overarching American policy initiatives towards the Baltic republics during the first decade of the Cold War. First, the debate about continuing the non-recognition policy towards the Soviet annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, where the United States continued relations with the existing Baltic diplomats residing in the United States. Little attention has been given to the very discrete policy discussions that took place on how the diplomats would continue their work while in exile and how the United States would or would not materially assist them. Second, the immigration debate, where tens of thousands of Baltic displaced persons refused to repatriate to the Soviet Union. An important feature of American policy towards the Baltic republics was the use of refugees. Whether or not the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian DPs would be allowed to immigrate to the United States had necessary implications for American policy. Finally, the establishment of a State-Private network with Baltic exiles through the National Committee for a Free Europe, which constituted the bulk of unofficial American policy towards the region, will be analyzed.

This chapter will also examine the role that the rhetoric of liberation had on the way that the most important actor in policy towards the Baltic republics – the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exiles perceived American policy towards their homelands. I will argue that during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations there was an inherent asymmetry between the rhetoric behind calling for the liberation of the Soviet bloc and the confidence that exiles had in American willingness to follow through behind such claims. From the very beginning of serious discussions between Baltic exiles and American policymakers, the exiles were more than willing to be participants in American sponsored activities. The increased rhetoric

of liberation with Eisenhower's election in 1952, I will demonstrate, also raised the bar of exile expectations of the United States, which ultimately complicated exile relations.

First, however, it is important to understand the basic foreign policy tenets that the United States laid out from 1947-1950 in how it would deal with the Soviet Union and its allies in Central and Eastern Europe. It is also important to understand the complicated public-private network that was developed in order to provide a sufficient level of plausible deniability for official American policymakers. Finally, the prominence of Eastern European exiles as a key issue for the success of the policy will be addressed.

### *Tenets of American Policy towards the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*

The containment of the Soviet Union, as described by George F. Kennan through the "Long Telegram" in 1946 and his 1947 article in *Foreign Affairs*, has traditionally been seen as the primary policy put in place by the United States to deal with the Soviet threat throughout the Cold War. Recent scholarship, however, has argued that containment was merely the first step in a "determined effort to destroy Soviet power." Under the auspices of the containment doctrine, the United States pursued an aggressive policy to undermine Soviet power in Eastern Europe by "measures short of war." American policymakers thought that through engaging in psychological (or political) warfare, the Kremlin could be compelled to alter its behavior in the international system or hasten the collapse of the Soviet system.<sup>12</sup> In a nuclear age, both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations assumed that the deployment of psychological warfare could meet American objectives vis-à-vis the Soviet Union without having to rely on the armed forces.

The CIA's success in leading covert operations against Italian communists in 1948 encouraged Kennan's Policy Planning Staff at the State Department to begin studying

---

<sup>12</sup> Gregory Mitrovich, *Undermining the Kremlin: America's Strategy to Subvert the Soviet Bloc, 1947-1956* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), 2. See also: W. Scott Lucas, *Freedom's War: The American Crusade Against the Soviet Union* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1999).



whether or not the United States should inaugurate “organized political warfare” against the Soviet Union. During May and June 1948, the State Department, National Security Council (NSC), along with the Joints Chief of Staff (JCS) mulled over various drafts of policy papers on the establishment of a directorate that would oversee and execute covert operations. The major point of contention among the various bureaucracies was who would control such a body.<sup>13</sup> Ultimately President Truman approved NSC 10/2 on 18 June 1948 and the establishment of the Office of Policy Coordination (OPC) would be the home for American psychological warfare and covert actions for the remainder of his presidency.<sup>14</sup>

While NSC 10/2 created the new administrative body that would oversee American covert operations going forward, perhaps the most significant component of the document was the stipulation that operations must be designed to be “deniable” or “planned and executed so that any U.S. Government responsibility for them is not evident to authorized persons and that if uncovered the U.S. Government can plausibly disclaim any responsibility.”<sup>15</sup> The important implications of “plausible deniability” (as it has become known today) are twofold. Concerning operational effectiveness, attempts to insulate presidential administrations ultimately undermined the chances that a particular policy initiative would succeed. On the organizational front, it is out of this doctrine that the public-private network of institutions was established – the most famous being Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Throughout 1948, the Policy Planning Staff and NSC were engaged in a debate over what the Soviet Union’s international motivations were and how best to formulate American policy towards the Soviet Union. NSC 7, released on 30 March 1948, argued that Soviet power was growing so rapidly that it would surpass American power eventually and that

---

<sup>13</sup> The original plan envisioned by Kennan authorized the director of the directorate to coordinate the planning and execution of covert operations with representatives of the State Department and the Department of Defense, while having the ability to review all aspects of policy implementation.

<sup>14</sup> Miscamble, 108.

<sup>15</sup> Mitrovich, 21.

there were very few Soviet vulnerabilities that the United States could exploit.<sup>16</sup> Although NSC 7 was canceled due to significant protestation in many circles over its hyperbolic nature, the document was significant since it shifted the policy debate from how to implement some of the most defensive aspects of containing the Soviet Union to a more offensive policy against Soviet expansionism.<sup>17</sup>

This debate shift allowed Kennan's Policy Planning Staff to take the lead in formulating what, precisely, would be the strategic and tactical elements of policy to combat the Soviet Union. A historiographical consensus has been reached concerning the extent to which senior American officials believed in the likelihood of a Soviet attack against the United States or its interests. Kennan's confidence in American military superiority convinced him that the Soviets would not deliberately start a global war, but that the Soviet Union would utilize its psychological warfare capabilities to undermine American interests in peripheral regions.<sup>18</sup> It is through this understanding of the Soviet threat as something that was primarily rooted in a propagandistic and morale threat, that Kennan began working on the document that would define American policy towards the Soviet Union for the duration of the Cold War.

On 20 August 1948, Kennan submitted to the NSC the Policy Planning Staff paper on "U.S. objectives towards Russia." The paper expressed two guidelines for the United States to manage the relationship with the Soviet Union. The United States should try to:

1. Reduce the power and influence of Moscow to limit where they will no longer constitute a threat to the peace and stability of the world family of nations.

---

<sup>16</sup> NSC 7, "The Position of the United States with Respect to Soviet-Directed World Communism," 30 March 1948, *FRUS* 1948 I, 545-550.

<sup>17</sup> Mitrovich, 25. The postrevisionist Cold War historiographical school tends to understate the importance of NSC 7. Spalding argues that just because the universalism of those that were in favor of NSC 7 existed, it did not portend that Truman nor the NSC was incapable of making prudent decision. *The First Cold Warrior*, 283.

<sup>18</sup> See Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 82. Miscamble, *George F. Kennan and the Making of American Foreign Policy*, 65-68, and Walter L. Hixson, *George F. Kennan: Cold War Iconoclast* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 73-78.

2. Bring about a basic change in the theory and practice of international relations observed by the government in power in Russia.<sup>19</sup>

To achieve these objectives, American policymakers were to seek four main goals. First, the United States had to eliminate communist domination in the satellite area. Second, the United States had to foster nationalist sentiments in certain groups within the Soviet Union. Third, the United States had to attack Soviet credibility wherever possible. Fourth, the United States would have to compel the Soviet government to recognize the undesirability of its current policies in the international system.<sup>20</sup>

“US Objectives Towards Russia” became known as NSC 20/1 within the NSC and received a considerable amount of criticism from key members of the NSC, most notably, Hickerson and Sam Reber of the Office of European Affairs, through being skeptical of the premise that would it be possible for a real change in Soviet behavior if there was not a change of regime in the Kremlin?<sup>21</sup> Despite the skepticism, the NSC created several revised drafts, ultimately approving NSC 20/4 on 23 November 1948 and signed by Truman the following day. According to historian Gregory Mitrovich, “NSC 20/4 was in fact the definitive statement of U.S. objectives in the cold war and the document to which all subsequent Truman administration studies would refer for guidance.”<sup>22</sup>

Going forward, the United States would work towards the independence of Eastern Europe; the awakening of nationalist sentiments in the Soviet Union, rhetorically argue against the Soviet Union in international forums, while creating moments where the Soviet Union would be compelled to reassess its policies. Policymakers would deploy traditional diplomatic tools, economic tools, and covert actions to facilitate such desirable outcomes. While the most famous assertive policies towards Eastern Europe during the 1940s include

---

<sup>19</sup> NSC 20/1 “US Objectives towards Russia” 18 August 1948, *FRUS* 1948 I, 609-611.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> Mitrovich, 35.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 35-36.

the paramilitary interventions into Enver Hoxha's Albania and the economic and political tools used to further accentuate the Tito-Stalin split, parallels exist concerning the Baltic States.<sup>23</sup>

In all three Baltic republics, locally called "Forest Brothers" led national resistance efforts during World War II against both the Nazi and the two periods of Soviet occupation.<sup>24</sup> Beginning in 1945, British intelligence began hearing of ambushes against Soviet military patrols and of the communist Estonian Central Committee holding emergency meetings on what to do about the "bandits" in the countryside. As a result, British intelligence started building contacts with Baltic émigrés to make contact with the Forest Brothers. In 1948 the CIA joined the British effort to recruit Baltic émigrés. The United States ultimately had a large pool of recruits, some from DP camps and some from the United States, as a result, by 1950 the first insertions into the Baltic republics began.

According to John Prados, Balts working for the CIA earned \$125 per week for three months of training, \$100 per day when on an operation, and \$1,000 if they succeeded in their mission. "Few returned to claim the bonuses."<sup>25</sup> Early efforts at infiltrating the Soviet Union consisted of parachuting émigrés into the Baltic republics and most quickly succumbed to Soviet security troops before making contact with the partisans. By the time that the CIA and SIS were operating at a reasonable capacity of dropping people behind the Iron Curtain, Soviet security forces had defeated the Estonian and Latvian partisans. The Lithuanian Forest Brothers continued to function until as late as 1960, but received minimal assistance from the Americans or British despite their requests for munitions. The underground movements in the Baltic republics were not only unsuccessful, but also resulted in nearly 75,000 civilian fatalities.

---

<sup>23</sup> John Prados, *Safe for Democracy: The Secret Wars of the CIA* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006), 58-67.

<sup>24</sup> See Mart Laar, *War in the Woods: Estonia's Struggle for Survival, 1944-1956* (Ann Arbor, MI: The Compass, Press, 1992).

<sup>25</sup> Prados, *Safe for Democracy: The Secret Wars of the CIA*, 56.

Like the paramilitary interventions elsewhere in Eastern Europe during the late 1940s, the paramilitary interventions into the Baltic republics constituted a relatively small component of American efforts to undermine the Kremlin's authority in the region. Concerning the Baltic republics, two seemingly separate, but intertwined sets of policy were put in place. The State-Private network of supporting Eastern European exiles was also applied to how the American policymakers would deal with Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exile groups. More important, however, was the debate about continuing its non-recognition policy towards the 1940 annexation.

#### *Continuation of the Non-Recognition Policy and Accreditation of Diplomats*

The single most important question for the State Department concerning Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania after the inability to reach a settlement with the Soviet Union over the Baltic States' status at the Paris Peace Conference, was whether or not the United States would continue its policy towards the 1940 annexation. Despite Soviet insistence that the Baltic republics were constituent republics of the USSR and vital to the territorial integrity of the Union, the manner in which the republics were incorporated into the Soviet Union continued to be a useful rhetorical tool by the Americans to describe Soviet intentions internationally as Cold War tensions increased. Unilateral *de jure* recognition of the annexation would constitute a blow to American prestige internationally and reinforce the sentiment that the United States was exclusively pursuing a defensive policy against the Soviet Union.

The non-recognition policy at its core, however, was necessarily an exclusionary policy. The United States had not established consular relations within the republics; forbade American diplomats stationed in the Soviet Union from traveling to the Baltic republics; refused to promote any sort of cultural exchanges with individuals from the Baltic republics;

and lobbied aggressively against individuals of Baltic decent from representing the Soviet Union in the United States. At the same time, the United States refused to recognize any exile government in the names of the Baltic States. There existed a contradiction between a strictly exclusionary policy and an overarching policy towards the Soviet Union that sought to frustrate Soviet actions. Kennan explicitly discussed the problem of American policy towards the Baltic republics in NSC 20/1 in terms of the issues of borders as well as the issue of revitalizing nationalism within the Soviet Union.

While discussing the issues of Soviet border changes since 1939, Kennan acknowledged that border extensions “cannot in all cases be said to have been seriously detrimental to international peace and stability.”<sup>26</sup> He continued, “In other cases, notably that of the Baltic countries, the question is more difficult. We cannot really profess indifferences to the further fate of the Baltic, peoples.”<sup>27</sup> On current American policy in 1948 he stated:

This has been reflected in our recognition policy to date with respect to those countries. And we could hardly consider that international peace and stability will really have ceased to be threatened as long as Europe is faced with the fact that it has been possible for Moscow to crush these small countries which have been guilty of no real provocation and which have given evidence of their ability to handle their own affairs in a progressive manner, without detriment to the interests of their neighbors. It should therefore logically be considered a part of U.S. objectives to see these countries restored to something at least approaching a decent state of freedom and independence.<sup>28</sup>

Kennan conceded that short of war, it would be impossible to work towards the complete independence of the Baltic States as it would “raise an issue directly involving the dignity and the vital interests of the Soviet State as such.”<sup>29</sup> As a result, Kennan proposed that the United States “should encourage by every means at our disposal the development in the Soviet Union of institutions of federalism, which would permit a revival of the national life

---

<sup>26</sup> NSC 20/1 “US Objectives towards Russia” 18 August 1948, *FRUS* 1948 I, 609-611.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

of the Baltic peoples.”<sup>30</sup> Answering why restricting this aim to the Baltic peoples:

Why do we not include the other national minority groups of the Soviet Union? The answer is that the Baltic peoples happen to be the only peoples whose traditional territory and population are now entirely included in the Soviet Union and who have shown themselves capable of coping successfully with the responsibilities of statehood. Moreover, we still formally deny the legitimacy of their violent inclusion in the Soviet Union, and they therefore have a special status in our eyes.<sup>31</sup>

In NSC 20/1, Kennan reaffirmed that the Baltic republics constituted a special case in American dealings with the Soviet Union and the existing non-recognition policy.

Upon a first reading of NSC 20/1, however, there appears to be a contradictory nature in the policy prescriptions that Kennan lays out for the Baltic republics. At the same time as endorsing the non-recognition policy, by its nature an exclusionary policy, he argues that the United States should implement policies that would work towards establishing a federated place for the Baltic republics within the Soviet Union. Like much of Kennan’s writing, however, few specific policy initiatives are mentioned. Perhaps the only unequivocal statement that Kennan makes in NSC 20/1 is that “the Baltic States should not be compelled to remain under any communist authority in the aftermath of another war.”<sup>32</sup> Given that the United States sought to avoid a future military conflict with the Soviet Union and absent any clear way that the United States could demonstrably compel Stalin to change the Kremlin’s attitude towards the Baltic republics, the only clear path forward for American policymakers towards the Baltic republics was to continue the non-recognition policy.

As a result, the non-recognition policy became the cornerstone of American policy towards the Baltic republics for the duration of the Cold War. The non-recognition policy should also be seen as the main framework through which discrete policy initiatives towards the Baltic republics were interpreted. Although there existed several ways that the State Department expressed its continued policy of non-recognition, all policy initiatives that in

---

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

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

some manner might impact on the Baltic republics were considered through the non-recognition lens.

The central component of continuing the non-recognition policy was the continued recognition of the existing Estonian Consul General in New York City and the Latvian and Lithuanian legations in Washington, D.C. The diplomats accredited to the United States before the annexation in 1940 continued to be accredited as long as the non-recognition policy continued. In a way, the non-recognition policy would abstract away the territorial states and the relationship between any centralized governments and the larger polities that represented the three nations. In addition, the non-recognition policy gave policymakers more latitude in using official American channels to launch attacks against the Soviet Union.

As it became apparent that the Cold War would last an undetermined number of years and consume an immeasurable amount of resources, there were significant challenges to the viability of continuing the non-recognition policy through the accreditation of diplomats. The most significant challenge was balancing the necessity of maintaining the fiscal solvency of the diplomatic missions when there was little consular revenue flowing into the missions' coffers and the necessity of having the missions appear to be independent. In addition, there was the question of maintaining the relevancy of the missions through a period where it was unknown when Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania would regain their independence.

In 1940 an agreement between the Estonian Consul General Johannes Kaiv, Latvian Ambassador Alfreds Bilmanis, a Lithuanian Ambassador Povilas Žadeikis and the U.S. Government was reached where a limited amount of blocked assets would be released for the Baltic missions to continue functioning. According to this agreement, "under Section 25 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, the Secretary of State each year issues appropriate certifications for the release of the necessary funds, the amounts in each case being determined on the basis of a budget submitted by the respective missions in the United States for the Department's



approval.”<sup>33</sup> Generally speaking, the release of frozen assets was strictly reserved to meet the minimal funding necessary to allow the diplomatic missions to continue their work. In 1945, however, there was one major exception to this policy. The Americans released \$100,000 to the Latvians, and \$200,000 each to the Estonians and Lithuanians to assist in relief efforts for Baltic DPs.<sup>34</sup> The use of funds outside of preserving the existence of the diplomatic missions was generally discouraged for fear of prior decisions being used as precedent for potential future decisions.

On 27 December 1946 in a memo from the East European desk officer C. Burke Elbrick to John D. Hickerson, Deputy Director of the Office of European Affairs:

EE feels that there are overriding political considerations which make it undesirable to defrost Baltic assets in the United States at this time... It is felt that no action in connection with defrosting should be taken before a general settlement of our problems in the Baltic States is undertaken. It is not expected that such a settlement will be discussed before the Moscow meeting of the Foreign Ministers, at the earliest.<sup>35</sup>

From 1946-1949, the Baltic diplomatic missions in the United States continued to submit annual budgets to the U.S. State Department for approval and continued to receive the minimum amount of money to function. As Cold War continued it became apparent to both the State Department bureaucrats and the Baltic diplomats that this model of funding was not sustainable.

While the Baltic missions were preparing their 1950 budget proposals, the first major instance where their sustainability was called into question was with the acknowledgement that the Lithuanians held very little currency. To this point, the Lithuanian legation had been

---

<sup>33</sup> Secretary of State Memo on 24 November 1946, Folder “B402: Blocked Funds,” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII.

<sup>34</sup> “Memorandum of Conversation between C. Burke Elbrick and Alfreds Bilmanis” on 4 December 1946, Subject: Funds for Latvian Relief. Folder “B402: Blocked Funds,” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII

<sup>35</sup> Memorandum from C. Burke Elbrick to John D. Hickerson on 27 December 1946, Folder “B402: Blocked Funds,” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII.

able to use frozen currency to pay for its annual budget. For 1950, however, the Lithuanians were faced with the prospect of converting gold to currency. In a 30 December memo, Žadeikis outlined this problem.

In connection with the adoption of the budget for 1950, amounting to \$124,860 for the maintenance of the diplomatic and consular offices abroad, this Legation is faced with the procedure of the unblocking of an appropriate sum from the gold account of the Government of Lithuania held by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Since the deposit balance of \$4,639.48 in the dollar account in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, designated “the Government of Lithuania Dollar Account,” is insufficient to cover the budgetary expenditure for 1950, it appears that there is an inevitable need to use certain amount of gold from the gold account.<sup>36</sup>

Since the non-recognition policy’s viability rested on the viability of properly functioning Baltic diplomats, the State Department was inclined to devise a program to help delay the exhaustion of Baltic frozen assets.

In May 1949, State Department officials began taking note of the fact that the Lithuanian dollar amount was insufficient to meet the projected 1950 budget, based on the prior year’s budget. The following represents the quantitative realities of the Baltic delegations in 1949. Latvia, the legation with the best financial situation, had a budget of \$73,500. In accounts, the Latvians had \$4,350 million worth of US Dollars and \$3,450 million worth of gold. The Estonian budget was \$57,500. In accounts, the Estonians possessed \$999,400 in currency and \$2,880 million in gold. Lithuania’s operational budget was \$110,000. In accounts, the Lithuanians had \$4,639 in US Dollars and \$2,806 million in gold.<sup>37</sup>

In internal memos, State Department officials began discussing the possibility of holding informal meetings with the Baltic diplomats to enquire whether they would be

---

<sup>36</sup> Žadeikis Aide Memoire on 30 December 1949, Folder “B402: Blocked Funds,” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>37</sup> State Department Memorandum for the Investment of Baltic Blocked Funds in the United States on 8 November 1949. Folder “B402: Blocked Funds,” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

willing to invest the blocked Baltic funds in the hopes of preserving the accounts' principal.<sup>38</sup> Simultaneously, scenarios were planned on how the investment would take place, using Latvia as an example (as it was the state that was most financially solvent). According to their most favorable scenario, The Chargé d'affaires would file a written application with the Office of Alien Property under Executive Order 8389 for a license that would authorize the sale of Latvia's gold, through the Federal Reserve, to the United States Treasury, and authorize the Federal Reserve to use Latvia's new dollar amount to purchase American Savings notes.<sup>39</sup> After that, the individual legations would be responsible for the continued investment of the funds. What about the "blocked" nature of these funds? This proved to be a major policy consideration for the Americans, and was decided on 7 June that there was "no intention of changing the blocked character of the assets of these foreign states and that the transactions we are considering contemplate, merely, the conversion of the character of the existing assets now held, namely blocked dollars or gold into blocked US Treasury Certificates."<sup>40</sup>

The first meeting between State Department officials and the Baltic diplomats occurred on 7 June over lunch between Žadeikis and Fred K. Salter of the East European Desk. Little was decided at this meeting and Žadeikis stated that he would let his views be known at a later time.<sup>41</sup> Although the United States was particularly interested in making sure that there would be sufficient money for the Baltic diplomatic missions to continue, it was clear that the initiative for the investment of funds had to come from the Baltic diplomats and not the State Department. As a result, there was obviously the possibility that the plans

---

<sup>38</sup> Salter to Metzger. 15 August 1949 Folder "B402: Blocked Funds," Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> Internal Memo on 7 June 1949. "Proposed Investment of Blocked Funds of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Folder "B402: Blocked Funds," Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>41</sup> Memorandum of Conversation 7 June 1949 "Proposed Investment of Blocked Baltic Funds in the U.S." Žadeikis and Selter. Folder "B402: Blocked Funds," Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

initiated by the Baltic diplomats would not match the hypothetical plan posited by the Department in spring 1949.

On 30 December 1949, the Lithuanian legation submitted an aide memoire to the State Department concerning their position on the liquidating of their gold held in the United States.<sup>42</sup> As opposed to the general attitude among the Americans of selling the majority of the gold, the Lithuanians were far more reticent in doing so. In a meeting on 3 January 1950 between Salter and Žadeikis about the initial Lithuanian proposal, when asked about the idea of only selling only part of the Lithuanian gold, he stated, “he and his Lithuanian diplomatic colleagues felt quite definitely that only a part of the gold should be sold.”<sup>43</sup> He continued that if further developments proved that the sale of more gold would result in the greatest possible return, that “such a development might indeed change their views, but they would be very reluctant to sell all of the gold.”<sup>44</sup>

By April 1950, concrete plans for the investment of blocked Baltic funds began to materialize. Jules Feldmans presented the first cogent plan on 26 April 1950 concerning Latvian funds. Of the \$4.176 million of Latvian assets, \$2 million would be invested in long-term U.S. Treasury Bonds; \$1 million invested in short-term U.S. Treasury bonds; and \$1 million in U.S. Treasury Notes. The projected annual yield was \$81,300, an amount relatively close to meet annual budgets.<sup>45</sup> The Lithuanians faced the issue as to whether to transfer all of their gold in US Treasury Notes or to keep the funds in the Federal Reserve Bank of New

---

<sup>42</sup>Aide Memoire on 30 December 1949 Folder “B402: Blocked Funds,” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>43</sup> US. Government Office Memorandum “Preliminary Views of the Lithuanian Minister concerning Sale of Lithuanian gold Blocked in the United States.” 3 January 1950 Folder “B402: Blocked Funds,” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> Feldmans to Acheson 26 April 1950. Folder “B402: Blocked Funds,” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

York.<sup>46</sup> The Estonian situation was complicated by the fact that a large amount of Estonian assets has been deposited in the Bank for International Settlement in Switzerland. As a result, there was a significantly smaller amount of funds to work with in the United States.

During the investment negotiations of 1949-1950, American officials were very clear that the initiative that the investment of funds had to come from the Baltic diplomats. Indeed, throughout the early years of the Cold War the funding used to maintain Baltic diplomatic missions was Baltic money. In affect, this added to the legitimacy of the Baltic diplomats that they truly offered continuity to the interwar republics. The interwar republics granted their appointments; the interwar republics granted their wartime extraordinary responsibilities, and their funding was granted from Baltic assets.

Although the investment and maintenance of the funds was the Baltic missions' responsibility, the fact that the funds remained frozen by the American government created a situation where the U.S. government effectively created a veto over the actions and autonomy of the Baltic missions. From the American perspective, constraints were naturally built into the relationship of funding the diplomatic missions. During the investment debate, Voldemar Johnson, in a handwritten note stated: "procedure for investment should be requested from the Baltic governments in a voluntary program within certain limitations."<sup>47</sup> Such limitations manifested themselves in the continuation of the policy of demanding the State Department to approve the annual budgets.

The majority of the budgets created by the Baltic legations were approved by the State Department, the overarching concern, however, of the American bureaucrats was to make sure that the legations were not spending unnecessary funding. Additional funding for

---

<sup>46</sup> Žadeikis to Walter Davis of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York on 17 April 1950. Folder "B402: Blocked Funds," Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>47</sup> V. Johnson – Handwritten Note, Undated. Folder "B402: Blocked Funds," Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

extra secretarial staff, or the expansion of additional unofficial officials in other countries were often met with staunch criticism by the State Department and were ultimately not approved. One notable example took place with the proposed 1953 Estonian budget. The initial budget of \$72,000 was ultimately trimmed to \$68,360. In a 6 November 1952 memo concerning this budget, Barbour of the East European Desk stated:

The Estonian budget, as initially informally submitted, envisaged expenditures that appeared unwarranted both in view of the Estonian finances and because certain of the increases proposed did not appear justifiable per se.<sup>48</sup>

Ultimately the increases for a new automobile and salaries were cut resulting in a saving of \$7,500.<sup>49</sup>

The loss of sovereignty over their own funding, however, was not strictly inimical to the interests of the Baltic diplomats. Interwar Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, like most countries, had other states and private individuals to which they were indebted. From 1940 the Soviet Union had occasionally instigated small demarches with the Americans over gaining access to Baltic assets in the United States. In addition, on occasion there were Baltic nationals who attempted to lobby on behalf of gaining access to Baltic funds to pursue their own goals. Such was the case in September 1949 when two Estonians, residing in France, attempted to say there were official members of the Estonian government and would like to start an export-import firm in Paris.<sup>50</sup> The continuation of the State Department approval process assured that the assets remained secure, even from branches of the American

---

<sup>48</sup> Barbour to Perkins on 6 November 1952 "1953 Budgets for the Baltic Missions" Folder "B403: Annual Budgets," Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>50</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Johnson (EE) and Robert Jablon on 30 January 1949. Folder "B402: Blocked Funds," Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

government trying to recoup claims against the Baltic governments.<sup>51</sup> It is clear that a priority of the United States was to sustain the Baltic diplomatic missions for as long as possible.

While the fiscal solvency issue was resolved for the time being, two long-term trends threatened the diplomatic missions' relevancy. Providing consular service to Baltic refugees was one of the most important tasks that the diplomats provided. Although by 1952, 34,800 Latvians, 22,771 Lithuanians, and 9,811 Estonians were admitted to the United States, the processes of assimilation and age would take its toll on the necessity of consular services. As time went by, and it became clear that liberation was not going to be an immediate possibility, many exiles were forced to make a choice between maintaining their strict citizenship to the Baltic States or begin the process of naturalization and assimilation into the American landscape. At the same time, the growing number of unofficial organizations that represented émigré politics undermined the importance that the diplomats had for American psychological warfare against the Soviet Union.

### *Baltic Immigration Policy and The Establishment of Baltic Political Organizations*

The domestic debate about whether or not the United States would establish a new immigration regime due to the Displaced Persons problem in Europe was one of the first instances where the Lithuanian and relatively small Latvian communities in the United States would have the ability to influence American policy.<sup>52</sup> The major disconnect between President Truman's stated policy about DP immigration and the Congress' opinion on more immigration to the United States enabled Lithuanian and Latvian organizations to apply

---

<sup>51</sup> The U.S. government was owed roughly \$12,5 million by Latvia, \$11,2 million by Lithuania, \$30,2 million by Estonia. Private US property in Latvia was an estimated worth of \$8,3 million as reported in 1943. See 2 February 1956 Memo on US Claims, Folder "B402: Blocked Funds," Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>52</sup> Although Lithuanian Americans had been very vocal during World War II about the postwar status of their ancestral homeland, the fact that Lithuania's status had been decided by events on the ground meant that domestic lobbying had zero impact on American willingness to fight for Lithuanian independence.

political pressure on the White House to continue pushing for new legislation while lobbying members of Congress in the hope of changing congressional attitudes towards the plight of the Displaced Persons

The Estonian and Latvian communities in the United States were relatively small. Surprisingly, very few Lithuanian American NGOs were interested in the DP question. The interest of most Baltic-American organizations were focused on mandating that the United States stand up to the Soviet Union in upholding the principles of the Atlantic Charter. On 22 August, the Lithuanian American Council (LAC) and several other Lithuanian American organizations met with officials of the State Department to discuss the principles of the Atlantic Charter and whether the non-recognition policy was still in effect. On 19 September 1945, Constantine R. Jurgela of the LAC of Greater New York, penned a letter to the editor of the New York Times arguing that the democracies of the world must compel Russia to live up to its commitments and adherence to the Atlantic Charter and declaration of the United Nations. While Jurgela did mention the DP situation, it was connected with the political situation in the Baltic republics and not the issue of return or resettlement.<sup>53</sup>

The most active Lithuanian organization that dealt with the DP situation was the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America (ULRFA). Rev. Joseph Koncius, President of the ULRFA, spent 10 months in 1946 visiting Lithuanian and other Baltic DPS in Western Europe. Based on meeting with 60,000 DPs, the organization held a convention in October 1946 with delegates deciding to present the President of the United States with a memorandum on the situation in Europe. On 23 October 1946, Koncius asked the White House for an appointment with Truman in order to present the memorandum. White House

---

<sup>53</sup> FRANK SPOONER CHURCHILL, CONSTANTINE R. JURGELA, STANLEY J. QUINN, EDITH HARMAN BROWN.. "Letters to The Times :Directing the German Mind Work, It Is Held, Should Begin at Home And in the Schools Trouble in Baltic States Action by Russia Viewed as Violation of Atlantic Charter Blow at Constitution Seen Justice Department's Blanket Subpoena Held Against Bill of Rights Haste Held Inadvisable." *New York Times (1923-Current file)*, September 21, 1945, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed May 28, 2010).



staff declined the request citing schedule problems, however, acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who was consulted on the advisability of such a meeting stated that the “ULRFA is a political organization representing the anti-Soviet Lithuanian groups in the United States. I do not believe it would serve any good purpose for the President to receive a delegation from this organization at this time.”<sup>54</sup>

From 1945-1947, anti-communism was not the most important rhetorical discourse in the DP debate. Instead, the question of collaboration was paramount and was played out between the American media, American Jews, and primarily the exiled Baltic diplomatic representation in the United States. In prominent newspapers throughout 1945, the issue of collaboration between Latvian DPs and the Nazis had become a regular narrative. Drew Middleton of the *New York Times* in a correspondent article stated that there were Latvian “fascist organizations” that welcomed the German occupation from 1941-1944. Kendall Foss of the *New York Post* on 25 October 1945 argued that if the UNRRA would isolate English-speaking Baltic DPs, who had been contaminated by the Germans, the remaining Baltic DPs would naturally begin to migrate back to the Soviet Union.

The Latvian Legation in Washington, headed by Alfreds Bilmanis forcefully pushed back against these narratives put out by the American media through the regularly published *Latvian Information Bulletin*. In the November 1945 edition, the article “The Plight of Latvian Displaced Persons in Western Europe: Facts in Review” attempted to neutralize the negative attitude towards Latvian DPs in the American media. In response to Middleton’s article in the *New York Times*, the Latvian diplomats argued that it was the Soviet Union that attempted to slander the true activity of Latvian organizations as being collaborators with the Germans.<sup>55</sup> Concerning Foss’ claims, the Latvian diplomatic corps stated that Foss’s informer

---

<sup>54</sup> Acheson to Connelly 2 November 1945 Folder: “314 - Lithuania Miscellaneous”, White House Central File, Harry S. Truman Presidential Library (HSTPL).

<sup>55</sup> Alfreds Bilmanis, “The Plight of Latvian Displaced Persons” Folder: “314 - Lithuania Miscellaneous”, White House Central File, HSTPL.

intended to “slander the displaced persons who refuse to return to Bolshevik occupied Baltic countries, and to throw suspicion in the English speaking displaced persons, because they can explain to American and British the real situation in the Baltic, and what they had experienced during the Bolshevik occupation.”<sup>56</sup>

In 1946 the situation had become more acute as the concerns about Latvian DPs had not been put to rest. On 3 February 1946, Jules Feldmans wrote to Arthur Hays Sulzberger of the *New York Times* defending the majority of Latvian DPs who were forcibly conscripted into the German Army. Feldmans conceded that there might have been a few pro-Nazis, but reaffirmed that the Latvian people were democratically-minded, were equally opposed to both Nazi and Bolshevik dictatorships, and maintained their belief in the principles proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter.<sup>57</sup>

The most telling example of the collaboration argument is present in a private mailing correspondence between Bilmanis and David Berkingoff of New York City in 1947. On 8 August 1947 Berkingoff wrote to Bilmanis stating that “You may say that the Latvians had to do the will of their masters, the Germans, why the peoples of Belgium, France, Holland, who had Nazis of their own were able to fight and protect the Jews of their country. In the light of civilization, justice, heroism, the Latvian nation proved to be a failure.”<sup>58</sup> In a response, Bilmanis reasserted the claim that it was unfair to rashly accuse the whole nation of the misdeeds and atrocities committed by a minute fraction of the nation.<sup>59</sup>

By 1947, however, Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian DPs had created their own narratives related to their day-to-day existence in exile that proved to be more powerful than

---

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid*, 10.

<sup>57</sup> Feldmans to Sulzberger 3 February 1946. Folder: “Bilmanis, 1946, 1947, 1948” Box 1 Jules Feldmans Papers, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>58</sup> Berkingoff to Bilmanis, 8 August 1947, Folder: “Bilmanis, 1946, 1947, 1948” Box 1 Jules Feldmans Papers, Hoover Institution Archives.

<sup>59</sup> Bilmanis to Berkingoff 13 August 1947. Bilmanis drew his own comparison of the collaboration issue to Jews in Palestine stating: “I have never thought of holding the whole Jewish people responsible for the atrocities of a certain small group of Jews in Palestine, and I am confident that you will revise your attitude towards the Latvian nation in the same light.”

the reports of American journalists stationed in the occupation zones. The primary goal of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian DPs was to return to their native countries as soon as possible in order to devote their strength and knowledge to its reconstruction.<sup>60</sup> As this was not possible due to the geopolitical situation in the Baltic republics, creating a sense of unity among the nations while in exile was exceptionally important and the construction of a positive narrative of the character of the Baltic nations and the Baltic peoples became increasingly important.

One important aspect of the Baltic national narratives was to mitigate the issue of collaboration with the Nazis and to bolster the nations' democratic tendencies during the interwar period. In a 1946 memorandum to the American forces in Germany, Alfreds Bilmanis stated:

The Baltic peoples in the second World War remained faithful to the ideals of the Western Democracies, but as their national armies had been abolished by the Russian occupation authorities and most of the officers had been deported to Siberia, the Baltic States were unable to fight with armed forces in the ranks of Great Britain and the United States. Even the Baltic military units (so-called legionnaires) forcibly mobilized by the Nazis never fought against the armies of the Western democracies, but either joined the resistance movement or surrendered as soon they came into contact in Germany with the British, American or French armies. The Baltic peoples paid for their belief in the ideals of the Western Democracies and for their fight for these beliefs with the lives of tens of thousands of individuals, deportation to forced labor and concentration camps... The accusations frequently heard to the effect that the Baltic refugees and displaced persons are pro-fascist are false both in form and in content.<sup>61</sup>

The Baltic DPs not only attempted to create a monopoly on information related to the issue of collaboration but backed up the rhetoric by being perceived as “good citizens” while in the occupation zones.

When Truman signed the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 into law, he authorized the entry of 200,000 DPs over the period of two years into the United States. An important

---

<sup>60</sup> Folder: “Bilmanis, 1946, 1947, 1948” Box 1 Jules Feldmans Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

component of the DP Act was that those entering the United States were mandated to have “assurances” from an American sponsor who promised that the entering Displaced Person would not become a ward of the state.<sup>62</sup> This stipulation provided Balts residing in the United States yet another opportunity to organize around a political cause that was important to them. Between 1948 and 1952, several important organizations were either created or morphed their existing platforms to provide assurances to Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Displaced Persons.

The large-scale immigration of Baltic DPs to the United States established relatively large communities that generally viewed fighting for the liberation of their homelands as an important political objective. These communities would have implications for electoral politics in the districts where they resided, as well as adding to the anti-communist landscape that was present across the country in the early 1950s. The political and cultural potential that the refugee communities could gather, however, was intrinsically linked to the ability of the communities to establish organizations that were both able to create a sense of unity among each diaspora and express a coherent message to external audiences. From 1950-1952, the Baltic diplomats, prominent exiles, and existing national organizations in the United States began a concerted process of forming politically active organizations that represented the interests of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian refugees living in the United States.

A major problem that confronted the Latvians once the refugees began arriving was creating some sense of unity between the new immigrants and the older, established Latvian American community. Throughout 1950, Feldmans had discussed his disappointment with the political immaturity of the various Latvian American organizations that were already in

---

<sup>62</sup> The sponsor was responsible for meeting the DP at the port of entry, provide them with transportation, and ensure that the DP had suitable employment and safe living conditions.

existence.<sup>63</sup> As a result, Feldmans took it upon himself to take a leading role in establishing a Latvian organization in the United States that would represent the interests of Latvians and have a significant political force. Feldmans argued that the principal task was to reconcile the viewpoints of the two principal groups of the new Latvian community in the United States. First, “the members of the recent DP emigration who are actively anti-communist and who wish to pursue a vigorous program in this respect.”<sup>64</sup> Second, “Latvian-Americans who have lived in the U.S. for a number of years and who, although are anti-communists, are more lethargic in their approach to the problem.”<sup>65</sup> By 1 February 1951, Feldmans reported to the State Department that there had been general agreement that the Latvians should support the United States in its struggle against communism and that the structure for a new organization had been put in place.

On 24 and 25 February 1951, delegates representing 100 Latvian-American organizations met in Pierce Hall in Washington for the purpose of establishing an organization that would be known as the American Latvian Association (ALA).<sup>66</sup> Delegates attending the Latvian meeting were selected on the basis of one delegate for each one hundred people, resulting in nearly 10,000 Latvians being represented in Washington during the congress.<sup>67</sup> The main objectives of the ALA were to democratically promote social and cultural cooperation among Latvians; to encourage work for Latvia’s liberation; to protect and strengthen Latvian culture; to protect Latvians’ rights; and to organize all sorts of support to Latvians in exile.

---

<sup>63</sup> See Feldmans Meetings with Vedeler throughout 1950. “Folder: La711A Feldmans” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII.

<sup>64</sup> Feldmans and Johnson Memorandum of Conversation on Union of Latvians in the U.S.A. 1 February 1951 611C/215-1. Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAII.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.* Also See Ieva Zake, *American Latvians: Politics of a Refugee Community*, (New York: Transaction Publishers, 2010), 41-42.

<sup>67</sup> According to Feldmans, Latvian DPs in the United States who have not acquired U.S. Citizenship were also eligible for membership.

While Feldmans played an important role in the creation of the ALA, he quickly withdrew from having an active organizational role in the organization. The State Department made it clear that Feldmans should keep in mind the extent that a foreign diplomatic representative should properly play in the organizational activities of citizens in the country to which he was accredited.<sup>68</sup> Feldmans acknowledged the State Department's concerns and promised that he would not include his name as one of the organizers. Indeed, the ALA represented the interests of Latvians residing in the United States in highly democratic process. Local organizations chose delegates to the ALA's annual congress in Washington in proportion to the number of ALA members in that particular organization and the annual Congress elected the organization's Board and Chairman.<sup>69</sup>

The ALA was successful in speaking on behalf of the entirety of the Latvian community in the United States largely in part to the hierarchical structure of the organization. Annual congresses were organized to suppress opposing opinions to the organization's orthodoxy<sup>70</sup> This resulted in giving the veneer that all Latvians were like-minded when it came to pursuing policy initiatives concerning the status of Latvians in exile as well as the status of the Soviet occupied homeland. This appearance, nevertheless, had far reaching implications for the relationship between the United States and the Latvian community during the 1950s. On one hand, the ALA became a model of exile unity in a period of time where disunity was a major feature of exile politics. On the other hand, the ALA became an important constituent group in the United States that became a force that American politicians would have to negotiate with and that would keep the fate of Latvia alive within the American Cold War landscape.

---

<sup>68</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Feldmans and Vedeler 1 February 1951. "Folder: La711A Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>69</sup> Zake, *Latvian Americans: Politics of a Refugee Community*, 41.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*

Due to the smaller size of the Estonian community in the United States, it was not until May 1952 that Estonian exiles organized the most important politically active organization in the United States. On 23 May, more than 4,000 Estonians arrived in New York to elect delegates to a new umbrella organization that would represent the interests of Estonians residing in the United States.<sup>71</sup> The charter creating the Estonian National Committee (ENC) laid out its two main objectives. First, the ENC was “to provide a free voice for the Estonian people and fight for independence of Estonia and human rights for its people.” Second, the ENC was “to preserve the Estonian cultural heritage in the United States and provide mutual assistance for the ethnic group members.”<sup>72</sup>

Like the ALA, the structure of the ENC was relatively democratic in nature. Every three years, delegates representing various Estonian organizations would meet at an assembly in New York City and elect the organization’s executive council. The initial political campaign for the ENC leadership in 1952, between Rudolf Kiviranna, who was pastor of the largest Estonian Lutheran congregation, and Adolf Perandi, a prominent Estonian exile living in the United States set the political tone for the organization in coming years. Contemporary observers of the 1952 ENC elections commented that the various factions constituting the bulk of the organization were both of a democratic nature, as well as conservative.<sup>73</sup> The ENC’s formation constituted the first step in the organizing of Estonians in the free World.

Unlike the Estonians and Latvians, Lithuanian refugees arriving in the United States had a vast political network that had already been established around lobbying on behalf of the Lithuania’s fate dating back to the early years of World War II. The annexation in 1940 activated the political potential of the large Lithuanian American community and led to the

---

<sup>71</sup> Jaan Pennar, *Estonians in America, 1627-1975: A Chronology and Fact Book* (New York: Oceana Publications, 1975), 37.

<sup>72</sup> Fund Memo #532 “Folder: E801.4 Consultative Panel” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII.

<sup>73</sup> Fund Memo #456 “Folder: E801.4 Consultative Panel” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII.

establishment of several thousand local organizations and over thirty Lithuanian language newspapers. Prominent Lithuanian Americans, however, realized that the balkanization that had taken place in the organization of Lithuanian Americans was diminishing the ability of Lithuanian Americans to promote the interests of their ancestral homeland. As a result, on 15 May 1941, a delegation of Lithuanians representing the important organizations, met in Chicago to create the Lithuanian American Council or *Amerikos Lietuviu Taryba* (ALT).<sup>74</sup>

It was not until 8 January 1943 in New York that the structure of the ALT and its political aims were publicly laid out. The ALT was to be based out of Chicago, home to the largest Lithuanian community in the United States, and consist of an executive committee to act in the organization's name. The establishment of the executive committee instituted unity among Lithuanian Americans in a top down approach. The ALT decided that its executive committee should comprise of the editors of the three largest ideological newspapers in the Lithuanian American media. Pijus Grigaitis, editor of the socialist newspaper *Naujienos*, Leonardas Šimutis, editor of the Catholic *Draugas*, and Mykolas Vaidyla, editor of the liberal nationalist *Sandara* made up the first ALT executive committee. While the organization's structures expanded by incorporating more organizations under its umbrella, establishing local chapters, and creating a separate information distribution service based in New York City in 1944,<sup>75</sup> the executive committee, which was elected annually, provided the large Lithuanian American community a single voice.

The ALT's mandate shifted with the changing status of Lithuania during the 1940s. The initial rationale for ALT's establishment was to lobby the American government to fight for the restoration of Lithuania's independence after World War II. After it became apparent that Lithuania would not regain its independence, ALT's political mandate shifted to lobbying on behalf of DP immigration to the United States and insuring that the United States

---

<sup>74</sup> For a detailed analysis of the origin of the ALT see: Albertas Gerutis, *Lithuania: 700 Years* (New York: Manyland Books, 1969), 404-409.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 408



government would continue to maintain its policy of non-recognition towards the annexation. Unlike the Latvians where there were occasional conflicts between the older generation Latvian Americans and the newly arriving DPs, there was significantly less tension between the Lithuanian DPs and the established Lithuanian American community. This was in part due to the deliberate efforts of the ALT to absorb the DPs into their ranks as the organization's mission shifted yet again, to being a sustained campaign to insure that the plight of Lithuania would remain in the American public's sight through the long Cold War. Another important consideration is that the DPs political aims were met by the ALT. The process of settling in the United States involved very basic things, such as finding gainful employment, shelter, and adjusting to a new location.

During the 1950s, there was little interaction between the three central organizations representing the political activities of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in the United States. The interests of the ALA, ALT, and ENC rested with pursuing activities that promoted their individual homelands with little consideration for the other two Baltic nations except where it was politically beneficial. All three organizations, however, contributed in similar manners towards the development of relations between the United States government and the Baltic émigré communities that were interested in combatting in the Cold War.

The ALA, ALT, and ENC served as a single voice for Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians to communicate with centers of political power in the United States, whether they were governmental agencies or non-governmental organizations. This singular voice resulted in political power through the monopolization of information, while it also obscured some of the political disagreements that played out in the 1950s within each diaspora, as well as, disagreements that would eventually break out among the three nationalities. In addition, it provided policymakers, particularly in the State Department, with the belief that it was possible for émigré groups while in a state of exile to create relatively coherent organizations.

The Baltic organizations would be used as examples for exile organizations around the United States and Europe on how Eastern European exiles should cooperate with each other.

The ALA, ALT, and ENC also provided Baltic exiles that were residing in the United States an advantageous position in creating contacts with the United States government that Baltic exiles residing in other countries simply did not have at their disposal. Official State Department policy was that the United States would not deal with organizations that could be misconstrued as governments in exile. The State Department did acknowledge that there were exiles in the ranks of the central Baltic organizations, but the ALA, ALT, and ENC were all viewed as organizations that represented the interests of American citizens who were fighting for the interests of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The distinction between an organization that was comprised of potential constituents, rather than exiles made a significant difference in how relations Žadeikis with the United States Congress, State Department, and even the White House would develop.

#### *Establishment of Relations with the Free Europe Committee*

When describing one of the methods of engaging in psychological warfare against the Soviet Union in 1948, Kennan proposed that the United States should support the establishment of “liberation committees” that would serve as “foci of national hope” for political refugees; “provide inspiration” for popular resistance within the Soviet Union; and “serve as a potential nucleus for all-out liberation movements in the event of war.”<sup>76</sup> Within the context of NSC 10/2, these proposed liberation committees should be overt operations guided by trusted American citizens and should then receive covert guidance and possible financial assistance from the United States government.<sup>77</sup> By 1949 policymakers engaged in

---

<sup>76</sup> Richard H. Cummings, *Radio Free Europe's Crusade for Freedom: Rallying Americans Behind Cold War Broadcasting, 1950-1960* (New York: McFarland, 2010), 6.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

serious debate about whether such liberation committees should be established and how they should function, it was decided that the United States would establish an organization that would organize émigrés into liberation committees, would receive “confidential or unvouchered [sic] fund” from the CIA, and receive policy guidance from the State Department.

Joseph C. Grew, former American ambassador to Japan, held a press conference in New York City on 1 June 1949 announcing that the Committee for Free Europe had been created with the assistance of a number of noteworthy private American citizens on its board, including Dwight D. Eisenhower, DeWitt Wallace, publisher of *Reader's Digest*, and Henry Luce, publisher of *Time*, *Fortune*, and *Life* magazines. The organization's mandate was to “put the voices of these exiled leaders on the air, addressed to their own peoples back in Europe, in their own languages, in the familiar tones.”<sup>78</sup>

Initially, the FEC divided its activities into three discrete units that managed general relations with exiles; worked towards beginning radio broadcasts towards Eastern Europe; and managing relations with the American public.<sup>79</sup> Radio broadcasting was the most important FEC activity, but the organization also sponsored a plethora of other exile activities that ranged from the establishment of a Free Europe University in Strasbourg France to the Free Europe Press that published the prominent exile literature and scholarship.<sup>80</sup> Perhaps one of the most important short-term projects that the FEC started was the Mid-European Studies

---

<sup>78</sup> Richard H. Cummings, *Radio Free Europe's Crusade for Freedom: Rallying Americans Behind Cold War Broadcasting, 1950-1960* 10. The organizational papers were filed in April 1949 with the law firm that Allen Dulles worked, Sullivan and Cromwell. The Committee for a Free Europe was founded to “Help the non-fascist and non-Communist leaders who have fled to the United States from the countries of Eastern Europe to maintain themselves in useful occupations during their enforced stay in the United States.” On 11 April 1950, the National Committee for a Free Europe changed its name to the Free Europe Committee (FEC).

<sup>79</sup> Arch Puddington, *Broadcasting Freedom: The Cold War Triumph of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty* (Lexington, The University Press of Kentucky, 2003), 12.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 13. See “The Free Europe University in Exile” Pamphlet which describes the activities of the University. The purpose of the University was to establish an “invaluable reservoir of informed, trained, democratic leaders among the young people who successfully escaped to the free world.” “Folder: Free Europe University in Exile - Scholarship Gift” Box 55, C.D. Jackson Papers, Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library (DDEPL).

Center (MESC) in New York. The MESC's goal was to assist exiled academics transition into academic positions at American institutions of higher education.<sup>81</sup> In return, the FEC hoped that its activities would foster a sense of political solidarity among Eastern European exiles that could be eventually tapped as a useful resource to combat the Soviet Union.

The FEC's initial contacts with exiles were limited to the largest Eastern European countries: Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria. Despite the FEC's ambitious agenda and soaring rhetoric, the organization was resource constrained. FEC's covert funding was not limitless, resulting in its inability to hire American staff, exiles, or to meet the daily operational costs of more countries. Additionally, the State Department and CIA had an insufficient number of staff members who could oversee the FEC's organizations. The FEC sponsored National Committees that were based on individual nationalities and attempted to include members that were representative of each exiled community's political makeup.

Considering that the FEC was viewed from the outside as an organization that private American citizens created to give a voice to Eastern European exiles and that the organization provided material assistance to prominent exiles through employment and transition assistance, it was inevitable that exile communities that were not initially brought under the FEC umbrella would rapidly begin lobbying all facets of American society for inclusion. By the spring of 1950, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians began pursuing such contacts. Although myriad Baltic organizations in the United States attempted to influence the FEC to open lines of communication with the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exiles; it was the Baltic diplomats and the ALT that were most influential in this endeavor. The first contacts between the Baltic diplomatic missions and the FEC occurred during the late spring

---

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

and summer of 1950.<sup>82</sup> The main argument that the diplomats used with their interlocutors was that Baltic panels associated with the FEC would help unify the diasporas who were temporary refugees in the United States and hoped to return to their homelands as soon as possible to reassert “democratic standards.”<sup>83</sup>

On 17 March 1950, the LAIC submitted their first formal protest against the omission of the Baltic States from the activities of the FEC.<sup>84</sup> The increase of material and promotion by the Crusade for Freedom escalated the ALT’s efforts to lobby on behalf of Baltic inclusion. On 24 September 1950, the ALT’s Congress passed a resolution stating that “Whereas, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, are in urgent need of support of the cause of liberation...” Therefore, “be it resolved that the Lithuanian Organizations of Chicago appeal and request the FEC to include Lithuania, and the other two Baltic States, in the Committee’s plans and National Program for the liberation of Soviet-enslaved and dominated Europe.”<sup>85</sup>

Simultaneously, the FEC had begun making plans for the beginning of collaboration with Baltic exile groups. PROJECT 1-1951 was created on 15 March 1951 with the intention of coordinating “Baltic States’ Activities within the FEC.”<sup>86</sup> The initial proposal called for the creation of Consultative Panels and groups of individuals that would work with the Mid-European Studies Center, American Contacts Division and Radio Free Europe. The plan proposed that after the successful creation of panels by 31 March 1951 that Baltic scholars

---

<sup>82</sup> On 25 May 1950, Feldmans met with an FEC official; on 28 July Žadeikis met with an FEC official and on 1 August 1950, Kaiv met with an FEC official. “Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>83</sup> Fund Memo #51 25 May 1950 “Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>84</sup> Lithuanian American Information Center Bulletin on 17 March 1950. “Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>85</sup> Letter to “William” on 26 October 1950 “Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>86</sup> PROJECT #1-1951 15 March 1951, “Folder: B801.5 Radio Free Europe” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

would be employed by the Mid-European Studies Center, Baltic lecturers would be hired by the American Contacts Division, and Radio desks would be established.<sup>87</sup>

Officials acknowledged to the Baltic diplomats the reasons behind their initial reticence towards initiated such projects. First, FEC officials viewed the non-recognition policy as having a net positive for the emigrations since they continued to have diplomatic representation of the “democratic side” as opposed to the “totalitarian side” as in the cases of Poland and Hungary.<sup>88</sup> During the 25 May 1950, the FEC official asked Feldmans if it was in his interest to support a Latvian panel as it might prove to be inimical to his own diplomatic position in Washington.<sup>89</sup> Second, FEC officials acknowledged that they had limited resources and had decided to give larger countries that lacked any sort of democratic diplomatic representation in the West the organization’s top priorities.<sup>90</sup> Ultimately in August 1950, the FEC contacted the State Department’s Policy Planning Staff to give further guidance on the issue as their first impression was to “doubt the advisability of forming national councils along the lines of those in the satellite countries in view of the existence of diplomatic representation acceptable to us.”<sup>91</sup>

Despite the initial setback, Feldmans continued to make preparations to begin cooperative efforts with the FEC. On 25 July, the FEC received a letter from Feldmans with a list of potential Latvian exiles who could form a FEC committee.<sup>92</sup> Although the list of names largely represented officials of the former authoritarian government, and not the pre-

---

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>88</sup> Fund Memo #69 1 August 1950. “Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>89</sup> Fund Memo #51 25 May 1950. “Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>91</sup> Robert F. Kelley to Robert P. Joyce (Policy and Planning Staff) 9 August 1950, “Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>92</sup> FEC Letter to the State Department 2 October 1950. “Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

1934 democratic elements, on 5 October a meeting between the two factions of Latvian diplomats took place in London where it appeared as though there would be some reconciliation.<sup>93</sup> Meanwhile, the FEC gave instructions to its staff to go ahead with preparations for the creation of Baltic panels.

On 2 October 1950, the FEC asked the State Department if it would be appropriate to informally approach Feldmans about creating an advisory body to utilize Baltic refugees more effectively. The FEC argued that such a solution would combine the legal continuity of the exiled diplomats with the broad-based representative nature of a national council.<sup>94</sup> Conditions were placed on how such an advisory body should be created if it was to receive FEC funding. As a way of promoting unity among the competing political factions in the émigré communities, financial assistance would only be granted to a ‘genuinely representative’ group that represented both the official elements of the Latvian government and the pre-1934 democratic elements.<sup>95</sup> The three consultative panels, as envisaged by the FEC, would consist of seven members and have similar functions to the National Councils that already represented countries such as Hungary. All panel members necessarily had to be exiles, but would exclude members of the Baltic diplomatic corps, and would not duplicate the activities of the Baltic diplomatic missions in the United States. Further, the panels would receive a budget of roughly \$60,000 annually.<sup>96</sup>

FEC officials met with Feldmans on 28 December to propose the idea of creating a Latvian Consultative Panel. Feldmans considered it to be an excellent solution to the problem of fostering a closer relationship between the Latvian emigration and the FEC and agreed that no members of the Latvian diplomatic corps should be members. The question of broad

---

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.* The Latvian Ambassador in London Karlis Zarins, representing the official pre-1940 government met with Blodnieks of the various pre-1934 Democratic Parties met in attempt to bring some semblance of unity.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>96</sup> Fund Memo #117. 19 December 1950 “Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

representation among the various political factions in the Latvian Diaspora proved to be contentious. Feldmans held the opinion that exiled political parties had absolutely no relevance to the situation existing in territorial Latvia nor to the political situation that would exist in a future independent Latvia.<sup>97</sup> The FEC official stressed that if any political faction felt under represented, the resulting open hostility to the Latvian panel would undermine its effectiveness.<sup>98</sup> Feldmans conceded the point, but stressed that political orientation should only play a minor part in creating the panel.

After receiving a positive answer from the Latvian diplomat, FEC officials subsequently contacted Kaiv on 12 January and Žadeikis on 25 January to discuss the creation of Estonian and Lithuanian consultative panels.<sup>99</sup> Both Kaiv and Zadeikis confirmed their willingness to work towards the creation of their respective panels and were presented with suggestions relevant to their diasporas' political situation. Kaiv argued that a consultative panel was a better idea than a national council due to the complicated political situation of the Baltic States and the FEC official suggested that one or two members of the panel should consist of members of the Estonian emigration residing in Sweden since the largest group of Estonian exiles resided in Sweden.<sup>100</sup> During the meeting with Zadeikis, the Lithuanian diplomats submitted a list of eighteen names that he thought should be considered as members of the Lithuanian Consultative Panel, which was eventually reduced to seven members.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> Fund Memo #124 "Monthly Report for December 1950, January 6 1951. "Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>99</sup> Fund Memo #139 25 January 1951 and Fund Memo #150 1 February 1951. "Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>100</sup> Fund Memo #139 25 January 1951. "Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>101</sup> Žadeikis and the FEC representative went over the submitted list of names and came to the conclusion that Vaclovas Sidzikauskas was an indispensable member of the future panel and was instructed to meet again on 26 January to discuss the panel, where the number of names was ultimately reduced.



Meanwhile, Kaiv and Feldmans submitted lists of their own that should participate in the first iteration of the Estonian and Latvian Consultative Panels. On 19 January, Kaiv and Kaarel Pusta submitted the names of Ernst Ein, Leonhard Vahter, Adolf Perandi, Ilma Raamot, and Aksel Mei to the FEC for consideration as members of the Estonian Panel.<sup>102</sup> The Estonians considered it wise to begin with five names and increase it to seven later on as they considered the option of including exiles that did not reside in the United States. Feldmans submitted eight names to the FEC on 22 January and reaffirmed his opinion that consultative panels were more appropriate compared to national committees as he was under a great deal of pressure from a plethora of Latvian nationals who viewed the creation of a national committee as an excellent way to promote a government-in-exile - a concept that Feldmans disapproved of as it represented nothing.<sup>103</sup>

In January 1951, the FEC gave both written and verbal approval that the Baltic States should be included within the scope of the organization's activities.<sup>104</sup> After the FEC and leading Baltic exiles completed the assembly of the consultative panels, the FEC promised to move forward with creating radio desks to broadcast to each Baltic nation and include Baltic exiles in the full portfolio of activities that the organization had created. Although the FEC had created its own independent list while deliberating internally over whether or not to reach out to the Baltic diasporas, the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian diplomats had a significant role in deciding who would ultimately sit on the consultative panels. For instance, the eight members of the Lithuanian panel, led by Vaclovas Sidzikauskas all were of the same generation - born in the late 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries; were all former members of government or members of interwar Lithuania's academia; each represented a political party

---

<sup>102</sup> Fund Memo #150, 1 February 1951. "Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>104</sup> Fund Memo #150 1 February 1951. "Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

that existed in Lithuania prior to 1926; and all had resided in the United States for less than three years.<sup>105</sup>

On 24 May 1951 permission was granted for the formal creation of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian consultative panels, despite not having solved the radio funding issue. The primary goal of the Baltic consultative panels was to work “under the auspices of the FEC, to work hard for the emancipation of the Lithuanian people from aggressive Soviet imperialism and for the restoration of human rights in our country.”<sup>106</sup> Although the long-term objective of the consultative panels was to prepare for the eventual liberation and re-democratization of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, there were three main activities that the panels participated in over the short-term that were of consequence. First, the Panels played a small role in helping to coordinate the activities of various exile organizations throughout the United States and kept the FEC abreast on exile politics. Second, the Panels cooperated with the other organizations that were affiliated with the FEC. Third, the Panels took it upon themselves to provide accurate information about the political, economic, and social conditions in the Soviet republics.

The primary rationale for the establishing of National Committees by the FEC, and of Consultative Panels (as they relate to the Baltic States) was to foster rapprochement among various political factions within each nationality in the hopes of promoting a unified opposition front of exiles against communism. Although the Baltic diplomats, leading exiles, FEC officials, and the State Department attempted to mollify political factionalism through

---

<sup>105</sup> 8 June 1951 FEC Memo on Lithuanian Consultative Panel, “Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. On 9 May 1951, Žadeikis had a meeting with an FEC official concerning increasing the size of the Lithuanian Panel due to an oversight on considering an individual from an important Lithuanian political faction. Although there were concerns that Žadeikis was using the Panel as a means of employing Lithuanian refugees, the FEC allowed an 8<sup>th</sup> member to the Panel to avoid any embarrassment to Žadeikis and help foster political cohesion in the panel.

<sup>106</sup> Statement by the Members of the Lithuanian Consultative Panel of the National Committee for a Free Europe, Inc. 24 May 1951 “Folder: Li801.4 Committee for a Free Lithuania” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

providing politically balanced charter panels, the initial attempts at fostering cooperation through each diaspora was decidedly mixed.

In response to the composition of the Estonian Panel, the World Federation of Free Estonians (VEKO) based in Stockholm issued a strong protest. VEKO argued that one of its members had not been included on the panel while two members of the competing organization in Stockholm, the Estonian National Committee (ERN) had been included. They continued by stating that VEKO has a larger membership than the ERN and that they were suffering from unfair discrimination. FEC officials responded to VEKO's Chairman that members of the Estonian Consultative Panel do not serve as representatives of any party or organization. Discussions between Kaiv, the FEC, and the Estonian Consultative Panel in August 1951 resulted in an agreement that the Consultative Panel would directly negotiate with VEKO to insure that there would be a settlement that was satisfactory to all concerned.<sup>107</sup>

The Latvian exile community was equally displeased with the initial composition of the Latvian consultative panel. The most significant concern that Latvians had was that the Panel had too many members that were composed of Right-wing Latvians at the expense of the Left-Wing and the Social Democrats. Additional concern came from religiously devout Latvians. Lutherans were upset that the Lutheran Church as an institution was not represented on the panel and exiles from Latgale were concerned that Catholics were not represented on the panel. Finally, a small organization, the Latvian Liberal Union in Sweden was upset that there was not a member from their organization represented in the Latvian Panel. The FEC response to all of the concerns was that the political criticism was unfounded since the Panel was composed of liberals, the Peasant Party, and those not affiliated with a particular party, but held liberal or socialistic views. The Lutherans were told that all of the members of the

---

<sup>107</sup> Fund Memo #287 "Monthly Report for August 1951" "Folder B801.4 Consultative Panels 1950-1954" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

Panel were Lutherans. The Catholics were told that there were plans to have Bishop Rancans from Latgale sit on the Panel, but he had not been able to accept yet due to not receiving permission from the church's hierarchy. Finally, the Latvian Liberal Union was told that that Consultative Panel did not represent any particular organization.<sup>108</sup> On the other hand, the Lithuanian immigration was generally pleased with the composition of the Consultative Panel. FEC officials argued that this was the case because the Panel consisted eight members (opposed to the 5 Estonians and 7 Latvians) who represented each of Lithuania's political parties and one individual from Memelland.<sup>109</sup>

On 27 February 1952, the FEC decided that the Baltic Consultative Panels had succeeded in their initial portfolios of advising the FEC on political questions; keeping in touch with all Baltic exile groups; advising the Mid-European Studies Center on scholarly activities connected with Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; submitting a list of lawyers for the Mid-European Law Project; submitting preliminary recommendations and estimates and presenting candidates for the eventual broadcasting of Baltic languages in their countries; and finally supplying lecturers for the American contacts division.

The FEC argued that all of these objectives had been carried out and that they had achieved a position of importance in the Baltic exile communities and established a good working relationship with the diplomatic representatives in the United States. In addition to their regular function of contributing to the publications "News from Behind the Iron Curtain" and to other activities which RPS may wish to engage, the Baltic desk chiefs will contribute to RFE, not only should Baltic broadcasts materialize, but in providing information to existing radio desks about the fate of countries further advanced in Sovietization. The Consultative Panels have a large task in their advisory capacities, in corresponding with other exile groups and in sending lecturers throughout the country. In this

---

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*

latter capacity, they have already done a good deal of work and their members are known personally to Baltic groups as far as Chicago, also in Western Europe. They have not achieved a position where it would be possible to no longer designate them simply as Consultative Panels to the Fund, but as National Committees for a Free Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Such a designation would not meet with the objection from the diplomatic representatives, which they originally raised.<sup>110</sup>

The question whether or not the new National Committees for a Free Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania would be participating in FEC sponsored radio broadcasts had yet to be decided. Nevertheless, their efforts going forward were very important in all other FEC sponsored activities. The Committees laid the groundwork for publications in the three Baltic languages as well as the English Language; provided important analysis of raw data about the Baltic States for broader FEC publications; and worked towards fostering a sense of cooperation within their own exiled diasporas and with their other Baltic peers in the FEC.

### *Liberation Policy versus Liberation Rhetoric*

Dwight D. Eisenhower's victory in the 1952 presidential election returned the White House to the Republican Party for the first time in nearly two decades. The domestic reaction to a series of international events during Truman's second term provided Eisenhower the ability to cast a stark political contrast to his Democratic opponent, Illinois Governor, Adlai E. Stevenson. The "loss" of China and the Soviet atomic bomb in 1949, the stalemate in Korea, in addition to the advantage that the Republican Party had over the Democratic Party in claiming the anti-communist mantra during the age of McCarthyism, provided Eisenhower ample political ammunition when he accepted the Party's nomination in the Summer of 1952.

---

<sup>110</sup> Fund Memo #391 27 February 1952. "Folder: B8014 Consultative Panels 1950-1954" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

Eisenhower, along with his running mate, California Senator Richard M. Nixon, and his eventual Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles criticized virtually every facet of democratic foreign policy making since the end of World War II.<sup>111</sup> Eisenhower claimed that he would “go to Korea,” promising American voters that he would be able to extricate the United States from the morass the Korean Conflict had become.<sup>112</sup> The Republican ticket accused the democratic party of being soft on communism and selling out the Eastern European nations at Yalta in 1945.<sup>113</sup> The 1952 Republican Party Platform claimed to “mark the end of the negative, futile, and immoral policy of ‘containment’ which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and Godless terrorism which in turn enables the rules to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction.”<sup>114</sup>

Following the logic that containment was an immoral policy that would not continue under an Eisenhower administration, Dulles promoted a policy of rolling back the influence of communism internationally as well as liberating the nations of Eastern Europe from Soviet domination. After Eisenhower took the oath of office in January 1953 and Dulles became Secretary of State, there was the assumption that the rhetoric that Eisenhower’s campaign had used throughout the election would result in the wholesale change in how the United States dealt with the Soviet Union.

Despite the campaign’s rhetoric that Eisenhower would offer a drastic shift in American foreign policy, we have demonstrated that hastening the end of the Cold War and

---

<sup>111</sup> Campbell Craig and Frederik Logevall, *America’s Cold War: The Politics of Insecurity* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009), 140.

<sup>112</sup> Herbert S. Parmet, *Eisenhower and the American Crusades* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1998), 143. On 24 October 1952, Eisenhower spoke before a television audience in Detroit where he stated “That job requires a personal trip to Korea, I shall make that trip. Only in that way could I learn how best to serve the American people in the cause of peace. I shall go to Korea...” It exemplifies the use of rhetoric in the 1952 campaign.

<sup>113</sup> The Republican Party had attempted to use Yalta as a political tool to foster the goodwill of Eastern European ethnic groups who had been disappointed with the American failure to reach an amicable settlement in 1945-1946. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

<sup>114</sup> “Text of the Republican Party’s 1952 Campaign Platform Adopted by National Convention.” *New York Times* (1923-Current file), July 11, 1952, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed April 3, 2010). See Dulles’ article in *Life Magazine*, “A Policy of Boldness”

attempting to liberate Eastern Europe had been a component of the Truman Administration's policy since 1948 with the acceptance of NSC 20/4. Historians have had various interpretations on this issue. One such interpretation as described by John Lewis Gaddis is that "Presidents are rarely made by endorsing their predecessors... and Eisenhower soon came under pressure to put 'distance' between himself and the incumbent administration in the area of foreign affairs."<sup>115</sup> Another such interpretation, however, sees Eisenhower's campaign promises in a much more sinister light. W. Scott Lucas argues that "the shrill rhetoric of Eisenhower's Presidential campaign not only misrepresented the US position; it threatened to undermine a policy based on covert operations."<sup>116</sup> Nevertheless, there has been a historiographical consensus that a shift from containment to liberation never occurred when Eisenhower took office.<sup>117</sup>

Truman's last year in office can be described as quixotic in relation to the recalibration of its policies towards combatting the Soviet Union in information campaigns. There was an incessant political turf battle between the CIA, the State Department, and the Psychological Strategy Board, which was established to streamline American covert operations against the Soviet Union.<sup>118</sup> In addition there were very real debates about whether or not it was realistic to assume that the sorts of external pressures envisaged in NSC 20/4 would be effective.<sup>119</sup>

With a new administration, however, came a thorough review of the prior administration's policies. In the context of its broader policy reviews, Eisenhower ordered a committee led by former deputy director of the CIA, William H. Jackson, to assess the

---

<sup>115</sup> Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 125.

<sup>116</sup> W. Scott Lucas "The Myth of Leadership; Dwight Eisenhower and the Quest for Liberation" in T.G. Otte and Constantine A. Pagedas, eds. *Personalities, War, and Diplomacy: Essays in International History* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 160.

<sup>117</sup> See Bennet Kovrig, *The Myth of Liberation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973) is perhaps the starting point for the historiographical argument that there existed a discontinuity between the Truman policies of containment and the Eisenhower policies of liberation.

<sup>118</sup> Mitrovich, *Undermining the Kremlin: America's Strategy to Subvert the Soviet Bloc*, 101.

<sup>119</sup> See the debate about Bohlen's reentry into the scene and the roll of NSC 68.

Truman Administration's "information policies."<sup>120</sup> The so-called Jackson Committee released its report on 30 June 1953 broadly criticizing the misuse of psychological warfare by American policymakers on a host of issues ranging from the gap between announced policies and results to the inability of the PSB to coordinate various activities.<sup>121</sup> As a result of the Jackson Committee Report, the PSB as well as the Consultants Group were replaced with the Operations Coordinating Board (OCB) that resided within the NSC and was charged with handling psychological aspects of American foreign policy.

Eisenhower's foreign policy doctrine, commonly referred to as the New Look, had one main goal: achieve the maximum possible deterrence of communism at the minimum possible cost.<sup>122</sup> Psychological warfare operations would play a prominent role in implementing Eisenhower's New Look.<sup>123</sup> In fact, early in his administration, Eisenhower explained his desire for a unified psychological strategy in the Cold War and many individuals who had become frustrated with the Truman Administration viewed the ascension of Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles, and Allan Dulles as a means of rejuvenating American psychological operations against the Soviet Union.

1953 presented the Eisenhower administration a series of challenges concerning its ability to meet the expectations of those that had placed great hopes in its ability to capitalize on significant events in the Soviet space using psychological operations. Joseph Stalin's death on 3 March 1953 provided the United States the moment that many American policymakers had hoped would lead to the destruction of the Soviet Union and for many believers in psychological warfare that it would be a moment that the United States would be able to exploit. Ultimately, Eisenhower did not view the event to be as significant as many

---

<sup>120</sup> Mitrovich, *Undermining the Kremlin: America's Strategy to Subvert the Soviet Bloc*, 124.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid*, 125. The report disclosed that some plans "had failed to take adequate account of the capabilities of the United States and its allies."

<sup>122</sup> Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 162.

<sup>123</sup> See: Kenneth A. Osgood, "Form before Substance: Eisenhower's Commitment to Psychological Warfare and Negotiations with the Enemy *Diplomatic History* 24, Issue 3 (2000): 405-433.



bureaucrats and it took six weeks for the White House to decide whether or not the United States should adopt an aggressive stance. Ultimately, Eisenhower delivered an address on 16 April entitled “The Chance for Peace.”<sup>124</sup>

Throughout Eisenhower’s first term there existed a fundamental tension in its position towards the liberation of Eastern Europe and the importance of psychological warfare. Although there was a remarkable level of continuity between the Truman and Eisenhower administrations in how they dealt with the Kremlin, the Truman Administration did not publicly acknowledge that it was pursuing a policy actively to subvert Soviet influence in Eastern Europe in order to avoid causing alarm with West European allies. While such a policy opened up the Truman administration to domestic charges that it had become soft on communism, there was little gap between rhetorical policy and implemented policy. The Eisenhower administration, however, made itself potentially vulnerable because of the gap between rhetoric and its actual policy. The continued rhetorical claim to promote the liberation of Eastern Europe throughout the administration’s first year, in addition to the its commitment to total psychological warfare, elevated expectations that the United States would act when a suitable moment occurred.

Although Stalin’s death and the uprisings in Eastern Europe in 1953 did not immediately expose the tensions between rhetoric and reality, the fundamental question about the Eisenhower administration was whether or not United States remained committed to breaking up the Soviet bloc? Historians have argued whether or not the Eisenhower administration actually sought to break up the Soviet bloc or whether its adherence to a policy of liberation was a political ploy in order to build on the growing anti-communist sentiment in the United States. Contemporaries even claimed that the liberation rhetoric was exclusively geared at a domestic audience. The important point, however, is that rhetoric is

---

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, 409.

real and insofar as the Eisenhower administration promised to a wide audience that it would fight to liberate Eastern Europe and rollback the external borders of Soviet influence.

It is in this context of increased expectation that the United States would fight for the liberation of Eastern Europe that the relationship between Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian refugees and American officials should be understood. Those few exiles who had worked with the Truman Administration had a certain understanding that Americans were actively engaged in subverting the Soviet Union. Compared to Western European nations that had taken ambivalent positions towards the status of Eastern Europe generally, and the Baltic States more specifically, the United States was the only country with the potential demonstrably to change the situation in Eastern Central Europe. Eisenhower's election was partially based on the dissatisfaction in the Democratic Party's handling of the Soviet Union since the 1945 Yalta Conference, in addition to Eisenhower's claim that the United States would fight for liberation. This only enhanced the faith that the exile groups had in the United States during the 1950s. Indeed, the interests of Baltic exiles and the United States Government seemed perfectly aligned after November 1952.

### Conclusion

From 1948-1952, highest-order interests of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exiles and American officials converged around the idea that Soviet influence in Eastern Europe could in fact be curtailed by pursuing rather aggressive policies against the Soviet bloc. Although the Truman Administration sought to contain Soviet influence around the world, containment was by no means a purely defensive strategy. American officials subscribed to policies that were designed to foster discontent within Eastern Europe that not only hoped to prevent the Kremlin from utilizing resources externally against Western interests, but would

also cause deep political, economic, and social fractures in the Soviet Union and its satellite nations.

The hundreds of thousands of Eastern European refugees in postwar Europe provided the Americans with a unique resource to lead offensive efforts against the Soviet Union. Not only did Eastern European refugees appear to have the credibility accurately to describe their first-hand accounts with communism, but there was a shared belief that Eastern European political exiles continued to maintain a minimal amount of credibility in their homelands. Unlike the use of exiles in paramilitary operation in the Baltic republics and Albania, Eastern European exiles found a more sustainable and potentially more useful role as broadcasters over American covert radio channels beamed towards Eastern Europe and as exiled leaders who could create a sense of unity among each Eastern European diaspora through FEC activities.

Such policies would not have been possible had Truman not persuaded the United States Congress to pass the 1948 and subsequent 1950 Displaced Persons' Acts. Although Truman initially thought that it was a matter of humanitarian interests to allow refugees from Eastern Europe to immigrate to the United States, it quickly became a politically important issue with far-reaching implications. The DP situation was a source of instability in a Western Europe that was in the process of creating a sustained post-war reconstruction effort. As the Cold War became a contest not only for spheres of influence, but a battle for hearts and minds, the repatriation of DPs to the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe would have been a substantial blow to American prestige.

The thousands of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian refugees who immigrated to the United States represented just a small portion of the human anti-communist capital that the State Department and the CIA would have at their disposal at the beginning of the 1950s. The continued American non-recognition policy towards the Soviet Union's annexation assisted

in providing a legal justification for the refusal of Baltic DPs to repatriate and provided the Americans the justification to allow large numbers of Baltic refugees to emigrate.

As the Cold War intensified, it appeared as though there would be an unknowable number of years before the Baltic people would have the opportunity to honestly express their opinion on being Soviet citizens. As a result, it became clear that the non-recognition policy had to continue to be credible. The main focus of continued non-recognition was to permit the accredited Baltic diplomats in the United States to continue their work. From 1940 onwards, Baltic diplomats were able to fund their activities through withdrawing money from frozen accounts in the United States. The investment of funds provided a sense of stability to both the Americans and to the diplomats, as Baltic diplomats continue to function in Washington, funded by Baltic (and not American funds).

The non-recognition policy, however, should also be viewed as the main framework through which all policy decisions were viewed. This was immediately evident in the reticent movement by the FEC and the State Department in starting informal relationships between the FEC and leading Baltic exiles. While there were funding issues associated with starting services with relatively small exile groups compared to the Poles or the Hungarians, policymakers asked how the non-recognition policy could affect Baltic-FEC relations. The State Department was concerned that FEC-sponsored Baltic panels would undermine the authority of the exiled diplomats, and in turn undermine the non-recognition policy. FEC officials argued that the existence of “democratic” exiled diplomats as opposed to “totalitarian” diplomats of the satellite countries necessarily meant that there was less need for Baltic sponsored activities.

One possibly unintended consequence of the Baltic refugee migration to the United States was the establishment of highly-organized, politically active organizations that represented the interests of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. The pressure that the

organizations as well as the exiled diplomats exerted on both the FEC and the State Department helped in the establishment of Baltic Consultative Panels associated with the FEC. Although the FEC delayed discussions about commencing Baltic language radio broadcasts, the Baltic Consultative Panels were diligent in participating in the other FEC sponsored activities, such as the Free Europe Press, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, and the Free European University in Exile.

The long-term hope that American officials had in the Baltic Consultative Panels was that the Panels' activities would be able to create a sense of cooperation among the broader diasporas of each nationality and eventually establish some level of pan-Baltic cooperation. Such cooperation was seen to have a great amount of human anti-Communist capital that could be exploited at some point for future operations in the 1950s. Such hope, however, was immediately tempered by the reaction of many political factions within the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exile communities about the makeup of the extremely small Consultative Panels seated in New York. The major challenge for both the Baltic Panels and the FEC was how to use the Consultative Panels to create a sense of unity rather than have the Consultative Panels seen as a proxy political battlefield among competing exile factions.

The long-term hope that Baltic exiles had in the United States was that the State Department and the FEC would be reliable partners in helping to liberate their homelands. Eisenhower's election in 1952 only increased the expectations among Baltic exiles that the United States was becoming more serious about actively liberating the Baltic republics from the Soviet Union. Such hopes only increased the possibility that the relationship between the exiles and the Americans would splinter at some point due to the asymmetrical importance of the Baltic republics to each party. For the Americans, the Baltic States were a test of American international credibility dating back to its 1940 non-recognition policy, but was

never a central foreign policy issue. For the Baltic exiles, liberation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania was their central political aspiration during the early 1950s.

## CHAPTER III

### THE QUEST FOR CONTINUITY AND COOPERATION

On 15 November, 1950, Harold Vedeler of the State Department's Baltic desk met with Estonian Consul General Johannes Kaiv to discuss a number of issues pertinent to Estonian affairs. Rumors abounded that the Estonians were considering establishing a diplomatic mission to the French government in Paris and during the meeting Vedeler inquired whether or not the Estonians were intending to pursue the appointment of a diplomat to Paris. Kaiv pointed out that both the Latvians and Lithuanians had unofficial representatives in Paris who were working on an ad hoc basis to assist with refugee affairs and confirmed that he had been exploring the notion of an Estonian representative in Paris. Kaiv continued that he would like to send Kaarel Pusta Sr. to Paris, but that it would probably be Karl Selter, who had been serving as an Estonian liaison officer with the IRO in Switzerland.<sup>1</sup> In concluding the meeting, Vedeler said that the State Department wished to be kept informed of developments, but had yet to formulate a policy opinion on the matter.

Over the next month, a series of correspondences between the State Department's Baltic Desk and the American Embassy in Paris outlined the development of an initial policy towards the idea of a new Estonian mission in Paris that would function in a temporary capacity to assist in resettling Estonian displaced persons. The question of whether or not there would be any value for American policy came up. It was decided that there should be a discussion as to whether or not there would be any psychological warfare value in endorsing such an appointment. In concluding the discussion, Vedeler wrote to Joyce stating that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Kaiv and Vedeler, 15 November 1950, "Folder: Baltic General". Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

Baltic Desk had no objections to such a development and that the mission could be used for any number of purposes and even “including possibly psychological warfare activities.”<sup>2</sup>

Throughout the next year, Baltic diplomats, but particularly the Estonians were cognizant of the fact that their existence represented a great source of ammunition for American psychological warfare against international communism. On 2 June 1951 when Kaiv met with Johnson to discuss the beginning of Estonian language Voice of America (VOA) broadcasts, he stated that the American policy of continuing to recognize Baltic diplomats served as an important example to other countries of the free world and that there was growing perception that the “influence” of American policy was becoming more evident.<sup>3</sup> Kaiv explicitly coupled the inauguration of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian VOA broadcasts with a growing sense of hospitality towards the Baltic missions in countries that have access to the VOA broadcasts and that this increased the anti-communist sentiment in those countries.<sup>4</sup>

The existence of accredited Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian diplomats in the United States and abroad was important for both American officials and Baltic exiles. For American officials, diplomatic continuity for the Baltic republics meant that the non-recognition policy had real international credibility. For Baltic exiles, diplomatic continuity was one component of the larger exile narrative that they held political continuity and legitimacy dating back to the interwar Baltic governments.

Equally important for American policymakers was fostering a high level of cooperation within each Baltic émigré community and working towards establishing greater

---

<sup>2</sup> Vedeler to Joyce, 7 December 1950, “Folder: Baltic General”. Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>3</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Kaiv and Johnson, 2 June 1951 “Folder: Baltic General.” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* During the same meeting, Kaiv mentioned Pusta Sr.’s trip to Europe during the summer of 1950 and that he had taken photostatic copies of certifications and displayed them to foreign officials. Pusta Sr. commented to Kaiv that the officials who had seen the documents had been “visibly impressed with this evidence of forthright American policy on the question.



contacts between the three diasporas. The establishment of Baltic consultative panels associated with the FEC was only one area that the State Department and other American agencies pushed for greater cooperation within each community. Establishing contacts with various exile organizations internationally as well as allowing Baltic exiles to discuss the expansion of diplomatic missions were technical ways that the State Department hoped that cooperation amongst the exiles would benefit American interests in Eastern Europe.

This chapter will examine three areas where the principle of political continuity among Baltic exiles created direct tension with the American interest to foster greater cooperation within the exile communities. First, the issue of diplomatic succession, where the death of accredited Latvian diplomats created a policy discussion in Washington as well as within the exile communities about whether or not and how diplomatic succession should occur. Second, the issue of governments in exile, where the primary goal of the largest Estonian exile community was to establish an exile government, despite the policy problems for the Americans and the political factions established within the Estonian community. Third, the political infighting among Lithuanian exiles in Europe, where the Lithuanian exiled diplomats were in direct political opposition to a CIA sponsored Lithuanian exile organization.

This chapter will also examine the impact that these conflicts had on the debate about whether or not the United States would actively pursue the expansion of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian diplomatic missions internationally. During the early 1950s, the expansion of missions was a policy where Baltic exile interests and American foreign policy interests potentially aligned. I will argue that the quest for political continuity by the Baltic exiles ultimately undermined their ability to establish deep contacts with the American officials that could have provided demonstrable help to their political organizations and allowed them a greater voice in the policy making process. I will also argue that the furtive efforts that

American officials used to try to foster cooperation among the exiles only intensified conflict within the three exile diasporas.

*Baltic Diplomatic Succession: The Deaths of Alfreds Bilmanis and Jules Feldmans*

One of the most important issues that caused tensions between the Baltic exiles and the United States government concerned who would succeed one of the accredited diplomats when they passed away. For the American government, the continued credibility of the non-recognition policy was rooted in the fact that the diplomats who represented Baltic interests were those who were assigned to the United States by the independent interwar republics. For the Baltic exiles, the continuation of having Baltic diplomats recognized by several countries in the free world provided both practical assistance for the refugees as well as providing a close sense of legitimacy of the exiles to the interwar republics. The fact that the State Department wished not to become heavily involved in intra-exile politics necessarily meant that disagreements regularly occurred when it came to succession plans for the diplomats.

By 1948 it became clear that the Baltic republics were not going to regain their independence in the foreseeable future and the decision to continue the non-recognition of the Soviet annexation meant that at some point the United States government and the exiled diplomatic corps would have to make succession plans. This theoretical issue, however, became reality when Alfreds Bilmanis, Latvian Ambassador to the United States, died at his home in Rehoboth Beach, Delaware on 26 July 1948.<sup>5</sup> Anatole Dinbergs, the Latvian legation's attaché, contacted Vedeler that morning to ensure that American officials were aware of the situation.<sup>6</sup> Bilmanis' unexpected passing created a situation that threatened not only the ability of the Americans to legitimately argue that they continued to recognize

---

<sup>5</sup> "DR. ALFRED BILMANIS." New York Times (1923-Current file), July 28, 1948, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed 14 April 2009).

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* The other primary reason why Dinbergs contacted Vedeler was to ask whether the State Department could contact the Treasury Department to release funds to cover the funeral expenses.

accredited Baltic diplomats, but also threatened the Baltic mission to preserve the memory of the interwar republics.

Naturally, the diplomatic succession process had two requisites. First, the individual appointed as a successor would have to be accepted by the American State Department. Without the explicit approval of the American government, the individual selected by the Baltic diplomatic missions would play a particularly marginal role in their nations' affairs. Second, the individual would have to be accepted by the national diplomatic corps, and hopefully by the majority of exiled diasporas. In the event that there would be conflict within the diplomatic corps or within the broader diaspora, the diplomatic selection process would have caused further disunity.

Of the three Baltic nations, the Latvians had the clearest succession plan for diplomatic representation while in exile. On 17 May 1940, the "last legal government of Latvia" appointed Karlis Zariņš with emergency state powers should the government in Riga be unable to perform the normal duties of operating the state.<sup>7</sup> Of the various things that the emergency powers envisaged was the ability to appoint Latvian diplomatic representatives to various countries and to open and close legations.<sup>8</sup> While this made things slightly more clear within the Latvian diplomatic corps, there were still issues about whether or not the Americans would recognize such extraordinary powers and whether the whole of the Latvian diaspora would feel well-represented.

After hearing about Bilmanis' death, Dinbergs contacted Zariņš in London to make sure that the individual responsible for Latvian diplomatic appointments was made aware. Almost immediately, Zariņš sent a cable to Dinbergs stating, "Based on my Extraordinary

---

<sup>7</sup> Valdis O. Lumans, *Latvia in World War II* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2006), 86.

<sup>8</sup> Johnson to Vedeler, 27 July 1948 "Folder: La711a Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

powers, I appoint you to take care of the Legation.”<sup>9</sup> The following day, Dinbergs set up a meeting with Vedeler at the State Department building to discuss the succession plans, and inquired whether or not Zariņš had contacted the State Department about his nominating Dinbergs to be the placeholder at the Latvian legation. Dinbergs’ major concerns was that in the past, the United States Government had not recognized the legality of emergency state powers bestowed upon diplomatic official abroad, and that the American precedent could have a negative impact on the present situation.<sup>10</sup> In an attempt to mitigate a potentially negative American position towards Zariņš’ declaration, Dinbergs presented Vedeler with a document signed by Bilmanis, while he was seriously ill, that would appoint Dinbergs as the legal successor to Bilmanis.<sup>11</sup>

Throughout the subsequent week, State Department policymakers led an internal debate about how to handle the succession issue. They were faced with a choice between allowing diplomatic representation from the Republic of Latvia to come to an end with Bilmanis’ death or they could extend credentials to another member of the Latvian exiled diplomatic corps. The failure to accredit a new Latvian diplomat would necessarily have consequences for the non-recognition policy, as the continued presence of Baltic diplomats in the United States was a central feature of the policy. The two big concerns were not to establish a precedent where any particular member of the diasporas could be appointed as a diplomat and secondly that the appointment of a diplomat would not cause unnecessary fractures within the diasporas.

---

<sup>9</sup> Zariņš to Dinbergs 26 July 1948 “Folder: La711a Feldmans” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>10</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Dinbergs, Hooker, and Johnson, 27 July 1948 “Folder: La711a Feldmans” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>11</sup> Document presented to Vedeler by Dinbergs at 27 July 1948 Meeting with State Department “Folder: La711a Feldmans” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

By 4 August 1948, the Office of European Affairs of the State Department decided that the United States would accept the credentials of Baltic diplomats so long as they are members of the independent nations' diplomatic corps and did not cause any particularly deep fractures within the diasporas. The Director of European Affairs wrote to Under-Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett arguing that the United States should recognize Dinbergs as the acting chargé d'affaires to the United States, and moreover, should recognize the extraordinary powers of Zariņš due to the fact that the United States "had wanted to continue the non-recognition of the Soviet annexation."<sup>12</sup>

Dinbergs was able to consolidate his position as acting chargé d'affaires of the Latvian legation but Zariņš made it clear by the end of August that this was a temporary appointment. Due to the stature associated with being the Latvian minister to the United States, Zariņš began a debate about who should be the long-term Latvian appointed to the country who held the most unambiguous position towards Latvia's annexation. The initial concerns of American officials about diplomatic appointments causing friction among Latvians were confirmed when Dinbergs began to assert his relationship with his American counterparts over the long-term Latvian representation in Washington.

Zariņš informed Lovett on 27 August that he was going to begin the process of appointing a permanent successor to Bilmanis who would be selected from former Latvian diplomats residing in Europe.<sup>13</sup> The Office of European Affairs advised Lovett that there should be no objections to Zariņš appointing a permanent successor to Bilmanis.<sup>14</sup> Zariņš' extraordinary powers as chief of the Latvian diplomatic corps provided the Americans a

---

<sup>12</sup>EUR to Under Secretary Robert A. Lovett 4 August 1948, "Folder: La711a Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>13</sup> Zariņš to Lovett, 27 August 1948 "Folder: La711a Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>14</sup> Director of European Affairs to Lovett 27 August 1948, "Folder: La711a Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

proper cover to shield themselves from criticism from other Latvians about the legitimacy of future appointments.

The idea of appointing another Latvian diplomat to the Washington post was of concern for Dinbergs who was most likely not going to be selected as Bilmanis' permanent replacement. Throughout August and September, Dinbergs used his position as acting chargé d'affaires to try to influence the State Department in who would receive the diplomatic credentials. Dinbergs met with Johnson of the Baltic Desk on 30 August to inform him that he had provided Zariņš with a list of four Latvian diplomats in Europe who could be moved to the United States.<sup>15</sup> When Dinbergs inquired whether or not he had acted properly in producing the list, Johnson refused to comment, stating that it was an issue to be decided by the Latvian authorities – not the Americans. Dinbergs also voiced his concern that in his own opinion Zariņš did not have the authority to appoint a new minister to the United States and that only the head of a Latvian government could make such decisions.<sup>16</sup> Johnson responded by making it clear that the State Department would give proper consideration to whatever appointment Zariņš might make, but such technicalities would be dealt with should they arise.

Dinbergs' overtures made it clear to the State Department that if it did not do something to assuage Dinbergs' concerns, there could be future problems in the ability and/or the willingness of the Latvian legation's staff to successfully work together once the new representative arrived. On 17 September, Johnson wrote to Salter about redrafting a memorandum intended for Lovett concerning the new Latvian representative. Johnson's main argument was that the Latvian to replace Bilmanis should not have a rank higher than chargé

---

<sup>15</sup> Dinbergs and Johnson Memorandum of Conversation between Dinbergs and Johnson on 30 August 1948 "Folder: La711a Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

d'affaires and that Dinbergs should be strongly considered as the permanent replacement.<sup>17</sup> This seems to imply that American officials were concerned that unnecessary personal or professional tensions could arise by replacing Dinbergs with somebody new. From the American perspective, their only issue was that there was a Latvian diplomat in Washington that represented the interwar republic, not necessarily one who had the most prestige within the entire Latvian diplomatic corps.

Throughout the fall of 1948, Dinbergs continued to be the main contact that the State Department had with the Latvian diplomatic corps and competently worked on behalf of Latvian consular issues and anti-communist statements within the United States. As a result, he became someone that the Americans were comfortable working with and had begun the process of consolidating his position in the burgeoning American Latvian community. It was not until January 1949 when Zariņš intimated to Dinbergs and the Americans the direction that he would be taking in appointing someone to Washington.

Dinbergs met with Salter on 10 January 1949 to discuss the letter that Zariņš had sent to Washington elaborating on the criteria that he was using to select the new diplomat for Washington.<sup>18</sup> Zariņš had not taken seriously the advice that the American ambassador in London had given him that Dinbergs was not one of the top choices.<sup>19</sup> Dinbergs took the opportunity to explain to Salter in detail the various factions within the Latvian diaspora and

---

<sup>17</sup> Johnson to Salter, 17 September 1948, "Folder: La711a Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>18</sup> Dinbergs and Salter Memorandum of Conversation between Dinbergs and Salter on 10 January 1949, La711a. "Folder: La711a Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>19</sup> Zariņš to Dinbergs on 2 January 1949, "Folder: La711a Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

the implications that the selection of a diplomat would have on those factions. Dinbergs even raised the specter of Zariņš appointing Alfreds Valdmanis.<sup>20</sup>

Dinbergs left the meeting reiterating his opinion that Zariņš did not have the authority to appoint new heads of mission and that he might have had his official position in London undermined since the British had given de facto recognition to the Soviet annexation and that Zariņš and Bilmanis had discussions before his passing that should something happen to Zariņš then Bilmanis in Washington would assume the extraordinary diplomatic privileges. His thinking was that Zariņš had been compromised by the British official attitude towards the annexation and that the center of Latvian diplomatic activity should sit in the United States. Dinbergs also threatened that he would be compelled to resign “in protest” if the new diplomat was someone that he could not work with productively. Salter ended the meeting by saying that the United States still felt that Zariņš was entitled to exercise his special powers and that all parties should wait to draw conclusions until after Zariņš had made his selection.<sup>21</sup>

Ultimately Zariņš settled on appointing Jules Feldmans to be the Latvian chargé d'affaires to the United States in March 1949. Later in the month Dinbergs met with Salter to discuss the situation at the Latvian legation and ultimately apologized for his original attitude towards Latvian diplomatic succession. He thought that Feldmans was an excellent choice due to his relatively young age, but also his lengthy experience in the Latvian diplomatic corps.<sup>22</sup> For the next four years, Feldmans proved to be instrumental in the development of

---

<sup>20</sup> Alfreds Valdmanis was a prominent Latvian refugee who ultimately settled in Newfoundland. He played a prominent role in the Latvian community in Canada, but was always quite controversial due to his alleged ties with Nazi war criminals. See Gerhard P. Bassler, *Alfreds Valdmanis and the Politics of Survival* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000).

<sup>21</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Dinbergs and Salter on 10 January 1949, “Folder: La711a Feldmans” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>22</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Dinbergs and Salter on 17 March 1949 “Folder: La711a Feldmans” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.



the Latvian community in the United States and serving as a vocal advocate on behalf of Latvian refugees in the United States and abroad.

Five years after Bilmanis' passing, Dinbergs arrived at the State Department to inform Richard Johnson and Thomas Dillon of the Baltic Desk that Feldmans had died at his home on 16 August 1953.<sup>23</sup> While Zariņš was quick to appoint Dinbergs as acting chargé d'affaires, the situation within the Latvian diaspora was markedly different. Unlike in 1948, there was a sizable and influential Latvian community residing in the United States and it was unclear who in the Latvian diplomatic corps would be as qualified and have the same prestige internationally as Feldmans.<sup>24</sup>

On 17 August, the same day that Dinbergs informed State Department officials that Feldmans had died, two prominent Latvians, Vaivada and Paul Hartman, met with Dillon and Johnson to discuss the State Department's views on Feldmans' replacement.<sup>25</sup> Vaivada and Hartman's real objectives, however, were to forward their own candidate for the replacement. The two Latvians suggested that Gunars Meirovics should be named the new Latvian chargé d'affaires to the United States. They argued that Meirovics' father had been an outstanding Latvian patriot and the name had considerable appeal among all Latvians. Additionally, they stated that Meirovics' had not been involved in any of the exile political conflicts that had been taking place and have never been a member of a particular political party. Nevertheless, he was currently acting on the board of the ALA. Finally, they pointed out that Meirovics was completely pro-Western in his sentiments, believed that the United States was the only

---

<sup>23</sup> Special to The New York Times "LATVIAN MINISTER DEAD :Jules Feldmans, 64, Held Post in Washington Since 1949." New York Times (1923-Current file), August 18, 1953, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed April 15, 2011).

<sup>24</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Dinbergs, Dillon, and Johnson on 17 August 1953, "Folder: La711a Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>25</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Hartman, Vaivada, Johnson, and Dillon 17 August 1953 "Folder: La711b Replacement for Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

world power that could help in liberating Latvia, and could be seen as a unifying force among the various émigré factions.<sup>26</sup>

Johnson and Dillon responded that it would be problematic for Meirovics to assume such a position for two primary reasons. First, he had never been a member of the Latvian diplomatic corps and from both the American and Latvian position, appointing someone outside the corps would erode the legitimacy of the Latvian diplomats and the non-recognition policy. Second, Meirovics had already started the process of politically assimilating into the United States by applying for American citizenship. Johnson stated that “the fact that Meierovics has his U.S. Papers would make him appear as an American stooge.”<sup>27</sup>

Over the course of the next month, the topic of who would replace Feldmans was the most important issue among Latvians residing in the United States as well as in Europe. The ALA put forward a number of other candidates who could be considered for the position.<sup>28</sup> Dinbergs also kept the Americans informed of the candidates that various Latvian organizations in Europe were pushing upon Zariņš. The frontrunner, however, most likely was Janis Tepfors, since he was considered in 1948 before finally settling on Feldmans.<sup>29</sup> The issue of who would replace Feldmans also was broadly discussed when Zariņš made a visit to the United States in September 1953.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Hartman, Vaivada, Johnson, and Dillon 17 August 1953 “Folder: La711b Replacement for Feldmans” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> These included Alfreds Berzins, Aleksanders Plensners, Karlis Kalnins, Janis Tepfors, and Roberts Liepins. The ALA did not believe that someone such as Vilis Masens of the Latvian Consultative Panel would be appropriate since had created too many personal enemies within the émigré community.

<sup>29</sup> Barbour to Bonbright 15 September 1953 “Folder: La711b Replacement for Feldmans” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. Tepfors was only 55 years old, had a position in the Swedish Bank, had been a career diplomat including Ambassador to Finland. He was reportedly conservative, dependable, friendly to the United States, and high name recognition among the Latvians.

<sup>30</sup> Memo on Zariņš trip to the United States in September 1953 Central Decimal File, Records of the Department of State, RG 59. 760C.13/8-2753.

Despite the intrigue that had taken place in the Latvian diaspora over who would replace Feldmans, a more important debate was beginning to unfold among Latvians about the role that Latvian political history would have on the selection of the new representative in the United States.<sup>31</sup> Within the Latvian diaspora there existed a split over the legacy of the 1922 constitution. The 1922 constitution was perceived by Karlis Ulmanis and his supporters as defective in that it permitted the existence of too many small political parties. As a result, a string of unstable majorities formed governments in the parliament. Ulmanis disbanded all political parties and fashioned three new political parties: one for industrial laborers, one for farmers, and one for the middle class.<sup>32</sup>

By January 1954, Zariņš had decided that Roberts Liepins should be viewed as one of the frontrunners for the position in Washington. From 1936-1940, Liepins served as Riga's mayor. The point of contention between certain elements of the Latvian diaspora and the selection of Liepins as the new minister in Washington was whether or not Liepins had been elected mayor based on some sort of limited suffrage in 1936 or if he had been appointed mayor.<sup>33</sup> The other primary candidate happened to be Grosvalds who had been residing in France and Switzerland during the early 1930s. Grosvalds qualifications were based on his lengthy diplomatic experience and his excellent command of English. Unfortunately, the Americans had got to know him quite well through the embassy in Paris. When Zariņš had

---

<sup>31</sup> Harrison at the US Embassy in Paris sent the State Department a memo stating that Feldmans' death had caused much speculation in Baltic émigré circles. See 26 October 1953 Harrison to Barbour "Folder: La711b Replacement for Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>32</sup> Andrejs Plakans, *The Latvians: A Short History*, 132-135.

<sup>33</sup> Johnson to File 19 January 1954 "Folder: La711b Replacement for Feldmans" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

met with several American policymakers in October 1953, they made clear to Zariņš that Grosvalds would be a less than ideal candidate.<sup>34</sup>

Zariņš finally made his decision after a certain amount of fallout within the diaspora about the prospects of someone so closely tied to the Ulmanis regime becoming one of the most important diplomats among the Latvian exiles. Arnolds Spekke was selected in May 1954, and was received by the State Department on 6 May 1954. Credentials were ultimately presented to Dulles on 24 May instead with Eisenhower who had other engagements.<sup>35</sup>

### *The Estonian Exile Government: Exile Politics in an Unwelcoming Environment*

The first, and arguably most important, politically active Estonian exile organization established in Sweden was the Estonian National Council (ERN – *Eesti Rahvusnõukogu*). The ERN was established in 1947 by August Rei and claimed to be the center of the political struggle of Estonians living outside of their occupied country.<sup>36</sup> Despite being based in Sweden, it was clear that the ERN's objectives were not just limited to establishing a structure to Estonian political life in Sweden. Indeed, the organization's four stated objectives highlight this fact. First, the ERN sought to “unite all Estonians living in the free world in the effort to secure freedom and a happier future for their people.” Second, the ERN hoped to “form a well-organized and firm link in the front of freedom, which is being erected in the entire world against the totalitarian tyranny of the East.” Third, the ERN wanted to “develop the most intimate collaboration with all national and international organizations opposed to international communism and to maintain close contact with the resistance movement of

---

<sup>34</sup> Harrison (London) to Barbour on 26 October 1953 “Folder: La711b Replacement for Feldmans” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>35</sup> Merchant to Dulles 20 May 1954, “Folder: La711c Accreditation of Spekke” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 7, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>36</sup> ERN Objectives and Structure, “Folder: E801.1 Emigre Organizations Abroad” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

Central and Eastern Europe.” Finally, the ERN was created to “form a coordinating center for the numerous Estonian political organizations in exile at present active in Sweden, England, the United States, Canada, and elsewhere.”<sup>37</sup>

A distinguishing feature of the ERN from other Estonian refugee organization was that it perceived itself as the only legitimate body to continue the institutions of the Uluots government. The membership of several former high-ranking government ministers including August Rei (Foreign Minister), Rudolf Penno, (Industry Minister), and Johannes Klesment (Justice Minister) bolstered ERN’s position within the broader Estonian emigration. In addition, ERN’s General Assembly was comprised of the four principal Estonian political parties in equal proportion: the Estonian Agrarian Party, the United Party of Farmers and Smallholders, the National Center Party, and the Socialist Associations.<sup>38</sup>

Certainly the ERN had some fundamental advantages over other Estonian exile organizations, such as having former high-ranking government officials as members, a majority of the diaspora residing in its home location, and the desire to create a mandate from as broad a cross-section of Estonian exile society as possible. The ERN, however, faced a number of significant challenges during the late 1940s and early 1950s to succeed in its mission of being a unifying force among Estonian exile society. Of primary importance was the necessity to overcome the marginal position that Sweden played in the anti-communist world during the early Cold War years.

The failure of the Swedish government to take a rhetorically forceful position against the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States meant that there was the possibility that the Swedish government would place restrictions on the establishment of politically active exile activities within their country. Such restrictions were indeed put in place immediately following the establishment of the ERN. Anything that could be misconstrued as establishing

---

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

a government in exile was strictly forbidden. Considering the broad makeup of the ERN and their explicit statement that they represented the government that was in existence in 1945 the Swedish decision meant that ERN's activities were necessarily curtailed. As a result, the ERN began to seek assistance from various NGOs, Eastern European exile organizations, and foreign governments, including the United States.

Throughout 1948 and 1949, Rei began a letter writing campaign to the State Department, White House, and certain members of the U.S. Congress that were known to be sympathetic to the Baltic cause. The bulk of the material was merely informative in nature, including pamphlets concerning ERN's composition, with the hope that the country that had the most unequivocal position on the international status of the Baltic republics would support the ERN's causes (at the very least boosting its morale.) While the American Embassy in Sweden kept the State Department informed of the various activities of Estonian exiles in Stockholm, American bureaucrats also relied upon information provided by Kaiv on political activities that would have an impact on the Estonian diaspora.

In January 1949, Harold Vedeler asked Kaiv to provide any information that he might have about the composition of the ERN generally, and the position that Rei had within the Estonian diaspora more specifically. Kaiv immediately replied stating that the ERN appeared similar to "the so-called liberation committees organized by some national groups whose countries are at present directly or indirectly under Soviet domination."<sup>39</sup> Kaiv continued that "the council is a patriotic organization," but the memo has been composed and dispatched "without previous consultation with me."<sup>40</sup> From the very beginning of the ERN's attempts to garner favor with the Americans, it is clear that Kaiv viewed the council's makeup as being a

---

<sup>39</sup> Johannes Kaiv to State 19 January 1949, "Folder: Estonia 1502" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

competing political bloc. After 1949, the ability of the ERN to earn any favor with the Americans was entirely dependent on the working relationship that Rei had with Kaiv.

One implication of the narrow constraints that the Swedish government placed on Estonian activities was that ERN was limited in its ability to raise funds and grant salaries to organizers. Throughout the 1940s and early 1950s, Rei received a stipend from the Swedish government to work as an archivist. During a regularly scheduled meeting between the Estonian Consul in New York and State Department Baltic desk officials, Kaiv inquired whether it would be possible to provide Rei with a \$5,000 stipend from the Estonian frozen assets in the United States. While Kaiv was hoping to alleviate the possibility of Sweden ending Rei's stipend and causing a blow to Estonian credibility internationally, he framed the question to the Americans in a manner that would place a salary for Rei within one of the larger American concerns for the Balts – unification within the diasporas. Kaiv suggested, "His personal relations with Rei might also be improved if it would be possible to provide some funds [for Rei.]"<sup>41</sup>

Even though Kaiv insisted that doing so would not lend any official character to Rei's position in Stockholm in relation to the Estonian diplomatic corps, the primary importance for the Americans was to insure that the Estonian General Consul's office remained viable. Johnson told Kaiv that the State Department would be reluctant to authorize an appropriation for Rei if it would substantially increase the Estonian consul's annual budget.<sup>42</sup> Kaiv's inability or unwillingness to reduce his own expenses or the expenses of other accredited Estonian diplomats created a situation where there was no possibility of establishing rapprochement between Kaiv and Rei based on providing a salary for the former foreign minister.

---

<sup>41</sup> Memo of Conversation between Kaiv and Johnson on 7 November 1951 "Folder: E844a August Rei" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 6, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

The ongoing problem of trying to circumvent Kaiv, however, was not the most important issue that the ERN faced while trying to establish itself as the preeminent Estonian organization in exile. As Cold War tensions increased, the political leanings of most Estonians in exile became more homogeneous. All major political parties in interwar Estonia secured maintained some popularity in exile, but a significant portion of Estonian refugees leaned more towards the Right as they were middle class and largely bourgeois in their homelands. August Rei, however, continued to be an unapologetic Social Democrat – even in exile. While by no means an agenda killer, it made Rei increasingly vulnerable to competing power blocs establishing themselves in Sweden.

In the early 1950s, a second major Estonian organization was established in Sweden. The Central Organization of Free Estonians (Vabade Eestlaste Ülemaailmne Keskorganisatsioon – VEKO) was comprised mainly of individuals who were less prominent in independent Estonia since they were younger, but decided that members of the old government no longer represented the attitudes of Estonians in exile. What the VEKO lacked in direct ties to the former independent Estonian government, it made up for in its youth and broad appeal across the increasingly single issued Estonian diaspora. For younger Estonians in exile it became less important to mimic every government institution and political party that was in place during the period of independence and more important to demonstrate to the international community that free Estonians were anti-communist and promoted the liberation of their homelands.

While a power struggle between ERN and VEKO began in earnest in the 1950s and VEKO quickly earned the sympathies of most Estonians in exile that lived in the United States and Canada, there was very little ideological difference between the two organizations. Foreign diplomats in Stockholm astutely noted, “The singly unifying motivation among Estonians is the struggle for an independent homeland. There are no important ideological



differences between the ERN and VEKO and both include representatives of all political parties.”<sup>43</sup> Throughout 1951–1952 while the United States was trying to foster growing cooperation among Eastern European exile groups through the NCFE, the Estonians were splintering into even more political factions.

A general theme of meetings between Kaiv and his counterparts in Washington was how to bridge the divide between the ERN and VEKO. Vedeler pressed Kaiv on the issue during a September 1952 meeting and Kaiv mentioned the idea that a “Secretariat General” was being discussed between individuals representing Estonian organizations in the United States (mainly the Committee for a Free Estonia), Canada, and ERN, and VEKO. The new secretariat was supposed to be seated in New York and would consist of seven members, including two from Canada, one from the United States, Australia, Germany, and two from Sweden (ostensibly being one representing VEKO and one representing ERN.)<sup>44</sup> This organization, intended to assist in unifying the Estonian diaspora in a way that the Committee for a Free Estonia had been unable to up until this point, however, never came to fruition. Simply, the primary concern of the Estonians in exile was not creating a unified front to assist in the liberation of their homelands, but to enhance their own position of power in the Estonian diaspora.

An important component of leading Estonian exiles’ ideology was that they were to be the foundation of any future independent, and democratic Estonia. The lack of a government-in-exile became one of the most pressing problems that faced the Estonian diaspora. The establishment of a viable government-in-exile would not only demonstrate to the international community that the Estonian diaspora was serious about returning home

---

<sup>43</sup> Herbert R. Lottman to R.G. Mays, Jr. 16 January 1953, “Folder: E701.1 Diplomatic Representation” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>44</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Kaiv and Vedeler on 24 September 1952, “Folder: E701.1 Diplomatic Representation” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

once their country had been liberated, but it was also argued that it would establish a sense of unity among the exiles that had alluded them since entering into exile.

The rhetoric of establishing unity among the exiles, however, should really be interpreted as a desire by leading Estonian exiles to consolidate their power within the diaspora as opposed to an altruistic plan to foster rapprochement with exile groups that would be marginalized by the existence of such a government. Over the course of 1952, support for establishing an exiled government became more apparent across broad portions of the Estonian exile community. Even exiles, such as Kaiv, who could potentially be undermined by such a step, appear to have given tacit support for the government's establishment. In July 1952, Kaiv gave a speech before the ERN where he argued that since there existed a provision within the 1938 Estonian constitution to establish an exile government it might be an available option to further the objectives of combatting the Soviet presence in their homelands.<sup>45</sup>

Kaiv, however, warned that a government should only be established if it was able to garner significant support across the Estonian diaspora. If the government was unable to do so, then Kaiv feared that such an entity would never win enough international recognition to be perceived as a viable government.<sup>46</sup> While it is impossible to ascertain whether or not Kaiv's tacit endorsement of the establishment of an exile government provided the necessary catalyst for one to be organized, historian Vahur Made has argued that Kaiv's interpretation of the 1938 Constitution provided enough of an impetus for two competing Estonians to declare exiled governments in early 1953.

The ongoing debate over the establishment of an exile government focused on the existing split in the Estonian diaspora between those that supported Rei and the ERN and

---

<sup>45</sup> Vahur Made, "The Estonian Government-in-Exile: A Controversial Project of State Continuation" in Hiden, et. al. *The Baltic Question During the Cold War*, 136.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

those that supported VEKO, and its most prominent member who was a politician Edward Maurer. On 2 January 1953, Maurer and his VEKO supporters organized a meeting in Stockholm where they decided to convene the Electoral Body necessary to establish an exiled government. Sensing that the window was quickly closing on the exiled government debate, Rei traveled from Stockholm to Oslo on 12 January 1953 and established an Estonian government-in-exile. Rei's claim for establishing the government was that he has served as Acting President of the Republic since he had been the oldest surviving member of the last free Estonian government.<sup>47</sup>

Why did Rei travel to Oslo to establish the exiled government instead of Stockholm? Throughout 1951 and 1952, "friendly Norwegians" who offered to introduce him to key American military and civilian officials there had invited Rei to Oslo.<sup>48</sup> While such overt support never materialized between Rei and his American interlocutors, the experience proved to be invaluable in ascertaining what the Norwegian attitude would be towards an exile government being declared on their territory. The Norwegian Foreign Ministry made it clear that it would not interfere in the establishment of such a government and that from the Norwegian perspective it had zero significance. The Swedish government, however, appeared to be quite sensitive to the idea of an Estonian exile government operating on its territory. Upon the exile government's return to Stockholm, on 31 January, the Swedish Foreign Minister clearly informed Rei that the Swedish government would not recognize the newly created exile government and that Estonians residing in Sweden did not have the right to carry out political activities in the country.<sup>49</sup> Simply, the Norwegians had less concern about exiles engaging in political activities within their border compared to the Swedes.

---

<sup>47</sup> Embassy in Stockholm to State Department, 4 February 1953, Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAII. 760B.00/2-453.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> Embassy in Stockholm to State Department on 11 February 1953 Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAII. 760B.00/2-1153.

Rei's actions, however, did not dissuade Maurer from moving toward the establishment of his government. On 2 March 1953, Maurer established a second Estonian exile government in Augustdorf, Germany based on the Electoral Body that had been mandated in Stockholm that January. Maurer nominated an Estonian cabinet, and attempted to appoint an Estonian from each of the major centers of Estonian exiles to the cabinet positions. As a result, by March 1953, the Estonian diaspora and its supporters in the West were faced with not one exile government, but two.

The government in exile was supposed to add another tool to the Estonian diaspora's arsenal against the Soviet Union, whilst providing a unifying force within the community, but instead ultimately created even deeper fissures. Logically, the Rei government refused to recognize the Maurer government, and visa versa. The power struggle between the ERN and VEKO that had been developing over the course of the early 1950s established two political camps over which group's exile government would ultimately speak on behalf of the Estonian people. Ultimately, the legal issue of whether it was appropriate for an exile government to be organized was ultimately elevated to a political one between two émigré organizations.

Despite the general growing tensions between the ERN and VEKO, the rationale for the establishment of two exiled governments was rooted in conflicting interpretations of the 1938 Estonian Constitution and how it would handle the possibility of an exile government. Yet again, political issues from the 1930s plagued political issues in the 1950s. The Constitution stated that should both the President and Prime Minister be unable to fulfill their responsibilities to the nation, the oldest member of the government should become acting President and Prime Minister. The imprisonment of the former president and deputy prime minister, and death of the prime minister meant that the 1944 Estonian government had no leader. August Rei assumed the titles Acting President and Prime Minister as he had been the

most senior member of the 1944 Estonian government and had gained the support of many other government politicians who successfully fled to Sweden. Maurer and other leading Estonian politicians who had fled elsewhere rejected this interpretation of the Estonian Constitution and claimed that should the President and Prime Minister be unable to govern than an Electoral Body consisting of politicians and civil servants should be established to elect the new president.

The minutiae of the arguments revolved around the interpretation of Article 46 of the 1938 Constitution. The article stated that such a Constitutional Electoral Board would have to be appointed if the office of the President became vacant in times of war. Maurer and his supporters claimed that the President's office had clearly become vacant because of World War II. Rei, however, argued that Estonia never entered a state of war despite everything that had taken place between 1944 and 1945. As a result, there was no need convene the Electoral board.<sup>50</sup>

The political context of the ongoing struggle between the two governments goes back to the rudimentary conflict between the ERN and VEKO. Rei was a social democrat who did not necessarily hold the same contemporary ideological stance of the majority of the Estonian exiles. Simply, some people "did not think it is appropriate for the Estonian Government in exile to be led by Socialists."<sup>51</sup> Matters were complicated by the opinion of many Estonians exiles who were not members of either VEKO or ERN who thought that it was best that there be an agreement between the two bodies so that only one government would function.<sup>52</sup> In this one instance, Rei and Maurer agreed that this was a nonstarter.

---

<sup>50</sup> Embassy in Stockholm to State Department on 10 March 1953 Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAI. 760B.00/2-1159.

<sup>51</sup> Perandi Report to the FEC 14 July 1953 "Folder: E801.4 Consultative Panel" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

Perhaps the single most important question pertaining to the rationale for establishing exile governments is whether or not it was realistic for the Estonian exiles to expect there to be any widespread international support for such an endeavor? Clearly it was not expected that governments such as Sweden would tolerate an exiled Estonian government to function within their borders, so it is more likely that the Estonians would expect nations, such as the United States, to support such an endeavor. Unfortunately, the State Department had a long-standing policy not to recognize exile governments.

A major concern of State Department officials once they began dealing strictly with Baltic exiles in the postwar period had always been that governments-in-exile would be established. Exile governments posed a profound threat to American aims of maintaining the non-recognition policy and fostering a growing sense of solidarity within each diaspora. In official policy briefings concerning the non-recognition policy, the State Department made clear that they continued to recognize the existing diplomatic missions from the 1940 governments, but did not recognize any group that could be misconstrued as an exile government. The fear was that recognizing an exile government would call into question the continued recognition of the diplomatic missions. What would happen should the exile government decide to appoint a new diplomatic representative to the United States? Additionally, there was an acknowledgement among senior officials that exile groups were prone to rehashing old political arguments and an exile government would undermine any effort at national reconciliation. To what extent were the Estonian exiles cognizant of this American attitude?

Based on the reports of regular meetings between Kaiv and American diplomats, the State Department was quite unequivocal about its position on exile governments. As early as 1949, the State Department became cognizant of the threat of Rei creating an exile government based on the structures of ERN. On 15 March, Marshall, a lawyer representing

Estonian interests in the United States contacted Salter and Johnson about the possibility of securing funds for ERN to establish an Estonian government-in-exile. Johnson tersely replied that while the State Department had sympathy for the work that Rei and the ERN were trying to accomplish in Sweden, the United States would not recognize that group as an Estonian government in exile.<sup>53</sup>

In the same meeting where Kaiv discussed the establishment of an Estonian Secretariat General in New York, he floated the idea of establishing a “legal government” that had been the preoccupation of much of the diaspora in Sweden, as a means of maintaining legal continuity for a future Estonian government. Vedeler used the opportunity to reiterate the point that Kaiv had already known perfectly well. The State Department’s position had not changed that they saw no practical functions for an exile government and that the United States would not recognize such an action.<sup>54</sup> These discussions make it clear that Kaiv saw no possibility of any western government recognizing an Estonian government-in-exile. Nevertheless, the Estonians continued to pursue such a policy and Kaiv tacitly endorsed the policy by stating to Estonians in Sweden as well as American diplomats that the issue of recognition was not necessarily important, but that the question of legal succession of the Estonian interwar government was of principal importance for the Estonian diaspora.

Adolf Perandi, member of the National Committee for a Free Estonia, was consulted by his American interlocutors to analyze the reason why the Estonians pursued the idea of an exile government in the first place. Perandi referred to Uluots who wrote while still in

---

<sup>53</sup> Memorandum of Conversation Between Salter and Marshall 15 March 1949, “Folder: Estonia 1502” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>54</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Kaiv, Vedeler, and Johnson. on 24 September 1952 “Folder: Estonia 1502” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

Estonia that “in the soul of the Estonian people is rooted a deep feeling for legality.”<sup>55</sup> This strong allegiance to legality among the Estonian diaspora was one reason why there was such a demand by the Estonian exiles for a government to be put into place. The primary reason for the rush towards taking such actions, Perandi argued, was because the members of the government who are in exile will die sooner or later, and if they all died, it would be impossible to elect a Deputy Premier who would represent the legal continuity of the Estonian government.<sup>56</sup>

Although the two competing exile governments fell along general organizational lines between those who were members of VEKO and those who belonged to ERN, both governments had to consolidate their own legitimacy in the eyes of their own supporters and try to garner support from Estonians outside of their respective groups. Throughout the spring 1953, both Rei and Maurer held regular meetings among their supporters to obtain explicit support for the sustainability of their governments.

Rei called a meeting of the ERN on 18 April 1953 to persuade the organization’s members to throw their support behind the Oslo exile government. Helder Tõnisson, son of Jaan Tõnisson, and leading voice in the Estonian Liberal Party had indicated before the meeting that the Liberal Party would not acknowledge Rei’s group as the legal Estonian government.<sup>57</sup> Tõnisson threatened that the Liberal Party’s position within the ERN was strong enough that it would be possible to prevent the Council from fully supporting the exile government. Nevertheless, Rei moved forward with the vote and succeeded in gaining the backing of the ERN.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Fund Memo 724 Report on Estonian Government in Exile 14 July 1944 “Folder: E801 General Political Affairs - External” “Folder: Estonia 1502” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> Embassy at Stockholm to State Department 27 April 1953, Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAI. 760B, 00/4-2753

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*



The ERN's endorsement of Rei's exile government had two implications. First, it caused a small fracturing within the Estonian diaspora within Sweden. All political parties associated with the ERN voted in favor of the exile government except the Liberal Party. This unnecessarily exasperated tensions within the ERN structure. Second, it reinforced Rei's insistence that his government was the only legitimate government-in-exile. Had Rei been unsuccessful in obtaining ERN's support, he might have been forced to reach some settlement with Maurer's supporters in Germany. As a result of ERN's support for the Rei Government, Maurer went ahead with appointing three cabinet members to his exile government: Ilmar Raamot as Minister of Agriculture, Nikolai Kütt as Minister of Trade, and Leonhard Vahter as Minister of Foreign Affairs. All three individuals resided in the United States, while Raamot and Kütt served as members of the Free Estonia Committee.<sup>59</sup>

The dispute between the two competing exile governments ultimately came to a conclusion when Maurer died in September 1954.<sup>60</sup> Throughout the 1950s, meetings of the Rei government were continuously held in Stockholm and their activities primarily consisted of issuing declarations condemning the Soviet occupation of the Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and attempted to assist in resolving technical matters between the Estonian exile community in Sweden and the Swedish government on things such as citizenship and passport issues.<sup>61</sup> The government-in-exile, however, never gained widespread support among the worldwide Estonian community. The manner in which Rei consolidated his power within the ERN, coupled with his social democratic background and living in a country that had a contentious policy towards the Baltic States served to marginalize the exile government even further.

---

<sup>59</sup> Fund Memo on Kütt and Raamot. "Folder: E801.4 Consultative Panel" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII.

<sup>60</sup> Made, 135.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

Maurer's death and the dissolution of the Augustdorf government-in-exile did not assuage the concerns of Estonians who did not recognize the ERN's authority over the Estonian diaspora. The debate quickly shifted to the Estonian National Committee that had been established in the United States to organize Estonian political efforts in North America. During the ENC's October 1954 meeting, Kaiv was asked to address the Committee's body and directly addressed the issue of the exile government, which was on the organization's agenda.

Kaiv backtracked from his earlier position that an exile government would be useful in maintaining the legal continuity of the Estonian government and made an argument that fit perfectly with the American attitude towards the idea of an Estonian exile government. He stated:

In order that the acts of an exile government be valid in a foreign country, it is necessary that the exile government be recognized by that country. According to international practices, the exile government must also have permission to function from the country where it is staying.

The Government of the United States does not recognize now any exile government, and I do not see any reason to assume that they would make an exemption in regard to Estonia... The Same position has been taken also by other countries. Notes of an unrecognized government or its ministers are not accepted by foreign governments, which means that an Estonian government without recognition cannot officially function even in the field of foreign affairs.<sup>62</sup>

Kaiv made the point that the hopes had been placed on the exile government to provide a sense of unity among Estonian exiles and guide the activities of the many Estonian organizations that had been created to advance the cause of Estonian freedom. This, however, would only have occurred if "we [the Estonians] had a harmoniously chosen government."<sup>63</sup>

As there had been allegations made by some prominent Estonians, such as Rei, that the diplomatic corps did not support the establishment of an exile government, Kaiv stressed

---

<sup>62</sup> Kaiv Speech on 30 October 1954. "Folder: E801 General Political Affairs - External" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

that continuing assistance to establish a government-in-exile would only do damage to the unique diplomatic situation that the Baltic exiles had at their disposal – the continued recognition of diplomatic representatives in certain countries in the free world. He stated that the United States, along with other countries, accepted the appointed diplomatic representatives from the Päts government and only the Päts government. As a result, if there were to be any changes to the government that the United States recognized, i.e. an exile government based in Sweden, the legitimacy of the diplomatic representatives would be completely undermined. Estonians would then have an exiled government with little legitimacy and an exiled diplomatic corps with little legitimacy.

As has been pointed out, American policy officials were not excited about the prospect of an Estonian exile government coming into existence. State Department officials were concerned with maintaining legitimacy behind the non-recognition policy and working towards reconciliation within the Estonian diaspora. The government-in-exile was ultimately a threat to both of these positions. The continued push by leading political exiles for the establishment of a government-in-exile did not foster reconciliation, but represented a wedge issue within the communities. At the same time, there were fears that a government-in-exile would attempt to establish official diplomatic representation with individual nations, which would not only exacerbate tensions within the community, but undermine the non-recognition policy's legitimacy.

#### *The Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania and the Lithuanian Diplomats*

Of the three Baltic nationalities, the Lithuanian diaspora was in many ways the most organized. The ALT had been established in the United States dating back to the World War II period and had close contacts to influential Americans and the backing of the large historical Lithuanian community in the United States to back it. The Lithuanians had more

legations that not only worked in Washington and London, but also Paris, the Vatican, and Montevideo, with other consular offices throughout North America, Latin America, and Europe.<sup>64</sup> The Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania (VLIK) was by far the most prominent Lithuanian organization in Europe and owed much of its perceived strength to its legitimacy as maintaining many of the political structures from the interwar period in place.

Although many other smaller organizations represented different cultural and political ideologies within the broader Lithuanian community, the relative size of the major players in Lithuanian exile politics created a situation where it would be possible for a coherent and unified diaspora to come into existence. Indeed, American policymakers had constant and regular contacts with all three major Lithuanian factions during the 1940s and 1950s. The possible benefits of having three powerful blocs within the Lithuanian diaspora, however, allowed for the possibility that the development of factions could have a very negative long-term impact on unity within the diaspora.

The Red Army's westward advance filled the void that was created by the retreating Germany Army during 1944. The VLIK felt it was imperative to maintain and preserve its own organization, so the leaders in Lithuania forwarded written authorization to Monsignor Mykolas Krupavičius, attorney Rapolas Skipitis, and diplomat Vaclovas Sidzikauskas to reconstitute the VLIK in Berlin during October 1944.<sup>65</sup> When the Red Army forces began to approach Berlin, the VLIK moved to Würzburg, which was soon brought under the American military occupation forces.<sup>66</sup>

While working at Würzburg, the VLIK's agenda had three main initiatives. The first was to establish lines of communication with the Lithuanian diplomatic corps around the

---

<sup>64</sup> Juozas Audenas, *Twenty Years' Struggle for Freedom of Lithuania* (New York: ELTA), 76.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 69.

world and the American occupation forces. The hope of quickly establishing dialogue with the two groups that were seen as most important to the liberation of Lithuania was to make it clear that the VLIK was the only political Lithuanian representative body in exile.<sup>67</sup> Second, was to provide assistance to the 60,000 to 70,000 Lithuanian refugees who had fled to Germany. On one hand, the VLIK tried to make it clear to the occupation forces that Lithuanians were not to be repatriated, due to the position that western governments had towards the Soviet annexation. On the other hand, there were short-term practical things needed, such as obtaining material and medical assistance. To facilitate this, the VLIK reestablished the board of the Lithuanian Red Cross.<sup>68</sup> Third, the VLIK began an aggressive memorandum issuing campaign to try to get Lithuania discussed at postwar conferences.<sup>69</sup>

The VLIK's role was not strictly limited to political fighting for the restoration of Lithuanian independence and caring for Lithuanian refugees in Western Europe. An important component of the VLIK's mandate was to provide material support and intelligence to Lithuanian partisans in the Soviet Union. It is in this context that American intelligence officials first made contact with the VLIK's leadership. From 1945-1947, the United States sponsored covert paramilitary operations into the Soviet Union and the VLIK played an important role. In exchange for financial support, the VLIK offered the Americans intelligence from within the Soviet Union, access to partisans who could engage in paramilitary operations, and a pool of recruits who could be utilized for future covert operations. Although it is difficult to ascertain the exact amount of funds that the VLIK received from the OSS and eventually the CIA due to document declassification, State

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 70.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>69</sup> The first major postwar event was the Potsdam Conference. The VLIK wanted to exploit the event, but realized the difficulties it would face since the Soviet Union was going to be an active participant. On 10 July 1945, a memoranda was sent to the Americans and the British asking that the West assume the "guardianship of the Lithuanian independence until the sovereignty of Lithuania could be restored," but received nothing but tacit, symbolic support.

Department documents that deal with the VLIK do allude to the fact that the VLIK had “American friends” throughout the organization’s existence.<sup>70</sup>

The VLIK expanded its contacts with Americans beyond the intelligence community by making a “goodwill mission” to the United States from January to May 1949.<sup>71</sup> Krupavičius and Sidzikauskas traveled to the most important locations in North America for the fight for Lithuanian independence, being Washington, Chicago, Ottawa, and other important cities such as Cleveland. The two sought to establish closer contacts with important foreign policy makers in the United States, exchange ideas with Žadeikis, discuss how the broader Lithuanian community in the United States could help towards the liberation of their homeland, and to give the American people a first-hand account of what had been taking place in the Baltic region since 1940.

The ALT arranged an itinerary for Krupavičius and Sidzikauskas to visit important Lithuanian communities throughout North America. Commemorating the thirty-first anniversary of Lithuanian independence, a joint ALT-VLIK fundraiser took place in Chicago on 16 February 1949, which marked the point where a close connection between the majority of American Lithuanians and the exiles based in Europe came into being.<sup>72</sup> Sidzikauskas also visited Ottawa where he was introduced to the leaders of the Lithuanian community in Canada, discussed with recent Lithuanian immigrants their experiences, and made contacts with the Canadian foreign ministry.

The VLIK delegation’s most important task, however, was to make contacts with American policymakers and gain their support in establishing close relations with Žadeikis and the ALT. Krupavičius and Sidzikauskas, accompanied by the Lithuanian minister in Washington held an informal dinner on 31 January with Salter of the State Department’s

---

<sup>70</sup> On 20 May 1949, Krupavičius and Sidzikauskas while meeting with American policymakers stated that they had been successful in securing aid from certain “special services.” State Department officials noted in a commentary on the conversation that this was presumably a CIA contact.

<sup>71</sup> Audenas, 81.

<sup>72</sup> Audenas 82.

Baltic Desk.<sup>73</sup> In addition to submitting the usual *pro forma* memoranda to the State Department on VLIK's activities and the situation in Lithuania, the delegation was successful in making a good impression on the Americans.<sup>74</sup> While discussing policy towards the Soviet Union, Sidzikauskas stated that "the work of his Committee was closely followed by Lithuanians at home and abroad and that he wished to be able to reassure his people that the United States was going to continue to stand with Lithuania." As this clearly referenced the continuation of the non-recognition policy, Salter replied that there was no thought of changing American policy towards Lithuania and that the thoughts of the American people were with Lithuania.<sup>75</sup>

Subsequent meetings over the next several months with State Department officials dealt with more substantive issues. Like most exile groups, the VLIK viewed the State Department as was one of many different sources of funding. On 20 May 1949, Sidzikauskas inquired if it would be possible to have access to frozen Lithuanian assets in the United States to continue their work. Sidzikauskas reminded Salter that VLIK had earned the support of most Lithuanians in the free world and represented the political structure of interwar Lithuania more than any other Lithuanian exile organization.<sup>76</sup> The State Department's response was exactly the same as it was to similar requests from Baltic exile groups – the funds were to be used exclusively for the continuation of the existing diplomatic missions and not used on the endeavors of various exile groups.

Before leaving to return to Europe, Sidzikauskas also asked whether the State Department viewed it as advisable to relocate the VLIK's headquarters as sovereignty was

---

<sup>73</sup> Salter and Žadeikis Memo 31 January 1949, Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAI. 860M.00/1-3149.

<sup>74</sup> Salter described Krupavičius as a "strong and striking character who does not speak English, but knows French, English, Polish and German." Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAI. *See* 860M.00/1-3149.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup> Memorandum of Conversation: Johnson, Thompson, Sidzikauskas, and Krupavičius on 20 May 1949 Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAI. 860M.00/5-2049.

slowly being restored to Germany.<sup>77</sup> There was a great deal of consternation within the Lithuanian community living in Germany that once the United States began to end its occupation of Germany the Soviet Union might invade these territories. Johnson responded, stating that “if the Committee wished to move from Germany, it would nonetheless be well to remain as near at hand as possible to the bulk of the Lithuanian people. The Americans suspected that Sidzikauskas hoped that the State Department would make an explicit offer to assist the VLIK to move their headquarters from Germany to the United States. The first of two main rationales for such an interpretation was that the Lithuanians genuinely feared staying in Europe and moving the VLIK would expedite even more immigration to the United States. The second rationale was that the VLIK was attempting to consolidate its position among free Lithuanians and the United States had been the historical center of the Lithuanian diaspora.<sup>78</sup>

There were two major problems with the State Department agreeing to move VLIK to the United States. First, the VLIK continued to play an important role for the American intelligence community by providing information transmitted by Lithuanian partisans and serving as a medium for supplying partisans through the use of American covert efforts. Any attempt to move VLIK away from relatively close proximity of the Soviet Union would undermine these efforts. Second, the State Department and other pertinent branches of the American government had already created close and reliable contacts to American Lithuanian organizations, such as the ALT that did not have all of the baggage associated with exile organizations, since it had largely been constituted by American citizens of Lithuanian descent. Although the ALT and the VLIK cooperated in a number of areas during the three-month trip, there were two potential problems. Closer collaboration between the ALT and the

---

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>78</sup> There were 1 million Lithuanians residing in the United States with an additional 30,000 set to immigrate to Canada or the United States, compared to the 70,000 that were residing in Germany.



VLIK could mean that the ALT would become more deeply involved in émigré politics to the detriment of the organization being a reliable anti-communist group of American citizens.

There was also the possibility that members of the VLIK would attempt to usurp power from the ALT within the United States and create a situation of friction where there had once been relatively close cooperation among all Lithuanians living in the United States.

In addition to the decision to create the VLIK Executive Council and who would make up the nucleus of the Lithuanian delegation to a peace treaty, the other important issue that leading Lithuanian exiles took up at the July 1946 conference in Bern, Switzerland was how to delineate responsibilities between the VLIK and the exiled diplomats.<sup>79</sup> The two groups had worked as closely as possible during the war years on issues concerning the political status of Lithuania. As it became clear, however, that significant external pressure would be required for Lithuania to regain its independence after World War II, the overlap between what the exiled diplomats were pursuing in the countries where they resided and what the VLIK was trying to accomplish in Europe became more pronounced. Such issues were related to resettling displaced persons in the West and insuring that Western governments did not change their attitude towards the non-recognition policy. Such overlapping activities often raised problems of delegating tasks, assuming competencies, and coordinating efforts.

During the 1946 Bern Conference, Stasys Lozoraitis, Chief of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service, was invited to negotiate incorporating the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service into the VLIK's Executive Council. Krupavičius made the point that Lozoraitis would take charge of the new organization's foreign affairs.<sup>80</sup> The VLIK's goal of making such an arrangement was to elevate the organization's status to essentially an exiled Lithuanian government, without necessarily using that name. By incorporating the diplomats into the

---

<sup>79</sup> Audenas, 76.

<sup>80</sup> Audenas, 77.

Executive Council's hierarchy and establishing a quasi-parliamentary institution, which would have the responsibility of appointing members to the Executive Council, VLIK would no longer be merely the most important Lithuanian exile organization, but would essentially serve as a reconstitution of independent Lithuanian political life in the West.

The VLIK's leadership went forward and established the Executive Council at Bern. Lozoraitis refused to ratify the agreement between VLIK and the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service on the grounds that the diplomats owed their recognition by the governments that they were assigned to based on the appointments made by the Smetona government, so that any change in this relationship would be to the detriment to the continued recognition of Lithuanian diplomats. The subordination of the diplomats to the VLIK would be the exact type of situation where Lozoraitis would feel his position was threatened.<sup>81</sup> Nevertheless, Lozoraitis stressed that he would continue to work with VLIK on issues that were important to Lithuania's liberation.

Throughout the next several years a cold peace between the VLIK and the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service permitted these two powerful elements of the Lithuanian diaspora to work together on a number of issues. In August 1947, Lozoraitis and the VLIK's Executive Council met in Paris to reconfirm political and diplomatic activities that were seen as important for Lithuania's liberation, such as information and propaganda campaigns and fundraising.<sup>82</sup> Most importantly, the question of where the Lithuanian DPs should be settled was discussed in Paris. By 1947, significant immigration to the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and various Latin American countries had already begun to take place. Both the VLIK and the Diplomatic Service were concerned that Lithuanian refugees would be scattered in myriad countries throughout the world and it would then be virtually impossible to reconstitute the Lithuanian nation once the homeland became liberated. The conference

---

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

<sup>82</sup> Audenas, 77.

decided that it was important to make every effort to promote immigration to countries that had old and well-established Lithuanian communities, namely the United States. As a result, there was an active campaign of making contacts with various Lithuanian-American organizations, such as the ALT, the United Lithuanian Relief Fund, as well as directly lobbying the American officials to change the quota system.<sup>83</sup> In addition, every effort was undertaken to funnel Lithuanian immigration to countries where Lithuanians already resided.

The cold peace between the VLIK and Lozoraitis became a growing point of contention within the Lithuanian diaspora. As a result, by 1951 it became clear that some sort of a working agreement between the two groups would have to be reached. On 25 June 1951, Lozoraitis contacted the VLIK Executive Council proposing that the two groups meet to discuss the prospects of increasing the participation of all Lithuanians around the world who were working towards the liberation of Lithuania.<sup>84</sup> The VLIK Executive Council accepted the invitation and on 4 September 1951, the head of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service and members of the VLIK Executive Council met in Reutlingen, Germany to negotiate a framework for cooperation.<sup>85</sup> By 13 September, an agreement was reached that would offer a broad framework for cooperation between the two groups and would preserve both groups' autonomy.

The framework broadly defined the structure of Lithuanian exiled activity towards the liberation of the country. The idea that individual diplomats would report their activities and file disputes with Lozoraitis and that any subordinate VLIK officers would report their activities and file their disputes with the VLIK Executive Council was reiterated by both parties. More important, however, was that the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service and VLIK put

---

<sup>83</sup> Audenas, 78.

<sup>84</sup> Lozoraitis to J. Norkaitis, 25 June 1951 "Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>85</sup> VLIK Analysis in Paris Embassy, 6 September 1951 "Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

in place a structure where there would be joint sessions to consider all major political and diplomatic activity affecting Lithuania. In addition, a special separate body was to be created to coordinate connections with Soviet Lithuania seen as especially important once the time was right for aggressive liberation activities. Finally, both parties agreed that the VLIK Executive Council and the Diplomats would exert as much influence as necessary on various groups or prominent individuals within the Lithuanian diaspora to make sure that there would be no inconsistent messages sent to Western governments, polities, or to the homeland.<sup>86</sup>

The structure of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service meant that once Lozoraitis signed the Reutlingen Agreement it would go to into effect on the side of the diplomats. This, however, was not the case with the VLIK Executive Council. During the Executive Council's plenary meeting following the Reutlingen conference a vote was held on a motion to accept the Reutlingen Agreement. Surprisingly, the motion was rejected by a vote of five for, and five against.<sup>87</sup> The vote exposed a growing point of contention within the VLIK Executive Council. On one hand, there were exiles strongly associated with Krupavičius who had wanted to maintain the status quo within the VLIK. On the other hand, there were those that were hoping to reorganize VLIK to better represent the current situation of Lithuania in the international system and the composition of the Lithuanian diaspora. The vote fell along lines that were tied to personal allegiance within the Lithuanian diaspora in addition to religious and political affiliations.

Over the following year, there were calls for more meetings between the Diplomatic Service and the VLIK Executive Council to negotiate some sort of a renewed agreement between the two factions. In June 1952, a meeting among prominent Lithuanian diplomats

---

<sup>86</sup> Agreement Reached between J. Norkaitis, Kaminskas, and Stasys Lozoraitis in Reutlingen, on 13 September 1951., "Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>87</sup> Embassy in Paris to State Department 3 March 1952, "Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

was arranged where it was decided that Lozoraitis should maintain his present position towards the VLIK and prevent the diplomatic corps from becoming a subordinate to the Executive Council and that Lozoraitis should meet with VLIK officials at a meeting in Paris later in the summer. In July, Lozoraitis met with J. Kaminskas again to discuss some sort of way that the VLIK and the diplomatic corps could cooperate. Virtually nothing new was agreed upon and only a press release was issued that stated:

Negotiations took place in Paris from 21-24 July 1952 between VLIK and the Diplomats. Matters concerning cooperation were considered. It was agreed to accept the proposal of the diplomats that such cooperation shall be effected by consultations between the President of VLIK and the Diplomats. It was agreed that the calling of a general Lithuanian Conference was necessary. Such conference shall be called by the Chief of the Lithuanian Diplomats and VLIK jointly.<sup>88</sup>

Instead of fostering a greater sense of Lithuanian unity in exile, the initiative ushered a new period where growing recriminations within the diaspora became more and more vocal. While officially there were suppose to be continued negotiations between the diplomatic corps and the VLIK on issue such as organizing a greater Lithuanian conference, in reality, the very idea of having a greater Lithuanian conference in this political climate escalated the dispute between Lozoraitis and Krupavacius' camp in VLIK.

The ongoing dispute between the Lithuanian diplomats and the VLIK was a major blow to the tacit American policy of trying to foster solidarity among the Lithuanian community. In theory, it appeared that the United States would have at least a minimal amount of leverage with the most important components of the Lithuanian exile community. The continued policy of using blocked Lithuanian funds to finance the Lithuanian diplomatic mission in Washington; close contacts with the American Lithuanian Council; and covert funding of the VLIK all gave American policymakers with at least the tools to have a positive impact on affairs. Following the VLIK's rejection of the Reutlingen agreement, a senior State

---

<sup>88</sup> VLIK-LDS Press Release 24 July 1952. "Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

Department official in Munich, Wayzada invited senior Lithuanian diplomats and VLIK Executive Council members to have a dinner with him in Munich. During the dinner, Wayzada made a very pointed speech and said that “either you people get together and settle your differences, or else...” He allowed both the diplomats and VLIK members to make their cases, but implied that any further violations of the Reutlingen agreement would bring “drastic reprisals to the offending party.”<sup>89</sup>

Such “drastic reprisals,” however, were contingent upon American policymakers having the political will to bring about such actions and having proper information to base such decisions on. Unfortunately, the ability to gather good information was limited by two main factors. By 1951, the Lithuanian minister in Washington was in such poor health that he was unable to travel to important Lithuanian diplomatic conferences in Europe and when he did make appearances, his colleagues were shocked by his “poor condition.”<sup>90</sup> Additionally, the nature of the relationship between American intelligence officials and the VLIK and between the ALT and the rest of the Lithuanian community meant that the ability to guide events was minimal.

Due to Žadeikis’ poor health, obtaining useful and timely information about the most important problems that plagued cooperation among Lithuanians was difficult. According to available documents, the State Department ultimately relied upon information provided by the inventory clerk at the American Embassy in Paris, John Mazionis. From the mid-1920s until 1940, he worked as a clerk at the American consulate in Kaunas and was able to escape to Sweden with the help of American diplomatic officials when the United States closed its Baltic legations during the fall of 1940. During World War II, Mazionis worked as a clerk at

---

<sup>89</sup> Conversation between Zilinskas and State Department 18 September 1951, “Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>90</sup> See Memo from Paris to Walworth Barbour in Washington, 29 July 1952. “Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

the Embassy in Stockholm where he dealt with peripheral political and liaison matters. He eventually obtained his American citizenship, began his career as a Foreign Service Specialist and was assigned to Paris.

The willingness of the State Department to work towards the consolidation of Lithuanian exile activities was always subjugated to its ability to maintain the legitimacy of the non-recognition policy through the continued existence of a Lithuanian mission in Washington. As a result, in the State Department's dealing with the VLIK-Lozoraitis feud, more deference had to be paid to Lozoraitis since he was the head of the Lithuanian diplomatic corps. The State Department's ability, however, was also limited by the quality and type of information that they received from various Lithuanian stakeholders.

While Mazionis provided the State Department with invaluable information pertaining to Lithuanian exile activities in Europe, the information he gave was filtered by his own political opinions toward the VLIK and other exile groups. For example, on 23 September 1952 Mazionis forwarded to Washington the opinion of a competing Lithuanian organization based in London, the Lithuanian Resistance Service, on the current situation within the Lithuanian liberation movement. Necessarily, the opinion criticized the attitude that the VLIK had about the liberation of Lithuania. Mazionis argued, "Lithuanian exiles take it for granted that when they return to Lithuania they will automatically be the leaders of the nation... and that although they constitute about 3% of the whole nation, they assume they are the national and administrative potential of the whole nation." He continued that Lithuanians in the Soviet Union are not "ignorant of the intrigues and fratricidal political battled being waged between the exile political parties... while the real enemy, communists, is overlooked." He closed by stating that the exiles now only have two main purposes. First,

they must attract the public opinion in the free world to Lithuania's cause. Second, they must conserve Lithuanian ideals and the Lithuanian "spirit."<sup>91</sup>

Earlier in 1952 as the LRS became an increasingly important source of information for Mazionis; the American policymakers began making inquiries about the origin and politics of the organization. It was believed that the LRS dated back to September 1950, was based out of the United Kingdom and had a similar relationship with British intelligence services that VLIK had with their American counterparts.<sup>92</sup> While the critique that Mazionis and his LRS interlocutors might have been apt, it provided little assistance for Americans trying to determine a way of mediating the Lithuanian exile political landscape since the two main groups that the Americans had to deal with were the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service lead by Lozoraitis and the VLIK lead by Krupavičius.

While the American Embassies in Europe were highly critical of VLIK in the ongoing dispute, policymakers in Washington were obtaining contradictory information from their contacts in the ALT. On 16 January 1952, Allan of the Baltic Desk met with the leadership of the ALT, Šimutis and Grigaitis, as well as Mary Kizis of the Lithuanian American Information center for a lunch that was created "for the purpose of establishing closer liaison for the mutual benefit of the Lithuanian American Community and the State Department." The lunch lasted over two hours and discussed a number of urgent issues that the ALT happened to be working on for 1952.

Allan took the opportunity to ask what the ALT position happened to be concerning the ongoing dispute between Lozoraitis and the VLIK. All three Lithuanians unreservedly supported VLIK and condemned Lozoraitis. They described Lozoraitis as a "narrow-minded,

---

<sup>91</sup> Mazionis to State Department, 15 January 1953 "Folder: Li800.1 Underground" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>92</sup> EM Kretsmann to Kolarek 8 May 1952, "Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.



pigheaded, and ambitious fascist.” While they acknowledged that Lozoraitis might have been able to make himself to the more reasonable of the disputants, he was the main cause of disunity among Lithuanians.<sup>93</sup> Allan prodded further asking why this was the case, Grigaitis stated “that dictator, Smetona, met with Lozoraitis in Switzerland following the Soviet occupation and gave Lozoraitis a document stating that Lozoraitis was to be Smetona’s successor and that over the last two years Lozoraitis has made himself obnoxious by brandishing this document in the face of the Lithuanian emigration.” Šimutis then stated that the VLIK is working “industriously” towards unity and liberation of Lithuania and that the VLIK has the support of at least 75% of all Lithuanians and 90% of all Lithuanian Americans.<sup>94</sup> The ALT’s opinion of Lozoraitis was also reflected in the Lithuanian language press in the United States. Publications such as *Draugas*, *Darmininkas*, *Teviske*, and *Ziburiai* all labeled Lozoraitis as a “fascist,” “undemocratic,” and a “dictator.”<sup>95</sup>

Responding to these accusations, Lozoraitis argued that he had always been a democrat and that the independent Lithuanian government, before the Soviet occupation, appointed him as chief of Lithuanian diplomacy should Lithuania be occupied by a foreign power.<sup>96</sup> Indeed, when it came to diplomatic succession, Great Britain and the United States recognized Lozoraitis as the chief of Lithuanian diplomacy and that in the context of international politics in the 1950s, Lozoraitis was democratic in nature.

Despite the widespread acknowledgement that the United States was going to deal with Lozoraitis due to the preeminent position of the diplomats in American policy towards

---

<sup>93</sup> 1952 Opinion of ALT on Various Issues. “Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>94</sup> 16 January 1952 Opinion of ALT on Various Issues. “Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>95</sup> Embassy in Paris to State Department 3 March 1952 “Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*

Lithuania, throughout 1952 and 1953, the conflict among Lithuanians only intensified. While Lithuanians in the United States strongly supported VLIK and accused Lozoraitis of being the tool of a dictator, accusations escalated to a feverish pitch after the breakdown of a meeting among the LRS, diplomats and VLIK in Paris and Rome in early 1953. VLIK made allegations that the Lithuanian Resistance Service was actually an NKVD operation. Further allegations were made that they were merely tools of British intelligence. In addition, Lozoraitis was attacked as being too pro-British and not giving Lithuanian interests top priority. Additionally, American Lithuanians withdrew from participating in a worldwide Lithuanian conference that should have taken place in the United States under the pretenses that they were busy with their own conference in Chicago that October.<sup>97</sup>

By 1954, the Lithuanian exile diaspora was in a state of complete disarray. A coalition between the most prominent Lithuanian Americans and the VLIK had been forged through a growing reliance by the VLIK on ALT remittances. A feud between the Lithuanian exiled diplomats and the VLIK had reached the point where there was no possibility of cooperation among Lithuanians residing in Europe, only the prospect of a huge rift in the United States should a change in the diplomatic representation in Washington be necessary.

On 7 May 1954, Žadeikis met with Vedeler and Johnson at the State Department to inform him that Krupavičius and Zalkauskas were going to be making a trip to the United States. Žadeikis was not entirely certain why the leading VLIK officials were traveling to the United States, but expected that the visit would be concerned with either funding, recognition as an exiled government, or other matters such as radio broadcasts.<sup>98</sup> Zalkauskas was ultimately unable to travel due to ill health, so Krupavičius traveled alone to the Washington

---

<sup>97</sup> Inter-Lithuanian relations Memo Embassy in Paris to State Department, 19 October 1953 "Folder: Li800.2 Peripheral Information of Internal Affairs" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII.

<sup>98</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Žadeikis, Vedeler and Johnson on 7 May 1954 "Folder: B801 General Political Affairs External" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII.

and other important American cities from June through August.<sup>99</sup> The meetings that Krupavičius and his delegation had with State Department officials marked how the United States Government attempted to negotiate the separation between the domestic pressure that was placed on them by the ALT and the international problem that they found themselves in while trying to deal with the Lithuanian exiles.

On 17 June, Krupavičius met with Merchant, Thurston, and Vedeler at the State Department where he thanked them for continuing the non-recognition policy and, specifically, the work of Eisenhower and Dulles on behalf of the Baltic countries. The two main issues that Krupavičius wanted to negotiate, however, were firstly if the United States would recognize the VLIK as the official body for conducting the struggle to win freedom for Lithuania and secondly if the State Department could fund VLIK's future activities. While he argued that VLIK represented all of the various elements of Lithuanian society and that it had worked successfully in the past with the diplomats, Merchant stated that the United States could not offer any semblance of recognition. The United States "conducted diplomatic business with the Lithuanian diplomatic representatives here and we work closely with Žadeikis." However, the VLIK should be sure that the United States would morally support any private organization that continued the struggle against international communism. On the issue of funding, Merchant said that blocked funds were exclusively to be used for diplomatic efforts and not on private organizations. Krupavičius made the point that the funds would be used to improve VLIK's information services that surely would be important from the American perspective. Merchant retorted that USIA would be the body to deal with that was subject to Congressional authorization.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> Audenas, 83. In January 1953, the State Department's Policy Planning Staff asked the question whether the Department should recognize united organizations as governments in exile, more specifically, would the State Department recognize VLIK. See B801. Policy Questions, January 1953.

<sup>100</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Krupavičius, Merchant, Thurston, and Vedeler on 17 June 1954. Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 760D.0/6-1754.

What took place that day was a complete abdication by the United States from coping with the growing fragments within the broader Lithuanian diaspora. From 1954 onwards, American policy as it related to the Lithuanian diaspora was to deal with the ALT and to deal with the Lithuanian diplomats. The most important reason for American support for VLIK from the very beginning was to serve as intermediaries between partisans in Lithuania and American officials in the West. If the organization had been able to serve as a unifying factor among the Lithuanian diaspora this would have been an added benefit. By 1954, however, it was clear that the partisan effort in Lithuania was no longer effective against Soviet forces. Moreover, the age of VLIK members and the disputes with the diplomatic corps during the early 1950s diminished their effectiveness in unifying the diaspora.

In addition, it did not help that by 1955 VLIK had become a security risk for the United States. On 7 June 1955, a prominent Lithuanian in the Free Europe Press in Munich went to the Consulate stating the he needed to contact a “Certain friend” in Frankfurt urgently.<sup>101</sup> Rastinis stated that at a meeting in Paris on 5 June, President of the Lithuanian Community, Eduardas Turauskas, told him that Lithuanian intellectuals in Paris had been receiving Soviet publications urging them to return home to Lithuania. Upon inspection, it was determined that the mailing list had been obtained from VLIK. Rastinis stated that “until VLIK and its leadership are properly organized (and this can be done with proper prompting from the appropriate US agencies) I fear that the days of VLIK’s usefulness to them is rapidly coming to an end.”<sup>102</sup>

Indeed, similar criticism came from within American Lithuanian circles the same month when it was argued that VLIK has been reduced to a collection of “has-been politicians” who had been successful in creating discontent and antagonism among the

---

<sup>101</sup> Merrill to Jacob Beam, 7 June 1955 “Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*

Lithuanian public and that it was impossible to understand why the United States had tolerated them for so long. The paper argued that once two American officials applied a minor amount of squeeze, the conversation immediately turns to “consolidation and unity.” Constant pressure and supervision could bring about a change in personnel, more efficient work, and a smaller security risk than was presently the case.<sup>103</sup>

*Expansion of Baltic Diplomatic Missions Abroad: The Bonn Debate*

By 1950 two important questions arose – whether or not the United States would support the expansion of Baltic diplomatic missions elsewhere in the world and whether or not the United States would permit frozen Baltic assets to fund missions outside the western hemisphere. From the perspective of the Baltic diplomats, the rationale for expanding Baltic diplomatic missions was crystal-clear. New Baltic diplomatic missions were vital to attend to the needs of Baltic nationals who were in the process of settling in new countries. Official diplomatic recognition from an increasing number of nations also gave the Baltic diplomats even greater ammunition to discredit the Soviet Union and to enhance their own legitimacy among their own communities.

American policy concerns about expanding Baltic diplomatic missions were necessarily more opaque and complicated. Fundamental questions involved who would fund the missions and what would funding the missions through blocked funds mean for the longevity of American policy? Would the United States aggressively push sovereign nations to change their attitude towards the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States? Finally, what sort of advantages were likely for American foreign policy through promoting the expansion of Baltic diplomatic missions? The American decision making priority for signing off on the expansion of Baltic diplomatic missions was based on whether or not it would harm the US-

---

<sup>103</sup> Document on VLIK Reforms, 17 June 1955 “Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

based non-recognition policy; whether or not it would harm relations with allies; whether or not it would cause undue damage to the ability of the United States to negotiate with the Soviet Union at critical junctures.

Over the next several years, the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian diplomats pursued a policy of trying to open more diplomatic missions in any country that would accept them. While the Americans were sympathetic to their cause, there were many policy traps and demographic trends that proved to be potentially problematic. The balance between the sustainability of the existing missions and the desire to open new missions was of paramount importance. The balance between American ideals behind supporting new missions and the policy prerogatives of bilateral relations also had to be negotiated. Finally, and not to be understated, was the fact that as the years wore on, an inherent paradox developed between the desire and/or necessity to open new missions and the fact that the diplomats who were qualified to oversee such missions were aging.

After Kaiv's initial discussion about the expansion of Estonian missions to other countries beyond where they had been in 1950, it became a major Estonian policy goal throughout 1951. Kaiv had been in contact with August Torma in London about what would be important locations for Estonian missions to be established. Ultimately it was decided that the two locations that were of highest priority for the Estonians were in West Germany and France. This proposal was based on the knowledge that diplomats could only be accredited to countries that were willing to accept them and that the French and German governments "had shown increasing interest for the Baltic cause," which they argued "boded well for the establishment of official missions."<sup>104</sup> Negotiations to create new missions, however, were not just between the two most senior Estonian diplomats, but also other important voices in the Estonian diaspora – namely August Rei in Stockholm, as well as the State Department.

---

<sup>104</sup> 31 October 1951, Memorandum of Conversation between Johnson and Kaiv on 31 October 1951 "Folder: E701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

Due to the personal problems between Rei and Kaiv, Torma played the role of interlocutor between New York City and Stockholm. When Kaiv met with Allan in Washington on 19 December 1951, he stated that Torma had been in contact with Rei over the situation of who should be accredited to Bonn and Paris. Rei agreed that the problem was difficult, but in order to avoid embarrassment within the broader diaspora Rei would not question the diplomats' authority so long as the person appointed was acceptable to the ERN.<sup>105</sup> Before discussions between Kaiv and Torma commenced, Rei had been making his own list of potential Estonians who could be sent to Paris and Bonn. Kaiv was astonished by Rei's willingness to cooperate on this particular issue. It is important, however, to stress that with Rei creating his own list of potential nominees the potential existed for a serious crisis over establishing new diplomatic missions.

When Kaiv began seriously discussing this issue during his meetings in Washington throughout late 1951, the Americans had two primary concerns. First, how much would new diplomatic missions financially cost the existing legations. Second, what would the debate over new diplomatic missions do to discourse and cooperation within the Estonian diaspora. During the 30 October 1951 meeting that Kaiv had with Johnson about the idea of expanding Selter's role in Germany, Johnson explained that the Department was interested in this development principally because it would inherently pose the problem of increasing the Estonian consulate's annual budget.<sup>106</sup> The secondary question was whether or not other important components of the Estonian exile community had been properly consulted about Bonn and Paris.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> Memorandum of Conversation Allan and Kaiv on 19 December 1951 "Folder: E701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>106</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Johnson and Kaiv on 31 October 1951 "Folder: E701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

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

The initial discussion among the Estonians about who should be accredited to Paris was whether the post should go to Aleksander Warma who was an ally in Stockholm, or Karl Ast, who had been more closely associated with Kaiv. Johnson asked Kaiv what his opinion was on this particular debate. Kaiv responded that Warma would be an excellent candidate for an Estonian legation in Paris, but due to the financial concerns, he would have preferred Ast to be appointed; the latter was already on the Estonian diplomatic payroll while Warma had no official connections with the exiled Estonian diplomatic missions.<sup>108</sup> Johnson continued the discussion by asking whether or not it he was privy to Rei's thinking that Ast would be an appropriate candidate to represent Estonia in Paris. The question, Kaiv noted, was in "the determination of the appropriate Estonian persons or group that had authority to establish the missions."<sup>109</sup> Unlike the Lithuanians, there was no hierarchical structure to the Estonian diplomatic corps once the annexation had taken place in 1940.

The Americans were concerned with the problem of who would have authority to name new diplomats and open new missions and if this would be a source of contention among Estonians. Johnson argued that the State Department would probably have to undertake serious deliberations over approving Paris and Bonn if the selection process were to be disapproved of by a majority, or even a substantial part, of the Estonian community. He continued by stating "the Department hoped the Estonian emigration would approach this problem in a spirit of unity which would indicate clearly that the emigration approved of the manner in which the missions were established."<sup>110</sup> While Johnson emphasized that whether or not the Estonians would act in a unifying way on this issue was purely an internal matter, there was a thinly-veiled ultimatum that the State Department would be reluctant to approve

---

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>109</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Johnson and Kaiv on 31 October 1951 "Folder: E701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*



expenditures for the contemplated missions unless the Estonians demonstrated at least a nominal amount of unity, which was desired by the State Department.

After the October meeting with Kaiv, Vedeler contacted Harrison at the Embassy in Paris to the effect that it seemed in the interest of the United States to allow the Estonians to work towards establishing missions in Bonn and Paris.<sup>111</sup> In the correspondence, he provided some context behind the main American concerns about the intra-Estonian politics involved in this issue. He pointed out that from information that had been gathered from Estonian and American sources the ERN had been losing its standing among Estonian exiles in favor of VEKO. Taking into consideration Vedeler's view that Kaiv did not have any great standing with ERN or VEKO, Kaiv would likely oppose any sort of diplomatic moves unless he had a significant personal part in the effort."<sup>112</sup>

Kaiv's outspoken assistant, Kaarel Pusta Sr. entered the discussion on Estonian diplomatic representation in Paris and Bonn when he accompanied Kaiv to the State Department to have a meeting with Allan and Vedeler on 12 December 1951. Before Pusta was assigned as the First Secretary of the Estonian consulate in New York, he had spent eighteen years in France in various official and unofficial capacities. As a result, he had accumulated a significant number of contacts in the French Foreign Office and he continued to maintain those contacts. According to Pusta, the French in 1951 were willing to resume relations with the Estonians on a limited scale and they would like to see Pusta be the representative to France.<sup>113</sup> Vedeler continued by asking who would have the appropriate

---

<sup>111</sup> Vedeler to Harrison 23 October 1951 "Folder: E701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.* Vedeler went into a long narrative about the fact that to the best knowledge of American officials who deal with Baltic affairs that the last free Estonian government had not granted any residual power or extraordinary diplomatic powers to any official or group. Vedeler also lamented about "this problem would be greatly simplified by the unification of the emigration, and this could serve to promote such unification.

<sup>113</sup> Memorandum of Conversation Kaiv, Pusta, Vedeler, and Allan on 14 December 1951 "Folder: Estonia 1502." Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

authority in the Estonian diplomatic corps to open missions in Bonn and Paris. Pusta argued that it would just be easiest for either himself or another high-ranking Estonian to travel to Europe and that the question of appropriate authority “might be avoided by an unpublicized *fait accompli*.”<sup>114</sup>

On the question of whether or not Pusta Sr. would be willing to be the Estonian diplomatic representative in Paris, he stated that he would not be willing to leave the United States permanently since the United States is the most important country in the world from the perspective of Estonia. That said, he did say that Estonia could extend its representation and increase the protection of its citizens visits to the region on a part-time basis. He could see that he or someone else could spend several months in a year representing Estonia in Paris, Bonn, Rome, and possibly Madrid.<sup>115</sup>

The first few months of 1952 were dominated by debates among Estonians about who would have the legal accreditation authority and between the Americans and the Estonians about the cost that the new legations would incur. Initially, the prevailing opinion was that since neither Kaiv, Torma, Rei, ERN, or VEKO had clear legal authority, than all Estonians would approach the topic in a spirit of unity and collaboration. By April, Kaiv informed the Department that both he and Torma felt that they could not assume responsibility for proposing a mission in Paris without consulting Rei and Maurer in Sweden and Germany.<sup>116</sup> Vedeler recapitulated on the notion that the Department would not approve the expenditure of funds from the extremely limited Estonian account “unless the Estonian emigration exhibited

---

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>116</sup> Memorandum of Conversation Kaiv and Vedeler on 3 April 1952 “Folder: E701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

real unity to the matter.”<sup>117</sup> At this point Kaiv stated that the Estonians were going to move forward with a plan to appoint Pusta Sr. as the Estonian representative to Paris.<sup>118</sup>

Due to ongoing problems in the Estonian diaspora over the establishment of a government-in-exile, the diplomatic representation issue was placed on the shelf until on 4 February 1953, Pusta Sr. met with Vedeler and Allan where he expressed his interest in obtaining approval from the State Department of opening a permanent Estonian mission in Paris and Madrid with a permanent seat for himself to be located at Madrid.<sup>119</sup> Although the Estonian Minister to France and Spain had traditionally resided in Paris, the Estonians felt that French sensitivities from the Soviet Union might not favor the establishment of an official permanent mission in the French capital. On the other hand, Pusta Sr. stated that Spain was willing to grant full *de facto* and *de jure* recognition to Estonia.<sup>120</sup>

The State Department had hoped to finished negotiations with the Estonians on the issue of Paris and Madrid that February, but there were two lingering issues that Kaiv assumed responsibility for fixing. First, when his office was putting together the 1954 budget, he viewed the \$16,200 per annum for Pusta Sr. to be excessive and unlikely to be approved by the State Department.<sup>121</sup> Second, Kaiv indicated that he did not believe any diplomatic move of this type should be undertaken without the informal acceptance of the two Estonian governments-in-exile. The State Department had hoped to finish negotiations with Kaiv over the budgetary situation associated with sending Pusta Sr. to Europe, but while the Estonian

---

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>118</sup> Kaiv indicated that Rei was agreeable to the designation of Pusta as Estonian representative in Paris.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.* At this meeting is when Pusta Sr. informed Vedeler that he was offered a position in the Rei Government, but that he had refused.

<sup>121</sup> Memorandum of Johnson to the Files 29 March 1954 “Folder: E701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

consulate was drafting their annual budget the sum of \$16,200 per year was deemed excessive.<sup>122</sup>

Vedeler called Kaiv on 24 September 1953 asking why he had yet to submit a memorandum on plans for Pusta's trip to Europe. Kaiv stated that a settlement had been reached with Pusta and that a payment had been made to him from the 1953 budget. Additionally, he stated that the French and Spanish governments had been approached to obtain some sort of an agreement for them to receive Pusta Sr.<sup>123</sup> Before this call, however, Pusta met with Merchant and Dillon on 1 September 1953 to state that an agreement had been reached where he, would receive an additional \$6000 personally and that the new total of \$14,000 would be used to fund the missions to Paris and Madrid.<sup>124</sup> Pusta commented that he hoped that the State Department would urge the French government to grant the Estonian full recognition rather than the semi-official status that Pusta had at that point. On 2 November 1953, the Spanish Foreign Minister Alberto M. Artajo received Pusta and confirmed his December 1952 declaration that the Spanish government, though unable to grant Pusta Sr. full diplomatic status, was willing to consider a formula of "Minister Plenipotentiary, in charge of the Protection of Estonian Interests in Madrid."<sup>125</sup>

While the issue of accrediting Baltic (or Estonian) diplomats to France and other West European countries such as Spain largely hinged on the political situation within the diasporas and the financial limitations that faced each exiled diplomatic corps, the special situation that the Bonn government found themselves in during the early Cold War years

---

<sup>122</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Pusta and Vedeler on 21 April 1953 "Folder: E701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>123</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Kaiv and Vedeler on 24 September 1953, "Folder: E701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>124</sup> Memorandum of Conversation on 29 March 1954 "Folder: E701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 4, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*

meant that American-West German relations and the Soviet position on the German question were critically important in determining whether it would be feasible for the Baltic exiled diplomatic corps to establish a working relationship with the West German government. This is one area where there existed a significant difference in perspective between the American State Department and the Baltic diplomatic corps.

Throughout 1951, all three Baltic diplomats in Washington asked the State Department if it would be possible for them to pursue the option of opening missions in West Germany. From the perspective of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian diplomats, a presence in Bonn would not only send a powerful symbolic message to the international community, namely that the aggression inflicted upon them by the Soviet Union would not be recognized by the country with the most precarious situation in Europe, but was of immense practical importance due to the relatively large number of refugees who still resided in Germany and who were unsure whether or not the Federal Republic would be considered their temporary home until it was possible to return home.

After the Estonians had approached the Baltic Desk with the idea in early 1951, the Latvians and Lithuanians made similar overtures. On 6 November 1951, the Latvian chargé Feldmans met with Allan and Johnson about the possibility of a Latvian diplomat being placed in Bonn. When the American officials asked what the official Latvian position was on the matter, Feldmans was reticent stating that they had not taken any definite policy position on the matter. He stated that the Latvians would prefer a full-fledged mission in Bonn, but realized that the West German government would make the ultimate decision and intimated that the Latvians would be more than willing to accept some sort of consular representation rather than a fully accredited diplomat if it meant having some position there.<sup>126</sup> By early

---

<sup>126</sup>Memorandum of Conversation: Johnson, Allan, and Feldmans on 6 November 1951. Folder: La701a. Representation at Paris and Bonn, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 6, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. Johnson asked Feldmans whether Zariņš' extraordinary powers were broad enough to provide authority for establishing a mission in Bonn and

1952, the Lithuanians also began making their moves in Bonn. Žadeikis met with Allan on 14 January and stated that Lozoraitis, chief of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service, was in Bonn to discuss with the West Germans about their willingness to accept a Lithuanian diplomat.<sup>127</sup>

The issue of pursuing Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian legations in Bonn became one of the pressing issues for the State Department's Baltic Desk in 1951 and 1952.<sup>128</sup>

Throughout 1951 and 1952, the State Department's European desk contacted the French and West German foreign ministries about their attitudes about receiving Baltic diplomats in either an official or unofficial setting. While the Americans were more confident in allowing the Baltic representatives to negotiate directly with the French, the State Department was significantly more concerned about the implications that negotiations between the Bonn government and the Baltic diplomats might have on the relationship that Washington wanted with Bonn and how the Kremlin would perceive such negotiations.

Immediately following the Baltic desk's meeting with Kaiv on the question of Estonian representation in Bonn, the State Department sent enquiries to the German government explaining the American position towards the Baltic States and asked if Bonn would be willing to explain the West German government's policy on the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States was and if they were going to establish relations with the exiled diplomats. On 2 April 1951, the first letter dealing with this question was sent out, explicitly stating that "our interest in the matter is one of informing ourselves and that we did not wish to influence

---

whether or not there would be any major disturbances among the Latvians over selection of a diplomat to Bonn. Feldmans responded that Zariņš powers were broad enough to open a mission and that to his knowledge there were not any significant challenges within the diaspora over who would be appointed to Bonn.

<sup>127</sup> 14 January 1952, Memorandum of Conversation: Žadeikis and Allan, Folder: Li701a Representation at Paris and Bonn Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>128</sup> On 7 November 1951, Johnson wrote to Allan commenting on the four most important problems that had to be dealt with in the American policy towards the Baltic Desk and in the top four included the question of whether or not to establish Baltic legations at Bonn.

them [the West German government.]”<sup>129</sup> The Americans had wanted to contact the West Germans directly on this issue to insure that they were informed of the proper policy and not how the policy might be interpreted by the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians involved in the negotiations.

Dr. Hasse von Etsdorf, Deputy Chief of the Political Division of the West German Foreign Ministry contacted the American Embassy at Bonn on 11 February 1952 to discuss the complexities associated with the Baltic questions.<sup>130</sup> During the meeting between the First Secretary of the American embassy and von Etsdorf, the most important theme discussed what distinguished the American position towards the Baltic States and the attitude that the West German government had to take. This was the distinction between an act that “maintains the status quo” and an “affirmative act.” What the State Department had done in 1940 was to simply retain the names of the Baltic representatives that were on the list of accredited diplomats to the United States. The West German government did not have the same possibilities. Should the Federal Republic decide that it was in their interests to open diplomatic relations with the Baltic exiled diplomats it would require the establishment of new relations, not the continuation of existing ties.

Speaking personally, von Etsdorf acknowledged that such a relatively insignificant policy from a practical perspective was of small importance, but the official line of the West German government was that such an “affirmative action” could unnecessarily arouse the suspicion of the Soviet Union that West Germany was covertly (or overtly) sponsoring subversive activities within the Soviet territory. The West Germans were also concerned about arousing suspicions among the French. A strong West German policy towards the Baltic States was thought to reinforce French suspicions concerning the reliability of the

---

<sup>129</sup> State Department to West German Foreign Ministry, 2 April 1951 Folder: Baltic General. Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. Subsequent letters were sent out on 5 January 1952 and 11 February 1952.

<sup>130</sup> Disptach to State Department from HICOGG Bonn, 11 February 1952, Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAI. 760A.0162A/2-1152.

Federal Republic in promoting West European stability. He stated that the “present was no time to aggravate French anxieties.”<sup>131</sup> The First Secretary of the Embassy understood the West German concerns, thanked him for the information and forwarded it to the State Department.<sup>132</sup> Over the course of the next several months, the West German Foreign Ministry began the process of informing the Baltic diplomats who had been in Bonn that the Germans would be unwilling to extend full diplomatic representation to their nations.<sup>133</sup>

On 22 June and 3 August 1952, Pusta Sr. wrote to Vedeler, informing him that the West German government was not willing to offer the Estonians a full-fledged mission in Bonn and urged that the State Department intervene and “induce them [the West Germans] to establish formal diplomatic relations with the three Baltic States.”<sup>134</sup> After having worked with Pusta Sr. for a number of years in official capacities, Baltic Desk officers acted under the assumption that this would not be the last time that the State Department would hear from him about the problems that the Estonians were encountering in Bonn. As a result, American policymakers used the opportunity to craft their own official policy towards Baltic diplomatic representation in Bonn.

Quite simply, the State Department decided that the cost of pushing the West Germans to accept Baltic diplomats would outweigh any benefits for the Baltic communities or the United States from a matter of policy. The United States had two main policy points they would develop on the question.

---

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.* The major thing that needed to be addressed during this time was the idea of the CSCE and Schuman plan that were in the early stages of being implemented.

<sup>132</sup> Disptach to State Department from HICOGG Bonn, 11 February 1952, Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAII. 760A.0162A/2-1152.

<sup>133</sup> For a detailed study of the West German Policy towards the Baltic States during the Cold War see: Kristina Spohr Readman “West Germany and the Baltic Question during the Cold War” in Hiden, et. al. *The Baltic Question During the Cold War*, 100-133.

<sup>134</sup> Pusta Sr. To Vedeler on 22 June 1952 and 3 August 1952 Folder: Baltic General. Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII. Subsequent letters were sent out on 5 January 1952 and 11 February 1952.



First, the United States truly did not wish to influence the West Germans. It was argued that if American policymakers raised the subject with the German authorities there might be unnecessarily “ripples of apprehension and perhaps action or reaction far out of proportion to the subject at hand.”<sup>135</sup> There was a great concern that some German politicians or other European officials might interpret such pressure as a precursor to a major shift in American policy towards other European countries. Second, since the American position vis-à-vis the Baltic States is rather clear and unequivocal, the Americans would gain very little for us by attempting to force allied governments to parallel their policies. The only gains that the Americans would gain were largely in propaganda policies, while the losses could be substantial through the potential loss of solidarity among the allies. It was even argued that from the perspective of the Baltic, the establishment of fully accredited missions would serve no substantial value or purpose for the Baltic States and that the only thing they might gain would be greater goodwill.<sup>136</sup>

Lithuanian diplomatic representation to West Germany became a proxy battlefield in the ongoing conflict between the VLIK and Lozoraitis. During early 1952 while Lozoraitis was in Bonn establishing contacts with the West German Foreign Ministry, the VLIK had designated one of their own members, Sakalauskas, to represent the Lithuanian Republic at Bonn.<sup>137</sup> Although the German Foreign Office had indicated that it would prefer to deal with an accredited Lithuanian diplomat, such as Lozoraitis, and not someone from a private organization such as the VLIK, the VLIK felt that they were in an advantageous position vis-à-vis Lozoraitis since the organization was based in West Germany and could somehow drive

---

<sup>135</sup> Allan to Dillon on Baltic Policy 11 August 1952 Folder: Baltic General. Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.* Specific to the Estonians, Allan recommended that the State Department should emphasize that they lacked a previously established recognized authority that could appoint formal diplomatic representatives to new posts and that they were low on funding.

<sup>137</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Žadeikis and Vedeler on 3 April 1952, Folder: Li701a Representation at Paris and Bonn Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

the narrative in their favor on the domestic front. Essentially VLIK felt that if they pushed the West German Foreign Ministry hard enough on the issue, it would become a *fait accompli*.

Over the course of the next year, the issue of representation at Bonn would be one of the major sticking points preventing any sort of rapprochement between the VLIK and the Lithuanian diplomats. During the Rome meeting between VLIK and LDS, the Executive Council insisted that if there was going to be one diplomatic representative from Lithuania to Bonn that it would have to be agreed upon jointly between the VLIK and Lozoraitis. Lozoraitis refused this sort of arrangement since in his opinion, and in the opinion of Lithuanian jurists who supported him, the sole power of appointing diplomatic representatives belonged to the Chief of the Lithuanian diplomatic corps and was not something that could be negotiated with an organization such as VLIK. Although the latter had a great deal of political continuity with the Lithuanian republic it only had the *de facto* standing of a private organization.<sup>138</sup>

On 1 September 1953, the VLIK issued Lozoraitis with an ultimatum to the effect that unless the agreement over diplomatic representation in Bonn was agreed upon within a short period of time, the VLIK would continue to move forward with their own nominee to lobby the Federal Republic for the official representative to be appointed by VLIK and not Lozoraitis.<sup>139</sup> The primary rationale for the VLIK wanting to have a say in appointing a diplomatic representative in Bonn was to undermine Lozoraitis' position within the Lithuanian community and to consolidate all Lithuanian exile activities under the VLIK. In

---

<sup>138</sup> Rome Meeting, 1953 Folder: Li701a Representation at Paris and Bonn Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>139</sup> 19 October 1953, Paris Embassy to State Department on 19 October 1953, Folder: Li800.2 Peripheral Information of Internal Affairs, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL. Subsequent letters were sent out on 5 January 1952 and 11 February 1952. Mozionis and his contacts within the Lithuanian Resistance Service was one of the main sources of this information. They referred to the VLIK's action as "Warfare Against Lozoraitis."

essence, this gets back to the point of the VLIK wanting to function as the official Lithuanian government-in-exile without necessarily giving life to that particular label.

By the end of 1953, two Lithuanian diplomatic representatives were vying for the attention of the Bonn Government. Lozoraitis had appointed Gerutis on behalf of the Lithuanian diplomatic corps and Krupavičius had appointed Karvelis on behalf of the VLIK. Like the Latvian and the Estonian overtures to the West German foreign ministry, both Gerutis and Karvelis were informed by the von Etsdorf that the country would not be willing to extend diplomatic relations to either Lithuanian representative. They were informed that the internationally accredited diplomats such as Lozoraitis were free to visit Bonn from time to time to discuss issue such as consular services for refugees and other refugee welfare matters, while non-diplomatic leaders, such as members of the VLIK were free to contact the foreign ministry to discuss things concerning the status of Lithuanians residing in the Federal Republic.<sup>140</sup>

Neither Karvelis nor Gerutis, however, accepted this arrangement. The feud between the VLIK and the Diplomatic corps necessarily meant that the two sides would only escalate their pressure on the West German foreign ministry. During the spring of 1954, Karvelis contacted Otto Brautigen, Chief of the Eastern Division of the German Foreign Ministry and reinforced his case for wanting to establish a Lithuanian legation in Bonn. Brautigen reiterated the West German position by stating that it did not want to enter into a formal relationship with the Lithuanians since it “must hold itself free for the eventual establishment of relations with the Soviet Union.”<sup>141</sup> In a last ditch effort; Karvelis requested the ability to open a consulate in lieu of a full diplomatic mission in Bonn.

---

<sup>140</sup> State to Bonn 3 June 1954, Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAII. 760A.0162A/6-354.

<sup>141</sup> Memorandum of Conversation Karvelis and Brautigen. Folder: Li701.2 Diplomatic Representation, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 9, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII. Subsequent letters were sent out on 5 January 1952 and 11 February 1952.

Upon hearing that Karvelis had made additional overtures to the Foreign Ministry, Lozoraitis made two quick decisions. First, he contacted Gerutis and said that he needed to move to Bonn immediately so that he might be readily available to the West German government and to prevent Karvelis from being the only prominent Lithuanian residing in Bonn. Second, he called Brautigen on 27 July and remonstrated against Karvelis' efforts to obtain diplomatic representation by making the point that the VLIK was not an official organ of the Lithuanian government and that only Lozoraitis had the authority to establish or terminate diplomatic relations. In an attempt to alleviate the growing tensions between the two Lithuanian factions and the awkward position that it was placing the German foreign ministry in, Brautigen asked Lozoraitis whether he would be willing to nominate Karvelis as the official representative nominee to Bonn. Lozoraitis emphatically rejected this claim.<sup>142</sup>

Senior policymakers in Washington were slowly becoming aware of the Lithuanian situation in Bonn throughout July 1954 and asked the American Embassy in Bonn to send a report on what was transpiring and what sort of policy implications that this might have. At the same time, Brautigen made contact with the American Embassy to discuss what should be done with the demarche between the two Lithuanian factions. The Embassy's response on 28 July to the State Department's request included the questions that Brautigen wished to have addressed by the Americans.<sup>143</sup>

During the conversation between Brautigen and the Embassy's First Secretary, he intimated that he had almost decided that no change would be made to German policy on the Baltic question. He continued by saying that he had not yet replied to Karvelis' request for a consulate, but that he was glad that Lozoraitis had made contact at that time since he could

---

<sup>142</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Lozoraitis and Brautigen. Folder: Li701.2 Diplomatic Representation, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 9, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. Subsequent letters were sent out on 5 January 1952 and 11 February 1952.

<sup>143</sup> US Embassy Bonn to State on 28 July 1954 Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 760A.0162A/7-3054.

exploit the Lithuanian disagreement as a means of not negotiating any further with Karvelis.<sup>144</sup> In closing, he said that if the United States government wished to recommend a particular policy the Foreign Ministry might wish to be guided. The First Secretary stated that it had been the continued American policy not to urge any course of action, but only to understand what was the present German policy towards the Baltic States.<sup>145</sup>

Not to be undeterred by the rebukes received by the German Foreign Ministry, Karvelis went to visit the United States High Commissioner's office in Germany to discuss whether or not the United States would support the idea of VLIK having a consular agent in Bonn. He stated that he had contacted the Chairman of the West German Foreign Affairs Committee, Gerstenmaier, about the idea and wanted American support to push the "idea over the top."<sup>146</sup> The American diplomat stated that he would convey the information to the Commissioner himself and the State Department, but that there would be no guarantees. The diplomat forwarded the encounter that he had with Karvelis to the High Commissioner as well as the State Department.

On 31 August, the European Desk of the State Department sent their policy prescription to Bonn about how they should handle the Karvelis affair. He was supposed to be summoned to the American Consulate in Munich and told that the American government does not consider it appropriate to support or to oppose the petition to establish a consulate in the Federal Republic on behalf of VLIK.<sup>147</sup> The policy also included that it should be made clear that the State Department has always considered the VLIK to be a private organization consisting of Lithuanian exiles and not a Lithuanian government in exile. As a result of this point and the fact that the United States Government had never recognized the Soviet

---

<sup>144</sup> Memorandum of Conversation Brautigen and First Secretary of the US Embassy in Bonn. Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 760A.0162A/7-3054.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>146</sup> Memorandum of Conversation on 24 June 1954 Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 760A.0162A/7-3045.

<sup>147</sup> State to Bonn on 31 August 1954 Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 760A.0162A/8-3154.

annexation of the Baltic States, the State Department would continue to recognize accredited diplomats such as Lozoraitis and Žadeikis and provide deference to the diplomats' selection of Gerutis as representative to Bonn.<sup>148</sup>

Karvelis was eventually summoned to the American Consulate in Stuttgart where the message from Washington was given. Karvelis' response was that in reality the idea was not just a VLIK power play against Lozoraitis, but was a joint proposal put together by the Baltic Council in Reutlingen.<sup>149</sup> The Consul's response was that this made no real difference since it had been American policy to deal with organizations, whether VLIK or the Baltic Council as private organizations; that the Americans had never encouraged them to expect recognition as "governments in exile" and that only a government-in-exile would have the authority to pursue diplomatic relations with another country.

When summarizing the events that transpired in the summer of 1954 with the Lithuanian representation in Bonn, the State Department made it clear that, "rather than make policy recommendations which the Federal Republic is not prepared to follow, it is preferable for this Government to see it proceed on its present course, if less favorable to Lithuanian interests than US policy, is still marked by sympathy for the cause of freedom and the welfare of Baltic émigrés in West Germany."<sup>150</sup>

The dispute demonstrated that there was an inherent conflict between the policy goals of the Lithuanian exiles and the American government. The Lithuanian exiles sought diplomatic representation not only to enhance the status of the Lithuanian nation in the eyes of the international community and to assist Lithuanian refugees who might need consular assistant, but also to consolidate their own position within the broader Lithuanian community. The Americans, however, were never willing to put the interests of the Lithuanian exiles

---

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>149</sup> Dispatch to Washington from Munich on 15 October 1954, Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 760A.01262A/10-1554.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*

above the interests of the United States. When it came to negotiating with an important ally, the State Department was more than willing to intervene and undermine a particular policy prerogative of the Lithuanians. Even in 1954 the American belief was that Lithuanian independence could only be secured through solidarity in the free world with the United States and not by the actions by a handful of aging exiled diplomats.

American policymakers were forced to choose between two policies that were deemed to be contradictory. The relationship with the Federal Republic and the Federal Republic's political situation in Europe was too fragile for the United States to play a particularly strong hand one way or another when it came to the question of Baltic diplomatic missions. During the debate, it became evident that the United States Government was interested in the "maintenance of the greatest possible unity among the Baltic exile groups and the closest possible collaboration between the Baltic diplomatic representatives and the Baltic émigré organizations."<sup>151</sup> The United States had an opportunity to leverage the Lithuanian exiles to come to some settlement on who would speak for the Lithuanians in Bonn, but chose not to since the bilateral German relationship was significantly more important.

Reflecting on the issue during a meeting between the CIA and the State Department, American officials determined that VLIK and Karvelis acted irresponsibly and partly out of spite towards Lozoraitis. They determined that both Lozoraitis and VLIK held each other responsible for the breakdown of negotiations between the two groups, but that Karvelis and VLIK went well beyond what was expected of them by VLIK supporters throughout the broader Lithuanian community and that this reflected their own ambitions and irresponsibility. They continued by stating that there is no question within the Lithuanian emigration of Lozoraitis' authority on diplomatic issues and that it was hoped that the VLIK in the future

---

<sup>151</sup> State to Bonn on 31 August 1954, Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 760A.0162A/8-3154.

would function more as a “panel of elder statesmen” to provide leadership and moral authority in the struggle to preserve the national identity of Lithuania both inside and outside the present area of Soviet control. They also hoped that the VLIK might be encouraged to desist from any further purpose of seeking recognition as a “government in exile” and from competing with the Diplomatic corps and Vedeler, on behalf of the State Department, “would do whatever we could to encourage diplomatic representatives to cooperate with the VLIK.”<sup>152</sup>

### Conclusion

The primacy that Baltic exiles residing in Europe placed on political continuity through the establishment of exile governments and engaging in intra-émigré political struggles demonstrates the disparity between the goals of the American policymakers and those of the exiles. While both groups attempted to create the correct environment to combat Soviet influence, the most important concern for both parties was pursuing their own interests, which proved to be inherently rife with tension.

For the Americans, anything that could question the legitimacy of the non-recognition policy was seen as inimical. For the Baltic exiles, anything that could enhance their political legitimacy while in exile was viewed as essential to the wellbeing of exiles in the hopes of being able to return home at some point in the future. While the continued recognition of diplomats in the United States had been a point of convergence between the two, interests outside of the United States diverged rapidly. The Americans decided that the best way to foster cooperation among the exile groups was to assume a minimalist attitude. The Baltic Consultative Panels were supposed to be offer a sufficient avenue for cooperation.

Unfortunately, the Americans underestimated the willingness of the exiles to engage in infighting. Quite simply, the Americans offered enough policy guidance for exile groups to

---

<sup>152</sup> Undated CIA Memo on Baltic Affairs Folder: B90.2 Policy Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.



make the State Department and other agencies complicit, but not enough policy guidance to have a positive long-term impact.

American officials had the opportunity to reach out to Estonian organizations based in Sweden in either an official or unofficial manner. As early as 1949, there was the question of whether or not the ERN should receive support from either the blocked Estonian funds that were used to continue the diplomatic missions. One of Rei's reasons for traveling to Oslo throughout 1951 was potentially to build contacts with American military or civilian officials who happened to be in the country.<sup>153</sup> Although the United States maintained that they did not create policies that would favor one faction within a particular diaspora, the very existence of the National Committee for a Free Europe meant that a handful of powerful exiles received salaries in return for their assistance from the American government. When Rei returned to Stockholm from Oslo, one method of trying to earn legitimacy for the exile government was to make thinly veiled claims that they acted upon the suggestion of "very powerful friends whose names cannot be revealed."<sup>154</sup> Who these "very powerful friends" might be is not revealed in any contemporary documents, but it is logical to assume that Rei was referring to either American or British intelligence organizations.

The American Embassy in Stockholm was the natural source of information for the State Department concerning Estonian activities in Sweden, so avoiding complete reliance on their interlocutors among Estonians living in the United States. While Embassy officials were successful in gaining credible information about what the Estonians were attempting to pursue in Sweden, they were less successful in persuading Estonians to streamline their efforts within the larger American foreign policy structures. In many instances, diplomats

---

<sup>153</sup> Paris to State on 27 September 1951, Folder: E701 Diplomatic Representation, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>154</sup> Martin to Allan on 26 March 1953 Folder: E701 Diplomatic Representation, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

were not informed of what other American operations in Europe were trying to pursue with other exile groups. Embassy officials very often were limited to holding conversations with their informants while unable to offer material assistance. Frustrated after the establishment of the Rei government over an “illicit weekend” in Oslo, one such American official, commented in frustration: “At any rate, we have listened to what they [Estonians] have to say and taken the opportunity for the 5,350<sup>th</sup> time to suggest that they stop fighting each other and proclaim universal sweetness and light.”<sup>155</sup>

Frustration, however, was reciprocal. Many parts of the Estonian diaspora were equally frustrated with the lack of support that the Americans provided to the establishment of a viable, unified Estonian government-in-exile. A significant number of prominent Estonians, as well as most émigrés, failed to understand why the United States would see the establishment of a government-in-exile as a problem in the fight towards the liberation of Estonia from the Soviet Union. An encounter between an American Senior Information Officer in Frankfurt and an Estonian émigré temporarily living in Bad Nauheim in late summer 1954 is representative of the attitude that many Estonians had towards the exile government and the American attitude towards it.

On 24 September 1954, James M. MacFarland and Willard Allan held a series of conversations with this Estonian, who was at the sanitarium to improve his health, on the state of affairs within the Estonian diaspora. The Estonian stated that the “most characteristic feeling in the Estonian emigration is one of boredom and active antipathy with regard to émigré politics.”<sup>156</sup> He continued by acknowledging that “everyone agrees that the idea of having two Estonian émigré governments is stupid and that people just can’t be bothered with

---

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>156</sup> Memorandum of Conversation on 28 September 1954 “Folder E801 General Political Affairs External” Folder: E701 Diplomatic Representation, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

politics anymore.”<sup>157</sup> His criticism, however, was not just limited to intra-Estonian politics. When asked about the average Estonian attitude towards the Americans, he stated that Estonian “no longer have confidence in the sincerity of the opposition to communism by Western European nations. While these nations treat the émigrés as pariahs, they are beginning to come to terms with world enemy number one [the Soviet Union]; in so doing they are betraying more than 100 million Europeans.”<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*

## CHAPTER IV

### CONTAINMENT AND CONTACTS: PURSUING PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE AND PROPAGANDA

On 20 May 1949, prominent Lithuanian exiles and members of the VLIK, Vaclovas Sidzikauskas and his travel companion Mykolas Krupavičius met with American diplomat Jack Hickerson at the State Department before returning to Europe after a several month tour of the United States. While the point of the trip was to establish connections with the broader Lithuanian American community and with important centers of American political power, Sidzikauskas' meeting with Hickerson focused on specific policy plans that the United States might put in place eventually to help liberate Lithuania. The most striking policy initiative was Sidzikauskas' question as to whether or not the United States would be willing to start to Voice of America (VOA) broadcasts in the Lithuanian language.

Sidzikauskas hoped that Hickerson might be able to influence the International Broadcasting Division (IBD) of the State Department to commence Lithuanian language broadcasts. Unlike the Estonians and the Latvians, the Lithuanians were better equipped to continue contacts between exiled politicians and their Soviet occupied homeland. Nevertheless, the long-term prospects of continuing regular contacts with the Lithuanian underground were diminishing as the years had gone by. Sidzikauskas expressed hope that broadcasts by VOA might start as they "would greatly bolster their morale," but a more self-serving interest for Sidzikauskas and other Baltic exiles was that American sponsored radio broadcasts could be a useful tool to maintain contacts with their homeland, and as a result, maintain their political usefulness once liberation occurred. Hickerson replied, "I agree that such broadcasts would be most helpful to the morale of the Lithuanian people, but that matter

was complicated due to jamming and limited funds for VOA. In view of the fact that so many Lithuanians speak a second language, they could listen to other VOA broadcasts.”<sup>1</sup>

Although Sidzikauskas did not continue to press the issue at that particular juncture, throughout 1949 prominent Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, led by the exiled diplomats in Washington and New York City hoped that the United States would start broadcasting in the Baltic languages. Little did they know, but American policymakers in Washington were in the process of augmenting official VOA broadcasts with unofficial radio broadcasts sponsored by the FEC. The FEC’s initial plans were rather modest. Exiled leaders were to have access to a microphone and given free rein to speak to their countrymen.<sup>2</sup> These broadcasting plans eventually become known as Radio Free Europe (RFE).

The expansion of American sponsored radio broadcasts into the Soviet bloc beyond VOA broadcasts is proof that propaganda and the establishment of strong public diplomacy were becoming more and more important to policymakers in the late 1940s. A situation developed where there were mutual interests between American foreign policymakers seeking to utilize Eastern European exiles for radio broadcasts and the Eastern European exiles who sought American broadcasting wavelengths to establish new virtual contacts with their homelands behind the Iron Curtain. The fundamental questions, however, were whether or not the United States would be willing to begin Estonian, Latvian, or Lithuanian language broadcasts over the official VOA or the clandestine RFE and whether or not the Baltic refugees would be willing to participate in such broadcasts.

This chapter will examine three areas of potential cooperation and conflict between American policymakers and Baltic refugees over public diplomatic radio broadcasting from 1949-1956. First, the debate between VOA and RFE, which dominated discussions between

---

<sup>1</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Johnson, Thompson, and VLIK Delegation on 20 May 1949. Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAI. 860M.00/5-2049.

<sup>2</sup> Arch Puddington, *Broadcasting Freedom*, 17.

policymakers and Baltic diplomats as well as various organizations, affected virtually every aspect of relations between the State Department and exiles. A fundamental misunderstanding about the symbolic implications of the VOA – RFE debate drove a wedge between various Baltic leaders and their American counterparts. Second, intra-diasporic politics, where radio officials were caught between pursuing an official policy and managing disputes between exiles, took its toll on managing the expectations of all Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. Finally, the staffing of radio desks, where a countless number of qualified refugees sought employment for a small and finite number of positions, exacerbated intra-diasporic politics surrounding radio broadcasts.

The chapter will also examine the content that the United States broadcast to the Baltic republics and the limited feedback that policymakers received from refugee organizations as well as traditional intelligence matters. I will argue that while American policymakers and Baltic refugees were ultimately successful in portraying a positive image of the West and of Baltic émigré policy to the Baltic republics, the Baltic exiles placed too much importance on symbolism while the American policymakers were trying to manage a policy that was becoming increasingly paradoxical. The juxtaposition between attainable and unattainable, I will demonstrate, became more pronounced as the State Department tried to place greater constraints on the exile broadcasts.

First, however, it is important to understand the forces that shaped American foreign policy during the early years of the Cold War and led policymakers to embrace aggressive propaganda and public diplomatic efforts against the Soviet Union. It is also important to understand the basic rationale of Baltic exiles for participating in the American sponsored programs. In a period where the United States had the perception that it was falling behind the Soviet Union in “winning the peace” after World War II and where the Soviet Union was aggressively targeting American efforts through propaganda, it became increasingly clear that

the status quo was becoming inimical to the American postwar effort. The same international tensions that created this feeling for the Americans also impacted. Would they be able to return at some point or were they going to be in a perpetual state of exile? The idea of radio broadcasts in the Baltic languages were born out of the mutual interests between exiles and the State Department

### *Containing the Soviet Union and the Desire to Maintain Contacts*

Although there is much historiographical debate over the extent to which George F. Kennan supported the aggressive liberation of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, a program of aggressive psychological and ideological warfare was an important component to containment.<sup>3</sup> A crucial implementation of containment involved the acceleration of “fissiparous tendencies within the international communist movement” and within the Soviet bloc.<sup>4</sup> This demanded that the United States do what it could to create a string of complications for the Soviet Union within their own sphere rather than expanding their influence elsewhere. Early efforts at public diplomacy were thought to keep the peoples of the Soviet bloc restive and as a result, the Kremlin would be obliged to maintain stability in their own backyard.<sup>5</sup>

Within the context of NSC 20/4 in 1948, propaganda and psychological warfare activities around the world and specifically directed at the Soviet Union and its satellite countries became a major component of American foreign policy throughout the late 1940s and 1950s.<sup>6</sup> An aggressive psychological warfare campaign was thought to cause

---

<sup>3</sup> See Chapter Two

<sup>4</sup> Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 42-43.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* It is important to keep in mind that the primary means of containment during the Truman Administration was through economic development and establishing political strength in Europe and Asia.

<sup>6</sup> See Chapter 2 for reference on NSC 20/4.

complications within the Soviet bloc that would focus the attention of the Kremlin on internal matters rather than international expansion.<sup>7</sup>

In broad terms, every American radio broadcast during the Cold War should be seen in the context of engaging directly with the Soviet Union. The unofficial broadcasts of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty offered American policymakers a layer of plausible deniability through being seen as private organizations rather than officially sanctioned. It was through RFE and RL that the United States was able to engage in potentially controversial and hard-hitting propaganda against the Soviet Union.<sup>8</sup> Even though the Voice of America (VOA) sought to maintain its credibility as the official broadcasting arm of the United States Government through reporting the news “fairly and honestly,” it did have bold ambitions in its broadcasts against the Soviet Union.<sup>9</sup> The VOA “sought to capitalize on every vulnerability of the Soviet thought control system, emphasizing the benevolence of the United States and the possibility of alternatives to the Soviet Way and quite simply delivering ‘accurate information.’”<sup>10</sup>

The success of these propaganda and psychological warfare activities, however, hinged on the ability of the United States to coopt individuals who had the linguistic skills to broadcast in Eastern European languages, including Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian while also possessing a minimal amount of potential credibility with the hypothetical listener behind the Iron Curtain. Although the idea for building relations with postwar refugees from Eastern Europe to combat the Soviet Union came from Frank Wisner’s tour of displaced persons’ camps in the fall of 1947, the real relationship between the American government and refugees was not one where the United States had a difficult time coopting refugees, but

---

<sup>7</sup> Puddington, 8.

<sup>8</sup> Nicholas J. Cull, *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945-1989* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 63.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*



that the refugees had a difficult time earning the patronage of the United States.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, Eastern European refugees of all nationalities actively sought to participate in American propaganda campaigns against the Soviet Union.

There were two main reasons why the refugees were more than willing to cooperate with American policymakers. First, there existed an economic rationale. Many leading exiles from the Baltic republics suffered a significant drop in their standard of living after having to flee from their homeland. They had at one time been important politicians, academics, and entrepreneurs. Upon entering exile, they were forced to abandon many of life's luxuries. While the salaries associated with American psychological operations were modest, such positions were actively sought due to their prestige and relative security compared to other means of earning a living in the United States. Perhaps more importantly, however, many leading exiles still considered themselves as viable leaders in their home countries after they had become liberated from the Soviet Union.

Perhaps the only way that the exiles would be able to maintain some level of legitimacy with their homeland through a foreign occupation that had already existed for nearly a decade was if they were able to reestablish some level of communication with their fellow citizens behind the Iron Curtain. Although some exile organizations had nominal contacts with partisan movements in the Baltic republics, it was very difficult to get information into or out of the Baltic republics. As a result, there was excitement among exile communities upon discovering that radio broadcasts in their native languages that would be transmitted from the West – either by the FEC through RFE or the State Department via VOA. Such broadcasts would be a way for the exiles to reestablish regular contact with their homelands in order to let their compatriots know that the exiles were engaged in the struggle to liberate Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania from the Soviet Union.

---

<sup>11</sup> See W. Scott Lucas, *Freedom's War: The U.S. Crusade Against the Soviet Union, 1945-1956*, 61.

Quite naturally, Baltic exiles had a greater level of enthusiasm for participating in RFE broadcasts compared to VOA broadcasts. Whether or not an individual realized that the RFE was an American sponsored activity, it was widely accepted that the RFE was a station where East Europeans residing in the free world were communicating directly to those in the Soviet bloc with no interference from outsiders. Going forward, there were mutual interests between Baltic exiles and American officials in the area of psychological warfare against the Soviet Union. State Department officials believed that radio broadcasts could be an important tool in containing and possibly subverting the Soviet Union. Baltic exiles believed that radio broadcasts would provide them with the necessary means to reestablish direct lines of communication with their homelands without being perceived as mere pawns in great power politics.

#### *The Voice of America and Radio Free Europe Debate*

Throughout 1950 and 1951 State Department officials and leading Baltic refugee figures were engaged in a vigorous discussion about the proper broadcasting avenue for the small Baltic languages. At the highest level, there was general agreement between the Americans and their Baltic counterparts that Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian language broadcasts were an important component of American policy towards the Baltic republics, but there were three main issues that proved contentious. First, American policy towards the Baltic republics, where officials felt that the non-recognition policy placed Baltic radio broadcasts in a separate category from other parts of the Soviet bloc. Second, funding, where the small size of the three Baltic republics relative to other Eastern European nationalities, meant that the United States had to make policy decisions based on efficient use of limited resources. Finally, symbolism, where a basic misunderstanding existed what radio broadcasts meant for the Baltic republics and their exiled compatriots.

An important component of Baltic refugee lobbying the FEC about the establishment of Baltic consultative panels was the implicit understanding that closer cooperation between Baltic exiles and the FEC would result in eventual radio broadcasts under RFE. The FEC and State Department's internal deliberations about formalizing a relationship with the Baltic exile community in January 1951 underscored the centrality of radio broadcasts in the project. Correspondences between the Baltic Desk and the PPS highlight that the core of FEC cooperation with Baltic exiles should be similar to FEC cooperation with other Eastern European exiles – that the cooperation should be centered on radio broadcasts that would occur in regular 15 minute intervals.<sup>12</sup>

Baltic organizations in the United States, along with the exiled diplomats, vigorously continued to push the FEC to establish Baltic radio desks when it was announced in May 1951 that Baltic consultative panels would be created. Although State Department and FEC officials sympathized with those that actively promoted RFE broadcasts to the Baltic republics, major policy concerns remained. Of primary importance was what would be the implications of RFE broadcasts for the policy of non-recognition? Additional questions included: What would the financial burden of Baltic broadcasts be? How would staff for the possible radio desks be assembled?

Parallel to the push for Baltic RFE broadcasts was an intense lobbying effort to begin Voice of America (VOA) broadcasts in the three Baltic languages. While RFE necessarily involved contacts between legitimate exiles and American interlocutors, the VOA was predominantly an American affair. Representative of the time period, the most organizationally strong and numerous Baltic nationality in the United States, the Lithuanians, took the lead in lobbying the State Department and the White House to begin VOA broadcasts. At the annual ALT meeting in New York City from 17-18 November 1950, the

---

<sup>12</sup> Vedeler to Joyce 25 April 1951, "Folder: B801.4 Consultative Panels, 1950-1954," Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. For more on the establishment of the Baltic Consultative Panels: See Chapter II.

Council passed three resolutions supporting the initiation of VOA broadcasts to Lithuania.<sup>13</sup> Vedeler responded to Grigaitis' submission of the resolutions by updating him on the current status of Lithuanian VOA broadcasts. He stated that he had been in New York the previous week discussing Lithuanian matters with USIA officials and confirmed that broadcasts should start in the middle of February 1951.<sup>14</sup>

Lithuanian pressure, however, was not exclusively reserved for the State Department or White House. Republican Representative from Pennsylvania, Daniel J. Flood had a number of prominent American Lithuanians among his constituencies. In addition, he also had established a working relationship with Žadeikis. While the debate over whether or not to begin VOA broadcasts continued, Flood kept Žadeikis informed on the current state of affairs. He wrote to Žadeikis on 28 March 1950, informing him that while the present priorities were being given to a series of broadcasts in the Asiatic languages, he should be assured that plans were still underway for the Baltic languages.<sup>15</sup>

Flood served on the House Appropriations Committee and was willing to use his influence over the State Department's annual budget to apply pressure on behalf of Baltic VOA broadcasts. During the Appropriations hearings for the 1951 State Department budget, Flood asked the State Department's representative, Kohler, a number of questions pertaining to Baltic broadcasts – particularly the importance of Lithuanian broadcasts. Flood asked: “With reference to your Baltic language programs of the VOA, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, your choice of course, as between the three, the one of superior importance is

---

<sup>13</sup> Pius Grigaitis, Executive Secretary of ALT to Fred K. Salter, Officer in Charge of Baltic Desk, State Department. 24 November 1950 “Folder: B891 VOA.” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 3, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. For more on the establishment of the Baltic Consulative Panels: See Chapter II.

<sup>14</sup> Harold C. Vedeler, Officer in Charge, Baltic Desk, State Department to Dr. Pius Grigaitis, Executive Secretary, ALT. 28 November 1950, “Folder: B891 VOA.” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 3, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>15</sup> Daniel J. Flood (R-PA) to Povilas Žadeikis on VOA Broadcasts. 28 March 1950, “Folder: Li801.4 Committee for a Free Lithuania” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

Lithuania?" Kohler replied, "Yes, due to the increased numbers and for other reasons such as geography, resistance movement, and the ability to organize a larger number of Lithuanians residing in the free world."<sup>16</sup>

VOA Lithuanian broadcasts started on 16 February 1951 with a fifteen-minute daily program featuring Žadeikis along with Under Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett<sup>17</sup> and on 3 June 1951 in Estonian and Latvian, which featured the Estonian and Latvian diplomats and Barrett.<sup>18</sup> While the Lithuanian broadcasts increased their broadcasting time to thirty minutes daily in June 1951 and the Estonian and Latvian broadcasts increased on 26 August 1951, the debate over RFE broadcasts continued to consume the time of American officials concerned with Baltic affairs as well as Baltic organizations.<sup>19</sup> When the FEC first began formulating policy for Baltic broadcasts, there were no plans or appropriations within the IBD in New York to broadcast in these languages.<sup>20</sup> The relative ease with which the VOA began broadcasting in Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian meant that policymakers and exiles faced significant policy hurdles if they sought in the future to begin Baltic language broadcasts over RFE.

Discussions between FEC and State Department officials reveal the two intrinsically linked policy reservations about continuing plans for Baltic RFE broadcasts. On the one hand, there were questions as to whether Baltic radio broadcasts would be a fortuitous use of the

---

<sup>16</sup> Excerpt from "State Appropriations for 1951." Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 2 February 1951, "Folder: Li801.4 Committee for a Free Lithuania" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>17</sup> 'VOICE' TO ADD PROGRAMS :U.S. to Increase Broadcasts to China, Start One to Lithuania." *New York Times (1923-Current file)*, February 13, 1951, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed February 28, 2011).

<sup>18</sup> "The Department of State Bulletin, Vol XXIV, #623" 11 June 1951 "Folder: B891 VOA." Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 3, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. The broadcasts were initially supposed to be started on 27 May, but on 11 May the State Department was informed by VOA that they would be delayed due to technical issues.

<sup>19</sup> 16 August 1951 Johnson to Vedeler, Folder: B891. The Estonian and Latvian programs would emanate from the United States with simultaneous Munich and Tangiers relays. The Estonian program starts at 11.30 (18.30 Estonian time). The Latvian program started at 11.45 (18.45 Latvian time).

<sup>20</sup> "RFE Broadcasts to the Baltic States" Kohler to Barrett, 12 November 1951 "Folder: B801.5 RFE" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

FEC's perceived limited resources. Moreover, to debate how to fund Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian broadcasts exposed considerable implications for sustaining the Non-Recognition Policy.<sup>21</sup> The total cost of the initial FEC Baltic plans was estimated at an initial \$441,600. Ledgers suggest that the total cost could be reduced dramatically by reducing the broadcasting element of the Baltic proposal.<sup>22</sup>

Despite the existence of VOA broadcasts, FEC officials continued to seek approval for broadcast funding since it had been part of its negotiations with the Baltic diplomats and other Baltic organizations.<sup>23</sup> The FEC, however, needed to find some way to justify continuing the plans to broadcast to the Baltic republics. Throughout 1951, regular discussions between State Department and FEC officials culminated in the FEC's decision to propose that the Baltic diasporas should make a sizeable contribution towards the costs of FEC sponsored broadcasts to their homelands. Subsequently, FEC sent the State Department a memorandum asking whether it would be possible to ask for donations from Baltic Americans to subsidize broadcasts and for the State Department to unblock frozen Baltic funds in the United States to help fund the FEC's efforts.<sup>24</sup>

Vedeler outlined the State Department's position towards the use of frozen Baltic funds for radio broadcasts. "The Department can see no way clear to unblocking any of the Baltic frozen funds for this purpose." He continued, "We do not wish to see the position or the operations of the Baltic diplomatic missions jeopardized by utilizing these blocked funds

---

<sup>21</sup> While the FEC received most of its funding from the CIA, for appearances sake the organization did not have a never-ending flow of available resources.

<sup>22</sup> "Baltic Radio Broadcasts" Kelley to Robert Joyce on 10 April 1951, "Folder: B801.5 RFE" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>23</sup> From a bureaucratic argument, it is understandable that the FEC would like to have expanded its presence to cover as many nationalities as possible, if only to increase its own presence in American foreign policy making. For Baltic broadcasts, the FEC wanted to start Baltic broadcasting from New York City rather than from Munich for two main reasons. First, far better Baltic personnel was available in the United States rather than Germany. Second, as a way to streamline costs, they hoped that members of the nascent Baltic panels could double as radio desk personnel.

<sup>24</sup> "RFE Broadcasts to the Baltic Area" Bauer to Kohler 7 November 1951 "Folder: B801.5 RFE" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

in some other way. So long as these funds exist the representatives of the Baltic countries have some measure of independence which supports our doctrine of non-recognition.”<sup>25</sup> The implications were clear that the State Department was not willing to allow radio broadcasts over RFE to jeopardize the cornerstone of its policy towards the Baltic republics – the Non-Recognition Policy.

American officials found themselves in a precarious situation where there were very real policy and economic problems with RFE broadcasts as well as potential political problems with the Baltic exiles, to whom they had virtually promised access to the wavelengths of Radio Free Europe. Kohler wrote to Robert Bauer of the PPS in November 1951 asking for documents from the Baltic desk chiefs of the VOA broadcasts for a rundown of what specifically they were broadcasting. Kohler was hoping to demonstrate that there was a sufficient amount of overlap between the VOA and RFE broadcasts to square the circles, so to say. Bauer contacted IBD personnel and several prominent Baltic exiles who were well disposed to VOA, as well as the new Baltic Consultative Panels to create his report.

Bauer responded to Kohler on 7 November arguing that the VOA program to the Baltic region had consistently implemented and carried out the clear-cut American policy towards the area. He continued by offering critiques by several notable Estonians and Lithuanians. August Torma, the Estonian Minister in London stated that he “backs without reservation the American policy toward the area and its implementation by the VOA. The three Baltic consultative panels all gave very specific recommendations to the VOA on what their broadcasts should include, and they were all fully implemented. Bauer concluded that Sidzikauskas (who had been promoted to Chairman of the Lithuanian Consultative Panel)

---

<sup>25</sup> 27 April 1951 Vedeler to Joyce, 27 April 1951 “Folder: B801.4 Consultative Panels.” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII. A related concern was that if blocked funds were to be “raided for this FEC purpose” that it would set a disastrous precedent for claims against blocked funds.

and Marzins (a member of the Latvian Consultative Panel) had all been actively involved in formulating VOA broadcasts to their respective homelands.<sup>26</sup>

Throughout November 1951, regular correspondences between FEC and State Department policymakers occurred to finalize what the official policy concerning American broadcasts to the Baltic region would be. In their final analysis, the State Department decided to argue that the Non-Recognition Policy ultimately was a benefit to American broadcasting efforts. One of the original rationales for separating RFE broadcasting from VOA broadcasting had been to allow the United States to transmit material that might not have been officially acceptable due to diplomatic protocol with other states. The non-recognition policy meant that the United States did not have to worry about increasing diplomatic tensions with regimes that they did not recognize. Kohler argued:

To use a separate and distinct RFE operation to an area controlled by the USSR makes sense only if it can use medium wave facilities not available to VOA and if it can make use of political exiles in a manner denied to the VOA as an official arm of government policy. Neither of these criteria apply in the Baltic States. The contemplated competing shortwave operation of RFE could only serve to confuse target peoples.

If it is deemed advisable to expand broadcasting to these areas – the logical thing to do would be to give VOA a directive to the effect and to provide the necessary funds for carrying on this expansion. In short, we feel that the funds available to RFE could be more profitably and with less confusion be expanded elsewhere.<sup>27</sup>

Going forward the State Department was going to justify the cancelation of RFE broadcasts to the Baltic republics due to the broadcasts being too expensive and that the VOA would be able to provide the same policy initiatives to both the Americans and the Baltic exiles that RFE might otherwise be able to provide.

---

<sup>26</sup> RFE Broadcasts to the Baltic Area, Bauer to Kohler 7 November 1951, “Folder: B801.5 RFE” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>27</sup> “RFE Broadcasts to the Baltic States” Kohler to Devine and Barrett, 12 November 1951 “Folder: B801.5 RFE” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.



RFE and OIB officials met on 5 December 1951 to discuss what help the State Department could provide RFE in liquidating their commitments over Baltic broadcasting. Looking back at the meeting, Kohler reported that there was clearly a great deal of suppressed resentment directed at the State Department, creating an environment that was less than cordial. The first point of contention was that that the RFE officials that were in charge of the Baltic programs had not received any specific long-term instructions about how to proceed, but only to suspend their activities pending a review and receipt of further instructions. The second, and perhaps most important point, was that they felt that it was the State Department's responsibility to insure that the Baltic diplomats were made aware of the official policy line.<sup>28</sup> Concurrently, the Baltic diplomats were beginning to express their displeasure about broadcasting delays during regularly scheduled appointments with State Department Baltic Desk officials. Throughout December 1951, the State Department utilized these meetings as opportunities to inform the Baltic diplomats of the official broadcasting policy.

Feldmans and Pusta Sr. met with Vedeler and Allan on 12 December to ask about the future of American sponsored radio broadcasts to Latvia and Estonia. Pusta stated in no uncertain terms that the failure to initiate Baltic RFE broadcasts would result in the appearance that the United States was slighting the Baltic States and that the only way to avoid such a falling out was to inaugurate broadcasts. Pusta intimated that this fact alone was significant enough to be a primary reason to begin broadcasts. Pusta and Feldmans asked how the State Department could explain to Baltic refugees in the West or to Balts behind the Iron Curtain why an American organization interested in opposing Soviet tyranny could broadcast to other places in Eastern Europe, but ignore the Baltic States? Vedeler asked "what tasks, if

---

<sup>28</sup> Letter on RFE Meeting, Kohler to Barrett 6 December 1951 "Folder: B801.5 RFE" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

any, could be performed by RFE, which are not being done by VOA?”<sup>29</sup> Neither Pusta Sr. nor Feldmans were able to provide a specific answer.

One week later, Kaiv and Žadeikis met with Allan and Vedeler to double down on the Baltic diplomats’ position that RFE broadcasts were essential for the Baltic refugees as well as Balts in the Soviet Union. The diplomats strongly felt that the abandonment of Baltic language broadcasts by RFE would be misunderstood in the United States and abroad and that the decision would be interpreted widely as a change in the position of the United States towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Kaiv continued by stating that Baltic language broadcasts had been known and widely discussed among exile groups abroad as an excellent medium for providing support and morale for their compatriots fighting for their freedom.

Vedeler stressed that Balts should not attach any political significance to the decision not to support RFE broadcasts and that the decision was “strictly based on the desire to produce the most effective broadcasts in the Baltic languages by concentrating professional efforts in a single organization.”<sup>30</sup> Vedeler continued by explaining that the unique relationship between the Baltic States and the United States allowed the Americans to take a much stronger line in its official broadcasts than it could take in broadcasts to countries in which the United States had accredited missions. From the American position, Vedeler felt it was logical to utilize official American foreign broadcasting in as efficient a manner as possible.<sup>31</sup> Kaiv and Žadeikis viewed this reason as illegitimate and left the meeting under the assumption that the State Department vetoed RFE broadcasts due to VOA insistence rather than real policy considerations and that they would file official petitions with both the State Department and the FEC.

---

<sup>29</sup> Memorandum of Conversation on Question of Baltic Language Broadcasts, 13 December 1951, “Folder: B801.5 RFE” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>30</sup> Memorandum of Conversation on RFE Baltic Language Broadcasts, 18 December 1951 “Folder: B801.5 RFE” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

The meeting between the Baltic diplomats and Vedeler did not solve the issue; it only inflamed tensions. Žadeikis submitted his official memorandum to the State Department on RFE broadcasting on 31 December 1951, followed by Feldmans on 3 January 1952 and Kaiv on 8 January 1952.<sup>32</sup> Summarizing the diplomats' argument, Vedeler wrote:

One of the chief inducements for cooperating with the FEC had been the promise that RFE would broadcast to the countries of Eastern Europe. Žadeikis stated that prior to approving of the affiliation of Lithuanian emigre leaders with the FEC through the establishment of a Lithuanian Panel he had received assurances from Poole that if the Baltic States were associated with FEC, would receive consideration equal to that afforded other East European countries.<sup>33</sup>

Throughout January 1952, RFE officials complained that “the reaction of Baltic exiles to the decision against sending broadcasts is one of deep disappointment. No matter what stand the FEC and the Baltic Panels may take, it seems that Baltic organizations in the United States will strongly protest the present negative decision.”<sup>34</sup>

Kohler, Vedeler, and John Devine met on 17 January 1952 to discuss the memoranda that had been submitted by the diplomats as well as all other petitions received from primarily Lithuanian organizations around the country. The three decided that their initial policy was correct and that the Baltic Desk would assume the responsibility that the decision had been settled. They did, however, agree that should the whole question of RFE operations be reviewed by the State Department in the future that the question of whether or not to include Baltic broadcasts could be re-assessed.<sup>35</sup> In subsequent meetings with the Baltic diplomats at the end of January, Vedeler concisely stated that “the problem had been

---

<sup>32</sup> See Lithuanian Note #2433 Dated 31 December 1951; Latvian Note #3 January 1952; and Estonian Note #773 on 8 January 1952. “Folder: B801.5 RFE” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>33</sup> “Question of RFE Baltic Language Broadcasts” 4 January 1952 “Folder: B801.5 RFE” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>34</sup> Fund Memo on Lithuanians, Monthly Report for January 1952, “Folder: Li801.4 Committee for a Free Lithuania” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>35</sup> Memorandum of Conversation on “RFE Baltic Broadcasts” (Foy D. Kohler, Harold Vedeler, and John Devine) 18 January 1952. “Folder: B801.5 RFE” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

reconsidered from every standpoint by all officers with a direct interest in it and the various points raised by the Baltic diplomats had been carefully studied... but the Department could see no other course but to reaffirm its previous position.<sup>36</sup>

Ultimately Žadeikis' most pressing concern was what sort of provisions were made for those who had been employed by the FEC to begin Baltic radio broadcasts. While Vedeler did not have a specific answer to the direct question, he commented that something probably could be done to take care of these matters through ongoing negotiations between the FEC and VOA representatives in New York. In closing, Vedeler hoped that the diplomats would be willing to cooperate with VOA administrators and the Baltic Consultative Panels as it was VOA's "sincere desire" to receive and make use of helpful comments.<sup>37</sup>

Ironically, once the Baltic diplomats' concerns were assuaged, the Baltic Consultative Panels that had fully endorsed the idea of streamlining all broadcasting activity through the VOA began protesting the American decision to supplant RFE broadcasts with the VOA. While many of the official memoranda that were submitted to the Secretary of State on the issue deal with the double standard involved, that is, other countries in Eastern Europe were receiving RFE broadcasts, they offer insight into the symbolic importance that RFE had for the Baltic exiles.

The Estonian Consultative Panel submitted a protest to E. Acker of the FEC on 8 January 1952 stating that "the Estonian Panel is of the opinion that broadcasting over the VOA cannot cover the field of broadcasting under the auspices of FEC because of the different approaches to the problem. The VOA is and will necessarily continue to be the spokesman of American official policy, while broadcasting under the FEC will express the

---

<sup>36</sup> 25 January 1952, Memorandum of Conversation on Question of RFE Broadcasts to the Baltic Countries, "Folder: B801.5 RFE" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

voice of Free Estonia and of the Estonians abroad.”<sup>38</sup> In May 1952, the Latvian Panel wrote to Acheson that “the VOA cannot and does not act as the speaker of Free Latvians. It is for Free Latvians themselves, and not only for the Latvian Panel to take care of their specific problems designed to help their compatriots at home. Our speeches and features would be read not anonymously, but by the authors, known and respected in Latvia, themselves.”<sup>39</sup>

The debate over Baltic language broadcasts over RFE would continue to be an important political issue for Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians residing in the United States over the next two decades. Regardless, in January 1952, as in August 1951, the VOA continued to be the sole broadcasting medium for the United States Government as well as Baltic exiles residing in the United States. Not all factions within the Baltic diasporas felt as if they had achieved anything substantive through the initial debate over radio broadcasts. In reality, however, the VOA was able to broadcast material to the Baltic republics and feature guests that VOA broadcasts in other languages were simply unable to, mainly due to political protocol. Nevertheless, the ongoing debate between Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians who were actively involved in the Voice of America and those who were not would play an important role in all aspects of Baltic-American cooperation in the sphere of public diplomacy.

### *Broadcasts to the Baltic Republics*

---

<sup>38</sup> Leonhard Vahter to E. Acker 8 January 1952 “Folder: E001 Notes, Aide Memoires, Incoming, Outgoing”. Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>39</sup> Fund Memo #436 Latvian Consultative Panel to Dean Acheson (Secretary of State) 5 May 1952. “Folder: B801.4 Consultative Panels 1950-1954.” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

The inaugural broadcasts in all three Baltic languages shared two main features. Žadeikis, Kaiv, and Feldmans all released official statements on behalf of the exiled Baltic diplomatic missions and Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett represented the United States Government. The implications of this duality are clear. The Voice of America would not only be the official broadcasting arm of the United States government towards the Baltic Republics and the primary way that people living behind the Iron Curtain would find out about American policy directed towards the Soviet Union, but the VOA would also be an official way that the Baltic diplomats and prominent exiles would be able to maintain contact with their homelands.

Barrett outlined why the United States felt that VOA broadcasts to Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia were important. He argued that they were “to convey to the Baltic people a factual and unbiased picture of the motives and aims which guide the United States in its international relations. These aims are: peace, freedom, and justice for all.”<sup>40</sup> Barrett also took the opportunity to slam the Soviet Union by contrasting their policy of depriving the Baltic people “freedom and liberty since the fateful summer of 1940” while the United States “have consistently advocated the freedom of choice of the people of Estonia [Latvia, and Lithuania], as to their form of government and way of life.” In closing, he forcefully read the entire text of Welles Declaration.<sup>41</sup> As promised, the United States was not encumbered by diplomatic protocol in criticizing the Soviet Union over VOA Baltic language broadcasts.

Although Kaiv did not pass up an opportunity to criticize the Soviet Union for “inflicting suffering upon the Estonian nation during the past eleven years,”<sup>42</sup> he and his colleagues had markedly different objectives during their first opportunity to speak to their

---

<sup>40</sup> Draft Statement of Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett 3 June 1951 “Folder: E891 VOA” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> Draft Statement of Johannes Kaiv, Charge d’Affaires of Estonia to United States 3 June 1951, Folder: B891 VOA Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 3, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

homelands directly since the Soviet annexation. Kaiv stated to his Estonian compatriots: “The fact alone, that I can address you over the radio as the free recognized representative of the independent Republic of Estonia and that there are to follow regular broadcasts in the Estonian language, is proof that the freedom of the Estonians is not buried but that the great democracies... are continuing to recognize the democratic Republic of Estonia... The body of Estonians abroad as well as the official representatives of Estonia are continuing the fight for the freedom of the Estonians.”<sup>43</sup> Later on the same day, the VOA broadcasted: “You are listening to Jules Feldmans, Latvian Charge d’Affaires in the United States... We are glad that you in this way will have contact with the free world, from which you have been separated for such a long time. You may be assured, therefore, that your interests are being actively represented before the Government of this great land of freedom.”<sup>44</sup>

It is notable that foreign nationals, such as the three Baltic diplomats were granted access to the VOA wavelengths. Most VOA language service broadcasters were born abroad, or were first-generation Americans that happened to be native speakers of their mother tongues.<sup>45</sup> Baltic broadcasts, however were different in their staffing as well as their message. So far this chapter has demonstrated the policy set forth by the State Department that the Baltic languages would be serviced exclusively by the VOA, in lieu of duplicate broadcasts over RFE. While it was probably a foregone conclusion that the inaugural broadcasts would feature some of the most prominent Baltic exiles (such as the diplomats) as well as senior American policymakers (such as an Assistant Secretary of State), there remained two critical questions to resolve. Would the VOA broadcast desks be willing to cooperate with the Baltic Consultative Panels to develop and execute policy? Could the American policy of trying to

---

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> Draft Statement of Jules Feldmans, Charge d’Affaires of Latvia to the United States 3 June 1951, Folder: B891 VOA Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 3, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>45</sup> See Alan Heil, *Voice of America: A History*, 132-134.

undermine the Soviet Union in the Baltic region coexist with the Baltic émigré policy of trying to reestablish contacts with their homelands?

Before the decision to indefinitely indefinitely the beginning of RFE broadcasts, the newly assembled VOA radio desks began working with their American supervisors to formulate broadcasting policy parallel to the Baltic Consultative Panels formulating their own broadcasting formulas. On 1 October 1951, the three Baltic Panels submitted a memorandum to the FEC, which was eventually forwarded to the State Department for policy considerations. The first priority of the Baltic panels was to strike a balance between “demonstrating support and encouragement of the hope among Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians remaining their homelands while avoiding the incitation to prematurely revolt against the Soviet Union. Second, the panels proposed that broadcasts should be specifically groomed for individual groups within Baltic societies, particularly agricultural workers, the youth, and the remaining clergy. Third, the broadcasts should highlight the fact that exiled Baltic nationals are doing “what they can to work for the independence of their homelands.”<sup>46</sup>

The State Department agreed with the FEC that the panels’ proposals were “reasonable and practical” and that their only major policy consideration that should be added was that there the American non-recognition policy should receive adequate broadcast time. This point highlights that even though the Consultative Panels and FEC broadcasts were an avenue for exiles to communicate with their homeland, the radios were indeed an American foreign policy initiative. As part of the debate whether or not RFE broadcasts were essential, Vedeler forwarded the Baltic Consultative Panels’ papers to the VOA radio desks to see whether or not the policies they were putting in place coalesced with the Panels’ policies.

Constantine Jurgela, chief of the Lithuanian VOA radio desk replied to his supervisor,

A. Bauer of the North Europe Section, who in turn contacted Vedeler about whether or not

---

<sup>46</sup>Vedeler to Hooker on Broadcasts to the Baltic 24 October 1951, “Folder: E891 VOA” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 6, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.



there were areas of agreement between the Consultative Panels and the VOA desks. Jurgela stated that “all of the groups mentioned in the memo of the Lithuanian Panel are the very groups for whom daily Lithuanian broadcasts are intended.”<sup>47</sup> Jurgela continued by arguing that the broadcasts are rooted in a message of “hope, perseverance, patience, and loyalty to the national and Christian heritage of the Lithuanian people.”<sup>48</sup> He recapitulated that indeed, Lithuania was one of the Baltic States whose continued independence is recognized by the United States and that the VOA broadcasts adequately reflect American policy to the region.

It was clear that there was ample policy room for the Baltic Consultative Panels and the VOA broadcasts desk to cooperate. Indeed, in the course of 1952 and 1953, the VOA broadcast panels not only used raw intelligence gathered by the Baltic Panels and broadcast academic writing that the Panels’ members engaged in, but offered the wavelenghts directly to panel members. From January 1952 through 1954, a member from each Baltic panel was featured over Voice of America once a month. The Panel members spoke on topics ranging from the political developments of the independent countries to current initiatives to fight for liberation.<sup>49</sup>

While VOA broadcasts seemed to be a source of cooperation at the highest level of Baltic émigré politics, since the Baltic Panels, VOA radio desks, and the Baltic diplomats all at least tacitly supported the effort, the State Department and USIA officials were initially the ultimate arbitrators in what would be allowed to be broadcast over the official American broadcasting network. Ultimately, State Department officials and the VOA Baltic desk employees agreed on three main broadcasting topics to the region. The broadcasts would

---

<sup>47</sup> “RFE Broadcast to the Baltic States” 5 November 1951 C.H. Jurgela to A. Bauer Folder: B801.5 RFE, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> This calculation was done via the monthly reports available on the activities of the Baltic Panel Members. The most prominent VOA speaker from the Baltic Panels was Vaclovas Sidzikauskas.

focus on promoting freedom; regularly reference American policy towards the Baltic republics; and remembering anniversaries.

Calling to mind the value of human rights and freedom in the United States in comparison to Soviet totalitarianism was a universal feature of American public diplomatic radio broadcasts during the Cold War. In a period where the Baltic republics were experiencing repressive Stalinist terror that included deportations and summary executions, VOA broadcasters were able to offer a stark contrast to what life was like in the United States, particularly through referring the experiences of Baltic DPs who had found refuge in the United States. The Voice of America would feature refugees who recalled their memories of living in their Soviet occupied homelands and juxtaposing that experience with their lives in the United States.

The Lithuanian broadcast unit's coverage of a trip to Chicago in October 1951 offers an excellent perspective on the VOA's attempted depth of reporting. P.J. Labanauskas traveled to Chicago to interview several Lithuanians who had just arrived in the United States who had either been in Soviet prisons or witnessed massacres during the Soviet period. One such interviewee witnessed the massacre at Chervan where several thousand political prisoners were executed by the NKVD in June 1941. An interview with a Lithuanian who was imprisoned for eight years offered insight into what life was like in the Soviet prison camps in Siberia as well as Solovki Island.<sup>50</sup>

This experience was contrasted with coverage of the ALT Chicago Area Conference at the Lithuanian Auditorium in Chicago, where 385 delegates representing 197 Lithuanian organizations met. While they recorded excerpts of prominent Lithuanians such as the Grigaitis (Secretary General of ALT) and Šimutis (President of ALT), the more interesting

---

<sup>50</sup> "Two Special Events, Interviews, and Speeches Recorded on the October Trip to and Around Chicago" P.J. Labanauskas to A. Bauer and CR. Jurgela 20 October 1951 Folder: B801.5 RFE, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

content included capturing the experiences of average Lithuanian DPs through interviews. These interviews ranged from shining light on the continuation of Lithuanian handicraft and folk dancing institutes that had been started to the entrepreneurial efforts of a Lithuanian who owned a farm and several summer resorts after arriving in the United States.<sup>51</sup>

The next important theme was the continual rebroadcasting of statements in the United States that were favorable to the cause of Baltic liberty and which underscored the American non-recognition policy, as well as the plight of political refugees around the world. Naturally this was an important policy prerogative for American officials as it highlighted the differences between how the United States conducted foreign affairs and perceived personal freedom and how the Soviet Union conducted foreign policy and established universal values. Any prominent American citizen or government official that gave commentary about the plight of the Baltic States was mentioned. In addition, important exiled leaders were frequently given airtime, including the diplomats.

The most important messages that American policy makers wanted broadcasted over the VOA were the annual statements that the Secretary of State made on the national days of independence commending the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian people on their achievements as independent countries; restating the continued American policy of not recognizing the Soviet annexation of their countries; and the hope that in the future their nations would live in an independent and democratic manner. VOA Baltic broadcasts, however, also included statements by American officials that were not Baltic specific, but were intentionally used to foment dissent within the Soviet bloc.

Though the Estonian VOA broadcasts in September and October 1951, American politicians and military officials received significant informatino over the plight of refugees who were trying to flee the communist bloc. On 22 September 1951, the Estonians broadcast

---

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

a story about American High Commission Officials in Europe rejecting Czechoslovak demands for the return of 31 escapees aboard the “Freedom Train.” The broadcasts claimed that “American officials declared that political refugees will not be returned to countries where their freedom is in jeopardy.”<sup>52</sup> On 21 October 1951, the VOA discussed a U.S. Senate group that proposed to find home for refugees. It broadcast then Senator Richard Nixon’s statement that “Many under-populated areas of the world, which either are benefiting or may benefit in the future from the point-four program, would benefit from immigration.”<sup>53</sup> The message was clear to Estonians residing in the Soviet Union that should they feel inclined to escape from the Soviet Union the United States would not send them back to the Soviet Union and could possibly work to help settle them in a free country.

The final important theme consisted of remembering commemoration days and anniversaries. VOA broadcasts carefully feature two types of anniversaries. First, traditional anniversaries and birthdays were remembered. These included religious holidays, days of independence and older historical events. Second, anniversary dates of important contemporary political events were remembered. These included the peoples’ diet meetings, the Welles Declaration, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, the Soviet invasion of Poland, Molotov’s Speech to the Supreme Soviet on 31 October 1939, and the annexation dates of Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine, and Bessarabia.<sup>54</sup>

During autumn 1951, the Latvian broadcasting unit juxtaposed the anniversaries of Latvian Independence and the Revolutions of 1917. Commemorating Latvian Independence

---

<sup>52</sup> VOA Broadcast -42/1-2 22 September 1951, Folder: B801.5 RFE, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>53</sup> VOA Broadcast -9/1-3 21 October 1951, Folder: B801.5 RFE, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. 12 Senators proposed the creation of a special committee to investigate the finding of homes in under-populated lands for refugees from behind the Iron Curtain.

<sup>54</sup> Document on VOA North European Section Broadcasts, 1953. Folder: B891 VOA, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

Day, Minister Zariņš from London announced “Latvian organizations in the United States will not be alone in the commemoration of the Latvian Independence Day. Nations who are friends of Latvia and Latvians will speak on November 18, because the Latvians are bound to western culture and because Latvians are a Western nation who is enslaved now by the Eastern barbarianism.”<sup>55</sup> Lielnors of the Latvian VOA stated on 5 November 1951: “On the occasion of the anniversary of the so-called Communist October Revolution, let us begin, for the sake of clarity, with a few questions...” He continued by asking “What is the country where celebrations are held to commemorate the beginning of hunger? Who are the rulers, who celebrate bloodshed and slave labor camps with festivities, with champagne and caviar? What is the system where decorations are awarded for murder? It is the Soviet Union... It is the Kremlin... It is Moscow.”<sup>56</sup>

The Latvian broadcast unit effectively tried to contrast the political and cultural orientation of the Latvian nation, as being a Western nation, with the Soviet Union that functioned so far out of Western society that its “Eastern barbarianism” brought them to celebrate hunger, slave labor, and murder with medals, caviar, and social promotion. The message also attempted to tap into potential resentment over the lifestyle that members of the political echelon possessed in comparison to the severe economic dislocation that was transpiring in Soviet occupied Latvia.

The Voice of America, however, did not exclusively broadcast information that was pertinent to the Baltic republics or to the lives of Balts living in the United States. After all, the VOA was the main way that the United States broadcast about life and politics in the United States. On Estonian broadcasts over the course of several days through November

---

<sup>55</sup> Minister Zariņš on Latvian Future, 28 October 1951 Folder: B801.5 RFE, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>56</sup> Latvian Unit Memo on “October Revolution, 11-5-51” 5 November 1951, Folder: B801.5 RFE, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

1951, the benefits of the Marshall Plan in Europe were fully explained. The benefit from mentioning the Marshall Plan was to demonstrate how the United States was actively assisting in the reconstruction of Western Europe in the postwar period, while the Soviets continued their campaign to destroy the Baltic nations.<sup>57</sup>

For three days in September 1951, the Lithuanian broadcast unit covered President Truman's Constitution Day Speech at the Library of Congress, delivered on 17 September.<sup>58</sup> The Lithuanian desk saw from the Soviet Press that it had a negative impact in Moscow, so continued giving it a post-event treatment for several days.<sup>59</sup> American labor movements and agrarian reform policies were also highlighted.<sup>60</sup> These references were used to try to contrast with the collectivization that had been taking place in the Soviet Union and to foment remembrance of the notion of small Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian farms that were a primary feature of life in the interwar republics.

The material broadcast over the VOA highlights the relatively positive working relationship between the Baltic exiles who were a key component in making the broadcasts successful and the State Department, which ultimately had discrete foreign policy objectives in mind. At the highest level, there existed a convergence of ideology and interests between the Americans and the exiles. There was little room for the two groups to disagree over the regular employment of the non-recognition policy in broadcasts. The Policy remained the cornerstone of American policy towards the Baltic republics and the exiles owed part of their continued claims of legitimacy to the continued policy. It was both parties' interests to

---

<sup>57</sup> Ludmilla Floss (Estonian Unit) to Robert Bauer (IBD) RFE Broadcasts to the Baltic States Folder: B801.5 RFE, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>58</sup> See "Address at the Constitution Day Ceremonies at the Library of Congress" *Public Papers of the Presidents, Harry S. Truman 1945-1953*. <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/publicpapers/index.php?pid=441&st=&st1=> Accessed 01.09.2008. In the speech Truman juxtaposed the Soviet constitutional tradition with the American one by stating that "these good words in the Soviet constitution mean less than nothing."

<sup>59</sup> Lithuanian Unit Programming Guide Folder B891 VOA, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>60</sup> Estonian Unit Programming Guide 1951 Folder B891 VOA, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

foment dissent in the Soviet Union to attempt to hasten the liberation of Eastern Europe. The United States rhetorically found it useful and the exiles placed their hopes and future prospects on policies that might be successful. Finally, highlighting the positive aspects of life in the United States allowed the Americans to underline a sharp contrast to the lack of freedom in the Soviet Union, and it allowed the exiles to carry a message to their homelands that they were prosperous enough and free enough to devote their time to the eventual liberation of the Baltic republics.

VOA broadcasts were also a rare instance of significant amount of cooperation between some of the important forces of the Baltic émigré communities. While the Baltic Consultative Panels may not have been in charge of the broadcasts themselves, the VOA radio desks offered them enough of an opportunity not only to provide material for them to broadcast, but it gave them direct access to their homelands via the radio. More importantly, however, was that the Baltic Consultative Panels and the VOA desk chiefs were small enough in structure to facilitate effective cooperation and they were geographically close enough, both being located in primarily in New York City, for effective and regular communication to take place. Throughout the 1950s, however, other émigré organizations sought to impose their own influences upon VOA radio broadcasts, resulting in a mixed result in assessing whether or not the VOA was an avenue to foster Baltic cooperation.

### *Internal Exile Politics and the Voice of America*

For all of the cooperation that occurred among various components of the Baltic diasporas to provide thoughtful analysis about world affairs and émigré affairs over the VOA, the latter proved to be yet another forum for exile factions to compete for political supremacy, both within each community as well as for American sponsorship. VOA and State Department officials not only had to manage tenuous relations between individual

nationalities, but also faced considerable pressure within each diaspora in several areas. Staffing issues created significant tensions between officials and exiles where there were personal, generational, or ideological differences between factional elements of each diaspora. Critiques over broadcasting methods also created openings for competing exile organizations to attack each other. Finally, concerns about favoring one particular political party or geographic location dominated policy discussions.

The very nature of the VOA meant that there were a limited number of full-time employment opportunities for the development and transmission of broadcasts to the Baltic republics. Most VOA language service broadcasters were born abroad, or were first-generation American citizens who were native speakers of their mother tongue. Generally speaking, more than half of all 800 or more total employees were non-citizens who were seeking American citizenship.<sup>61</sup> Nevertheless, the longstanding policy was that American citizens would have priority over foreign nationals when it came to VOA language service broadcasters. Since Voice of America broadcasts were to be used as an outlet for exile broadcasts, a conflict developed between Baltic Americans who had immigrated before World War II and the newly arrived exiles.

This debate over the employment of recently arrived exiles and older members of the Lithuanian American or Latvian American communities was a source of potential animosity between the two generations. Indeed, the initial employment of older Baltic Americans fueled Feldmans' and Žadeikis' suspicions about the State Department's decision not to pursue RFE broadcasts. During the 12 December 1951 meeting with Vedeler and Allan, Feldmans insinuated that RFE broadcasts had been delayed due to the personal issues between newer Latvian arrivals and older Latvian immigrants represented by Harry W. Lielnors.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Alan Heil, 132-134.

<sup>62</sup> Memorandum of Conversation on Question of Baltic Language Broadcasts, 13 December 1951, Folder: B801.5 RFE, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69,



Earlier though, Žadeikis wrote to Alfred Puhan of the International Broadcasting Division (IBD) of the State Department on 19 September 1950 informing him that he would like to submit a list of acceptable candidates to the exiled Lithuanian diplomats.<sup>63</sup> Puhan replied that IBD was required by law to look for American citizens first. In the event that there were no qualified applicants, IBD had the authority to turn to the best-qualified aliens residing in the United States.<sup>64</sup> He continued that Žadeikis should contact Richard E. Morrissey, Chief of the Personnel Section of IBD with his list, noting that they were specifically seeking people with journalistic or radio experience. The ALT's existence and the generally high-level of cooperation between the older Lithuanian community in the United States and the newly arriving refugees meant that there was little dispute among the Lithuanians over the establishment of the Lithuanian VOA broadcasting desk.

Staffing questions, however, also exposed American officials to the occasional petty personal feuds that played out between prominent exiles in terms of their politics or even their family affiliations. While IBD began the process of interviewing Baltic Americans and exiles to staff the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian broadcasts desks, these became some of the most sought after positions for politically active Balts. Not only would they be the voices that their fellow citizens behind the Iron Curtain would hear, but would also be gainfully employed by the American government.<sup>65</sup> One such leading Estonian exile, the son of Kaarel Pusta Sr, Kaarel Pusta Jr. became a leading candidate in 1950 and early 1951 to head the Estonian VOA desk. The possible appointment of Pusta became a problem for Kaiv.

---

Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. Feldmans indicated that he received his information from members of the Latvian Consultative Panel who had long had issues with Lielnors.

<sup>63</sup> Žadeikis to Puhan on 19 September 1950, Folder: Li891 Lithuanian Broadcasts, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>64</sup> Puhan to Žadeikis, 28 September 1950, Folder: Li891 Lithuanian Broadcasts, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>65</sup> One of the biggest obstacles that newly arriving DPs in the United States faced was becoming gainfully employed and attempting to return to some sort of normal economic position that they had during the interwar period.

During a meeting with State Department officials to discuss financial matters, Kaiv asked whether Vedeler or Johnson had been aware if Pusta Jr. was going to serve as Chief of the Estonian VOA Desk. Kaiv explained that this would be terribly problematic due to a wartime incident where “Pusta had met a group of Lithuanian officers who had appealed to him for assistance and Pusta helped. However, on a subsequent occasion in Germany on meeting a similar group of Estonian officers, Pusta had declined to give any assistance.”<sup>66</sup>

Vedeler and Johnson asked for further information about the incident, and Kaiv diverged to reveal his personal dislike for Pusta’s father who he had felt was beginning to usurp his power at the Estonian Consulate.<sup>67</sup> Kaiv was told that the selection of a person to act as Chief of the Estonian Desk was entirely based on the candidate’s professional qualifications, and that aside from the mandatory security clearance, political considerations did not enter into account. Vedeler attempted to assuage Kaiv’s concerns by mentioning that the VOA Desk Chief would not be in a position to formulate policy, but would be executing policies and directives handed down from superiors in New York and Washington. Kaiv ultimately conceded that VOA had the sole right to hire its employees based on its own criteria, but only wanted to avoid a situation that would “probably cause trouble.”<sup>68</sup>

While it was true that the Voice of America hired its staff based on their professional qualifications, in reality when it came to the Baltic desks, it was policy to avoid taking on anybody who would be deemed as controversial to the majority of the national diasporas. Very naturally, Vedeler and Johnson looked at the question of whether or not Pusta Jr. would be an appropriate desk chief, and it decided that Kaiv had some sense of personal persecution by the Pusta family; that his attitude about the Pustas was not shared by an appreciable

---

<sup>66</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, 13 March 1951, Kaiv, Johnson, and Vedeler, “Employment of Pusta, Jr. by VOA” Folder: Baltic General, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>67</sup> Pusta had put a sign on his door stating “Kaarel Pusta, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.”

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

number of Estonian exiles and that therefore his employment would not detract from the cooperation of the Estonian emigration at large when it came to Estonian language broadcasts.

Ironically, the loudest voices that offered feedback and were critical of VOA Baltic language broadcasts were Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians residing in the United States and Europe. As early as 15 March 1951, the first American Lithuanian complaints started to reach State Department desks. Joseph Koncius of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America met with Val Johnson and Joseph G. Kolarek of the IBD to express his dissatisfaction with the VOA broadcasts. Koncius believed that over 75% of the speakers were radicals associated with the far Left or far Right of Lithuanian politics.<sup>69</sup>

Kolarek emphasized that the Lithuanian VOA employees had not only to be loyal American citizens and competent professionals, but that VOA was first and foremost an American foreign policy project and that internal Lithuanian political interests and disputes were primarily matters for the Lithuanian people themselves to work out.<sup>70</sup> It is important to note that Koncius' organization was perceived by both American officials and the Lithuanian community as being marginal and not surprising that he would levy criticism against a project that had close collaboration between the State Department and prominent Lithuanians.

Obtaining accurate information about what life was like in the Soviet occupied Baltic republics was a problem that VOA policymakers were confronted with on a regular basis. The United States did not have diplomats in the region due to the non-recognition policy and foreign visitors were barred from traveling to the area. As a result, exile groups that did not have regular contact with the State Department occasionally approached Americans and offered them allegedly better information about developments in the Baltic republics than what they were receiving. Naturally one of the ulterior motives such claims was to increase

---

<sup>69</sup> Memorandum of Conversation: Koncius, Johnson, and Kolarek. 17 March 1951 Folder: Li801.4 Committee for a Free Lithuania Folder: Li891 Lithuanian Broadcasts, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*

their standing within their exile community, but also garner favor with the Americans. Often, however, such claims devolved into full-blown demarches within an exile community.

One such incident started when S. Kuzminskas of the Lithuanian Underground approached Robert Bauer, an American diplomat in London during April 1951. Kuzminskas informed Bauer that regardless of jamming, the Lithuanians in Lithuania did hear some of the VOA broadcasts. Kuzminskas urged the Americans to consider adding one or two persons who had recently been in touch with present day Lithuania to the VOA's staff.<sup>71</sup> Kuzminskas offered a thinly-veiled threat that should the Americans be unwilling to cooperate this would cause some reluctance on the part of his group "to cooperate to the fullest, meaning that it is withholding some of the information about conditions in occupied Lithuania, which is as their disposal."<sup>72</sup>

Žadeikis was summoned to the State Department on 27 April 1951 to discuss the information that the Baltic Desk had received from London. Johnson asked whether this was a situation that could cause problems concerning unity within the Lithuanian diaspora. Žadeikis stated that the group in London was relatively small and unimportant. While Žadeikis mentioned that he was not surprised by the development, he reiterated that they were unimportant.<sup>73</sup> Johnson took the opportunity to remind Žadeikis of prior conversations where it was highly desirable for "Lithuanian émigrés to forget their differences and work together as closely as possible."<sup>74</sup>

For the next several months, Žadeikis proved to be correct in suggesting that there was little for the State Department to be concerned the Lithuanian community's willingness

---

<sup>71</sup> Letter from Robert Bauer to Alfred Puhon on 17 April 1951, Folder: Li801.4 Committee for a Free Lithuania Folder: Li891 Lithuanian Broadcasts, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>73</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Žadeikis and Johnson on 27 April 1951. Folder: Li891 Lithuanian Broadcasts, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

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

to accept VOA as the focal point of American broadcasts in their language. While the VOA broadcasts were not perceived as being the same as RFE broadcasts, Lithuanians in the free world did have daily contact with Lithuania behind the Iron Curtain through the Voice of America. In addition, the hierarchical nature of the VOA desks meant that the Lithuanians who were in charge of broadcasting were for the most part executing policy that was handed down from American government officials.

In January 1952, Jurgela was assigned to cover a special event for the local community in Lithuania where he interviewed Bronys Raila, a prominent Lithuanian exile associated with the Lithuanian Underground in London. Raila inquired whether Jurgela would be willing to include some statements about the Lithuanian Underground in London for the forthcoming VOA broadcast about the event. In response, Jurgela declined to accept such statements, since such material would need clearance by his superiors.<sup>75</sup> While it was standard protocol for Jurgela to require proper approval from supervisors to include such material in the VOA broadcasts, it stands to reason that Jurgela merely used this as an excuse to marginalize the role of the LRS within the broader Lithuanian community.

In the end, it was not the unwillingness of the Lithuanian Underground in London to participate with VOA that fomented discontent within the ranks of the Lithuanian diaspora, but the perceived reluctance of the Lithuanian VOA desk chief, Jurgela, to utilize the information that the Lithuanian Underground provided. A year after the first discussion between Johnson and Žadeikis over the role that the Lithuanian Underground could play in contributing to Lithuanian broadcasts, Žadeikis met with Kolarek to present intelligence that

---

<sup>75</sup> Letter from E.M. Kretsmann to Koralek. 8 May 1952, Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

the Lithuanian Underground in London was becoming increasingly frustrated over Jurgela's reluctance to use its material over the Voice of America.<sup>76</sup>

The demarche between the Lithuanian VOA desk operations and the London Underground must be seen in the context of the ongoing dispute between conservative factions of the Lithuanian diaspora that included the VLIK as well as the ALT, in which Jurgela was an active member, and the Lozoraitis/London faction of the Lithuanian diaspora. The VOA debate became yet another proxy battle between the two Lithuanian factions. By March 1953, prominent Lithuanians in London were calling for C.R. Jurgela's dismissal as chief of the VOA desk.<sup>77</sup>

Throughout 1953, the dispute between the Lithuanian VOA Desk and the Lithuanian Underground in London reached a fevered pitch. There were open calls that the VOA had been reduced to the mouthpiece of Brazaitis, a prominent Christian Democrat and Member of VLIK. The London group criticized the VOA for calling for the liberation of Lithuania prematurely, refusing to broadcast in a responsible tone, and ultimately providing "free propaganda to the chosen one political party, instead of giving more attention to the contents of Lithuanian broadcasts."<sup>78</sup> On 10 September, Jurgela attempted to combat the growing criticism his office faced from the broader Lithuanian community and to assuage the State Department concerns by composing a letter to Bauer of IBD as well as his Latvian counterpart, Harry W. Lielnors.

---

<sup>76</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Žadeikis and Kolarek, 21 April 1952. Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>77</sup> Fund Memo #656 1953 March Monthly Report. B801.4 Consultative Panels, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>78</sup> 15 February 1952 Memo from Landreth Harrison in Paris to State on Lithuanian Reception of Broadcasts 15 February 1952, Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. There were ongoing rumors within the Lithuanian immigration that Brazaitis immigrated to the United States using covert American funds. Based on available documents, it is impossible to ascertain the veracity of such claims.

Jurgela stated that there was no substance whatsoever to the LRS allegations that had reached Johnson's office at the State Department's Baltic Desk. He continued by attempting to articulate clearly what the Lithuanian Desk's operating guidelines for broadcasts truly were. VOA Lithuanian broadcasts were said to be "carefully edited to conform to policy guidance and to promote policy objectives in the target area" and that "the bulk of Lithuanian Service broadcasts are based on translations and adaptations of VOA house features and teletype newscasts."<sup>79</sup> In response to accusations that VOA was engaging in calls for premature hopes of liberation at a shrill pitch, Jurgela referred to the broadcasting of President Eisenhower's and Secretary of State Foster Dulles' policy statements and contacts with Lithuanian Americans, stating that they could "hardly constitute" such tones. Finally, he repudiated the claims that the Lithuanian radio service was under the influence of VLIK by stating that they "maintain no direct or indirect contact with VLIK beyond receiving gratis copies of the latter's ELTA bulletins in Lithuanian and German."<sup>80</sup>

In comparison to the Estonians, using VOA employment as a way of undermining the position of fellow exiles who were on poor terms with the diplomats, or the way that the Lithuanians used VOA broadcasts and information sharing as a proxy battlefield for the ongoing VLIK-Lozoraitis conflict, the Latvians faced few challenges across the broader exile community when it came to broadcasts. While VOA continued to be a problem between older Latvians in the United States and the DPs, very little was discussed about the VOA among Latvian community abroad. So little, that American officials took it upon themselves to make sure that problems might not arise when the question arose of whether or not to cover an important speech given by the Latvian Social Democratic Party in Stockholm Sweden in July 1954.

---

<sup>79</sup> C.R. Jurgela to Lielnors and Bauer 10 September 1953. Folder: Li891 Lithuanian Broadcasts Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

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

The major policy question the Americans faced was whether or not it was prudent to carry the message of a single political party over the VOA airwaves. While officials agreed that it was preferable to “refrain from broadcasting speeches and statements devoted to a single exile party” George Lister of the State Department summarized the feeling that most Americans had about the general political sentiments of Eastern European refugees by stating: “I feel that most responsible anti-Communist émigrés and émigré groups have something to contribute in the fight against the USSR, and that it is our interest to bring out, and make use of their contributions and to avoid exacerbating quarrels.”<sup>81</sup> Within this context, two main questions continued to be asked. What amount of coverage should be given to Latvian exile affairs in Sweden over VOA and what amount of coverage should be granted to the Latvian Social Democratic Party?

Officials readily acknowledged that VOA Latvian broadcasts featured the lives of Latvians residing in the United States and that it would be exposing itself to criticism from the Latvian community if it failed to broadcast material pertaining to other locales. They also acknowledged that to an extent the VOA had been guilty of favoring the message of more conservative Latvian political groupings due to the prominent role of American Latvians. The Americans, however, decided that it was best that the Latvian Social Democratic Party in Stockholm be informed orally, and in a “pleasant way,” that the United States would refrain from documents devoted to a single party. Lister also stated that the American should avoid answering whether or not the VOA reports on Latvian activities in the United States and conclude that the “Latvian people would decide which party they prefer when they regain their freedom.”<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> 29 July 1954 George Lister to Revey Folder: La891 VOA Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 8, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*



The personal, political, and geographic conflicts within each Baltic exile community created discrete problems that American officials had to either ignore or try to remedy. The conflicts, however, never had a direct impact on the ability of the Americans to broadcast to the Baltic republics on a daily basis and they did not reduce the Baltic exiles' ability to maintain a nominal level of contact with their homelands. The regular problems, however, were not inconsequential. The inability of the most important Lithuanian exile organizations to cooperate over what VOA broadcasts should consist of and what intelligence is deemed to be fit for broadcast, as well as the willingness of Estonian and Latvian groups to superimpose personal vendettas upon the VOA debate was important. It colored the reactions that American policymakers had towards claims that various Baltic exiles made over the effectiveness, scope, and content of radio broadcasts. It also was important in determining the level of autonomy that the exiles would have in making broadcast decisions.

#### *Assessing Broadcast Feedback and Policy Corrections*

Perhaps the most challenging aspect of conducting public diplomatic efforts towards the Baltic republics during the Stalinist period was that information was primarily unidirectional. That is, VOA attempted to broadcast information into the Soviet occupied territories, but it was very difficult to get information out. Since one of the policy aims of VOA Baltic broadcasts was to provide Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians news, not only about global affairs, the United States, and the émigré communities, but also news about developments in the Baltic republics, getting information out was of paramount importance. There is no doubt that the covert connections that the United States had with the Baltic underground movements assisted in this matter. The other important rationale for extracting information out of the Baltic republics, however, was to gain valuable feedback from the listeners to the Voice of America. As the formal broadcasting mechanism of the United States,

the VOA was subject to budget oversight by the United States Congress and policymakers were mandated to justify their broadcasting expenditures. Feedback from the target was necessary.

The early experience that State Department and USIA officials had with Baltic exiles demonstrated that while they were essential in producing high quality broadcasts to the Soviet occupied territories, they were potentially less useful in providing objective feedback on the way that Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain received the broadcasts. There were longstanding concerns that relying on émigré feedback would be a source of contention between competing factions. Indeed, as has been demonstrated, this did take place.<sup>83</sup> Finally, and quite simply, the VOA was a career path for a handful of prominent Baltic exiles and it was highly unlikely that they would vote against their economic and political interests in a post-liberation Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania that they would claim that the broadcasts were ineffective.

While the VOA relied on émigré feedback, to a certain extent, policymakers also relied on information from border areas of the Soviet Union that happened to receive Baltic language broadcasts and information that American diplomatic missions received from the few Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians able to escape from the Soviet Union. As early as February 1951, the State Department began compiling information concerning the effectiveness and reach of VOA broadcasts in the Baltic region. The initial reaction of most Balts residing in the free world was that the Baltic broadcasts were a welcome addition to the VOA. Latvians residing in West Germany and Australia expressed their appreciation in letters to the VOA in June 1951 writing “... we are glad about the Latvian broadcasts of the Voice of America, and we listen regularly... I referred in my address at the meeting (of

---

<sup>83</sup> W. Scott Lucas, *Freedom's War: The American Crusade Against the Soviet Union*, 148. A comprehensive survey stressed the “lack of effective coordination” with instances in which different information agencies extended support to the same foreign group, which had a negative impact on broadcasting.

Latvian refugees) to the broadcasts of the VOA in Latvian, bringing home to those at home.”<sup>84</sup>

Since the Lithuanian broadcasts had been ongoing, only a relatively small amount of information was received from Estonia or Latvia. The very rudimentary analysis they received offers insight into the broadcasts’ signal quality, how the broadcasts’ were received by certain segments of society, and how the regime responded. Information received from the Lithuanian-Polish border indicated that people not only listened to the Lithuanian broadcasts, but also the Polish and Russian language broadcasts. It was noted that of the three languages, the Russian broadcasts were of the highest quality, followed by the Polish and then Lithuanian. Policymakers decided that the Estonians and Latvians were also able to receive the Russian broadcasts and were willing to listen to them.

Listeners to the Lithuanian broadcasts suggested that the hours of the broadcast should be moved to the middle of the night since collaborators were tipping MVD officials off regarding the time of the VOA broadcasts. American sources stated that Russians were relentlessly conducting counter operations against the VOA and that the fear was not necessarily against individuals, but organized movements that might coalesce behind the radio broadcasts. Additionally, during interrogations conducted by the MVD, the question: “The Voice of America ordered you to raise a counter-revolution, yes?” was deployed on a regular basis. In the Latvian context, there was evidence that on a number of occasions the Latvian communist newspaper, *Cina* attacked the VOA by calling it “A Screaming, brazen,

---

<sup>84</sup> Letter from Varele, West Germainy to VOA on 15 June 1951 Folder: B891 VOA, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

boasting, and repulsive voice – the VOA – fills the ether day and night.”<sup>85</sup> In addition, Riga Radio had attacked the Voice of America, Dean Acheson and Barrett in outlandish terms.<sup>86</sup>

Other ways that the Soviet media coped with VOA broadcasts perhaps offer a better way to assess the effectiveness of VOA Baltic broadcasts. The day before VOA broadcasts to Lithuania began, Radio Vilna began its own broadcasts. Radio Vilna warned Lithuanians not to listen to the VOA since they were parts of the “imperial aggression” against the Lithuanian People and that “America is looking for new victims near the Baltic, but the Lithuanian nation will give the right answer to American slave-traders and aggression.”<sup>87</sup> This commentary was repeated on 16 and 17 February. After the beginning of Estonian broadcasts, the radio in Tallinn began broadcasting “Dangerous people stand behind the capitalist newspapers and radios. The VOA and BBC broadcasts to Estonia and the USSR to undermine the morals of our young people, to infect them with vicious qualities and brutish instincts, to train robbers and ravishers who can be used in aggressive ways.”<sup>88</sup>

The State Department acknowledged that they had almost no reliable information on the size of the audience reached by the VOA Baltic language broadcasts. In addition, they sent memos to American embassies and consulates around the world asking that should they come across Baltic refugees they should inquire about the status of American sponsored broadcasts in their homelands. The anecdotal information forwarded from American missions abroad seemed to reinforce the initial reports on the status of VOA broadcasts in the Soviet Baltic republics. Additionally, the frequent mention of the Voice of America made by Soviet-

---

<sup>85</sup> 1952 Document on VOA Broadcasts to the Baltic States, Folder: B891 VOA, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

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

<sup>87</sup> Free Europe Press Service #156 23 April 1951. 1952 Document on VOA Broadcasts to the Baltic States, Folder: B801.5 RFE, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*

controlled press and radio in the Baltic area appeared to substantiated the reports, and at the very least strike a nerve with Soviet officials.

The evaluation of the actual broadcasting content, however, was significantly more complicated to assess. Escapees that were interviewed by American diplomats abroad provided some insight about how VOA broadcasts were interpreted by Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians residing behind the Iron Curtain. A prime example was an interview given by a Lithuanian escapee at the American consulate in Frankfurt. While the source refused to make any estimate of the number of people in Lithuania who listen to the Voice of America, he offered two important feedback points for the Americans. First, the bulk of listeners reside in the urban areas of the republic – naturally where there existed the largest number of receivers. Second, the source stated that most Lithuanians compared what the VOA broadcasts with what Radio Moscow broadcasts and can draw their conclusions. Anecdotally, the source stated that the VOA could be improved by providing more concrete news concerning the Lithuanian émigré community and international affairs in general.<sup>89</sup>

After several years of broadcasting to the Baltic republics, there were two main problems relevant to augmenting and improving American policy towards Baltic broadcasts. First, two differing views towards the émigrés emerged within the State Department. IBD and USIA officials repeatedly failed to recognize the intricate exile politics that were being engaged in under their watch. Baltic desk officers were forced to try to mediate conflict among exiles groups that got into spats over radio broadcasts. The result was that the heads of the broadcast desks began to assert more control over the broadcasts. Second, the State Department still did not have a reliable source of information within the Baltic republics. The random interviews that were conducted at American embassies were helpful but totally anecdotal. The main source of information continued to be the émigrés.

---

<sup>89</sup> Frankfurt to State on 20 November 1951 1952 Document on VOA Broadcasts to the Baltic States, Folder: B891 VOA, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

IBD officials stated that they were not concerned with the internal politics of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian émigré communities since VOA broadcasts were strictly an American foreign policy initiative. This was the official line that policymakers took to deal with the Jurgela – London squabble during 1951. On the other hand, Baltic Desk Officers, such as Vedeler were quite sensitive to the impact that the VOA broadcasts had on the Baltic diasporas. Officials that strictly dealt with the radio broadcasts might not have paid particular attention to political intrigue within the émigré groups, but officials, such as those who worked at the Baltic desk, were keenly aware that the success of VOA broadcasts was often based on the availability of good intelligence of the Baltic republics and that one way of extracting good information was “keeping the peace” within the individual diasporas.

One particular goal of VOA broadcasts was not only to counteract internal Soviet propaganda, but also to offer an alternative international news source about life in the United States and the activities of the broader diasporas.<sup>90</sup> The focus on the diasporas was in the hopes of improving morale of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians residing behind the Iron Curtain through demonstrating that their compatriots were organized and fighting on their behalf for the eventual liberation of their homelands. The fact that the wider American foreign policy establishment viewed Baltic VOA broadcasts as a substitute for proper Baltic RFE broadcasts necessarily meant that there was a strong emphasis on the émigré communities.

The disconnect between the VOA officials and the Baltic desk officials resulted in a situation where a handful of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exiles exerted their own control over an official American foreign policy apparatus – the Voice of America – as it pertained to their homelands. The American government made broad distinctions between those who were American citizens and those that were in the process of becoming American

---

<sup>90</sup> Heil, 138-141.

citizens, and those that were foreign nationals who had no contacts with the United States besides diplomatic contacts. On the other hand, individual members of the Baltic diasporas did not draw similar distinctions between Balts residing in the United States and working towards citizenship and Balts residing in other countries. This created a situation where the Baltic exiles were able to directly influence American policy over broadcasts, but also necessarily created factions within the diaspora that proved to be inimical to American interests.

To deal with the exile problem, Harold Vedeler attempted to bring the Baltic VOA broadcasts back under close State Department supervision in April 1954 when he wrote to Pratt of IBD stating that he was looking for an arrangement where the Baltic Desk could be regularly informed about the daily contents of the Voice of America broadcasts. The Baltic Desk generally felt the lack of necessary information to best handle relations with the exiles as well as how best to provide policy guidance on broadcasts.<sup>91</sup> Specifically, Vedeler sought more information to analyze the direct relationship between American policy towards the Baltic republics (radio broadcasts) and the level of cooperation among the various elite groups. From May 1954 onwards, the Baltic Desk began receiving three types of reports on VOA broadcasts. First, period memoranda briefly described the contents of the Baltic language transmissions. Second, monitors' reports isolated one program selected among the many broadcasts over the course of several days. Third, USIA daily broadcast content reports provided headlines and titles relating to each of the Baltic language broadcasts.<sup>92</sup>

The Baltic Desk analysis suggested that the reports were adequate in providing information about the general nature of topics dealt with in VOA Baltic broadcasts, it was impossible to tell just how a particular topic was treated and the tone used. As a result,

---

<sup>91</sup> 28 April 1954 Vedeler to Pratt on Updates on VOA Baltic Broadcasting 28 April 1954 Folder: B891 VOA, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*

Vedeler charged the Baltic Desk staff to establish a detailed policy paper on the functions, purposes, and particular problems that faced VOA Baltic broadcasts going forward.

By the end of May 1954, the policy paper was completed and forwarded to IBD for the Baltic radio desks' staffs. Much of the paper reinforced existing broadcasting policy to the Baltic republics, namely VOA was to report objective material relating to developments inside and outside of the Baltic States; to report and comment on activities of the Baltic emigration, including the Baltic diplomats; and to disseminate authoritative statements of USG officials, legislators, and influential private citizens related directly or indirectly to the cause of Baltic independence. Several new specific concerns were addressed. First, Baltic radio broadcasts were to "present an encouraging picture of developments in the Baltic emigration despite the existence of various and sometimes mutually denigrating factions and personalities." Second, broadcasts were to "describe the activities of Baltic émigré groups in such a manner as not to appear to favor one political current or party over another."<sup>93</sup> Third, broadcasts were to "encourage a spirit of resistance to the Soviet system without adding to the already considerable anti-Russian sentiment of the Baltic peoples, which could adversely affect our present relationship with the Russian people and prejudge a future establishment of friendly cooperation between independent Baltic and Russian peoples."<sup>94</sup>

To address the lack of solid information about how the broadcasts were perceived from within the Baltic republics, the Department sought to formalize the policy of having American missions abroad interrogate escapees on affairs within the Soviet Union. On 9 February 1954, the Secretary of State sent a memo to all embassies abroad requesting that "should come to notice in the future any cases of visits of European commercial representatives, artists, or athletes to or through the Baltic countries, it is requested that the

---

<sup>93</sup> VOA Baltic Broadcasts Policy Memo, May 1954 Folder: B891 VOA, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*



Foreign Service post concerned endeavor to ascertain what the visitor observed, particularly in relation to the Voice of America.”<sup>95</sup>

One notable example was the interrogation of a Lithuanian who fled from Vilnius to Tel Aviv, Israel in 1955. On 10 August, the State Department instructed the American Embassy to re-interrogate the Lithuanian to obtain “more information about radio broadcasts from the West.” Specific questions included “Just how serious was the jamming?” “Was an effort made to keep people from listening to the broadcasts?” “What was the official attitude towards them?” “What was the people’s interest in the broadcasts?” “Did they make an effort to listen even if there was official disapproval?”

Nevertheless, the émigré community continued to provide State Department officials with the most regular critiques of VOA broadcasting to the Baltic republics. During November 1954 as part of the celebrations of Latvian Independence Day in Lubwibsburg, Germany, James Pratt, an American diplomat in Frankfurt, met with Robert Liepins, perhaps the most well-respected Latvian in Europe to discuss the current state of affairs towards the liberation of the Baltic States. Radio broadcasts naturally came up in the discussion and Pratt solicited Liepins views on the broadcasts. Liepins replied that VOA programs are regularly listened to despite constant jamming. He personally felt that the broadcasts were too short in length, but that they reinforced the confidence that the Latvian people had in the United States, as they were “doing all it can to liberate them [the Latvians].”<sup>96</sup>

This policy proposal by the Baltic desk exposed the inherent problems and contradictions in American public diplomatic policy towards the Baltic republics. While the VOA did provide more accurate information on world affairs than its Soviet equivalent in the Baltic region, the State Department was not unwilling to engage in negative propaganda

---

<sup>95</sup> State Department to Embassies Abroad 9 February 1954, Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 760A.00/2-954.

<sup>96</sup> 2 November 1954 Memorandum of Conversation, Pratt and Liepins, Folder: B801 General Political Affairs External, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

against the Baltic republics when it came to informing Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians what was occurring within their broader communities. Despite cooperation on many levels within the Baltic diasporas, there were too many factions that would have had a negative impact on Estonian, Latvian, or Lithuanian politics if they were to play an active role in post-liberation activities. Additionally, the relatively isolated position of the individual Baltic desks within the bureaucracy suggests that one political faction could have been favored over another. Simply, VOA staff did not hire employees based on political orientation in a similar way that the Baltic Consultative Panels had been created.

Even more contentious was the policy of encouraging a spirit of resistance to the Soviet system without adding to anti-Russian sentiment. From the perspective of the Baltic exiles that were in charge of VOA broadcasts, encouraging resistance to the Soviet system necessarily meant increasing anti-Russian sentiment. Opposition to the Soviet system among Free Balts and Balts behind the Iron Curtain took on a nationalistic attitude throughout the entire Cold War where Soviet tyranny equated Russian colonialism. While it was understandable for American policymakers to desire a post-independent Baltic region where Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania would be able to coexist with a democratic Russia, it demonstrates two competing interests in American policy towards the region. On one hand, the United States did not want to unnecessarily escalate tensions with the Soviet Union and wanted to foment better relations in a post-Cold War environment. On the other hand, the United States wanted to continue to combat Soviet aggression rhetorically by continuing to support the cause of the Baltic republics. It also demonstrates the hierarchy of American interests in the region – relations with the Russians were always preeminent over relations with the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians.

### Conclusion

The idea that public diplomacy could help hasten the dissolution of the Soviet bloc brought about a coalescing of interests between American foreign policy makers and Baltic refugees. American sponsored radio broadcasts to the Baltic republics through the VOA were ultimately successful for both the American government and the Baltic exiles. The brisk response that Soviet officials and its media outlets demonstrate, at least slightly, that the Baltic republics were sensitive to the American broadcasts. Meanwhile, the Baltic exiles were provided with a medium where they were not only able to explain what life in the United States was like and to report international news events, but were also able to describe the reorganization of Baltic life in exile and remind those left behind that Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in the West were fighting for their freedom. This convergence of interests, however, was not immune to regular misunderstandings between Americans and the Baltic exiles.

For the State Department, radio broadcasts were a way of disseminating information into the Soviet bloc in the hopes that it would stir discontent among the polity, and as a result force the Kremlin to utilize resources that it would otherwise direct towards aggressive actions against the West on maintaining its own authority. Broadly, the utilization of exiles over RFE was a means of creating plausible deniability when it came to diplomatic protocol with various regimes. Policymakers, however, were unencumbered when it came to broadcasts in the Baltic languages due to the non-recognition of Soviet control over Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The Americans viewed VOA and RFE as official foreign policy initiatives and the financial cost of such initiatives played a role in considering where to best utilize limited resources.

Once IBD authorized VOA broadcasts in the three Baltic languages and the State Department approved of allowing Baltic émigrés to play a major role in the broadcasting, the burden for justifying Baltic broadcasts over RFE dramatically increased considering the

additional costs involved. To put the costs of Baltic broadcasting over RFE in perspective, a study in 1952 compared a proposed Baltic budget to the Czechoslovakian broadcasting budget.

Of the 1952-1953 budget, it is estimated that 25% can be attributed to the cost of operating the Czech desk. This estimate of 25% is arrived at with the knowledge that the minimum cost would be 1/6 (six satellites now receiving broadcasts) of that total and that the maximum cost less the broadcasts to Albania, Bulgaria, and Romania would be 1/3 of the total. It is felt that 1/4 or 25% therefore is a fair figure to assign to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary each, and to Albania, Bulgaria, and Romania as a group. There are 2.7 million radio sets in Czechoslovakia. Based on the above, RFE is spending \$.762 per set annually to reach this target.

It is conservatively estimated that to operate the same number of hours to each of the Baltic countries as we do to Czechoslovakia for one year it would cost \$6,250,000. Assuming each of the Baltic countries will represent 1/3 of this cost and with the knowledge that in Estonia there are 78,000 radio sets, it can be said that RFE would be spending \$26.70 per set annually to broadcast to Estonia. There are 343,000 radio sets altogether in the Baltics. To broadcast to all three countries, RFE would spend \$18.22 per set annually.<sup>97</sup>

Given the huge costs involved relative to other RFE broadcasts, American officials simply could not advocate continuing the plan for Baltic broadcasts since all policy considerations could be met via the Voice of America.

Individual exiles and émigré organizations that pushed for radio broadcasts to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania realized that American sponsored broadcasts were indeed a policy initiative by the United States. During every meeting that organization representatives, individual exiles, and diplomats had with State Department officials, it was consistently restated that broadcasts were a component of American policy towards the Soviet Union. The ambiguous nature of the FEC and RFE, coupled with its strong rhetoric that it allowed free members of Eastern European diasporas to speak directly to their compatriots in the Soviet bloc created a situation where a feeling of American altruism was perceived. The two rhetorical components that Baltic diplomats used to lobby for RFE broadcasts was that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were the first victims of communist aggression and that they

---

<sup>97</sup> Comparison of Costs Incurred Operating RFE to Czechoslovakia and the Baltic Countries per Radio Set” Internal RFE Memorandum. 12 August 1953. RFE/RL Corporate Records Collection. Hoover Institution Archives, Box 152, Folder 11.

deserved to have access to the same broadcast medium that émigrés from other Eastern European countries had, and that anything short of RFE access would be interpreted as slighting the Baltic States.

The symbolism of RFE Baltic broadcasts was of high importance for almost all Baltic émigré groups. There was a universal belief that only a radio station designed around the idea of allowing Free Estonians, Latvians, or Lithuanians to design their own broadcasts was sufficient in meeting the émigré desire to reestablish contacts with their homelands. Clinging to this symbolism resulted in a significant amount of rejection of VOA Baltic broadcasts being an adequate substitute for RFE broadcasts. Upon finding out that the State Department believed that VOA broadcasts in Latvian could completely cover the needs of the Latvian nation and that there was no need for Latvian broadcasts over the RFE, Feldmans argued that it was not sufficient to merely allow the Latvian Consultative Panel access to the VOA radio desk.

For the sake of clarity let it be said that the intention of the Latvian Consultative Panel had never been to duplicate the VOA broadcasts. VOA is an official agency of the USA created for the purpose of explaining to the peoples of the world the American policy, the American way of life and for an overall fight against communism. This the VOA has been performing with good results and the Latvian emigration has repeatedly expressed its gratitude for the inclusion of their enslaved compatriots among its nations to whom the great American nation is sending its message. This however covers only part of the Latvian needs – the VOA cannot and does not act as the speaker of Free Latvians. It is for Free Latvians themselves and not only the Latvian Consultative Panel to take care of their specific problems designed to help their compatriots at home.<sup>98</sup>

Feldmans continued by outlining what specifically would be different about a Latvian RFE broadcast compared to what was being broadcast over VOA. The three features included presenting only news that directly or indirectly concerns Latvia or Latvians; programming

---

<sup>98</sup> Feldmans to State Department 24 April 1952 Folder: B891. VOA Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 3, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

that included speeches by Latvian leaders told through their own voice and not an anonymous lector; and the constant reminding of Latvians that “the free world has not forgotten you.”<sup>99</sup>

The implicit rejection by Baltic émigrés of the Voice of America was a sufficient replacement for RFE broadcasts to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania had two long-term implications. The decision to continue fighting for the FEC to include Baltic languages in their broadcasting program was something that virtually all Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians living in the West could agree on, regardless of their nationality, political ideology, or geographic locations. It provided a platform for Baltic organizations to organize and demonstrate to American policymakers, as well as the polity that Balts were an organized force against communism. At the same time, however, this sent a strong message to State Department officials that Balts were extremely sensitive to the smallest change in policy towards their homelands. While it became difficult to change existing policy, it made it more difficult to create possibly more ambitious policy that could help the Baltic republics in the long-term.<sup>7</sup>

In reality, however, these three features were included in all Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian VOA broadcasts during the early 1950s. Of course news about the United States and other parts of the world were included over the VOA broadcasts, but significant attention was given to news that directly related to the Soviet occupied Baltic republics as well as political and cultural developments within the Baltic diasporas. The VOA naturally felt compelled to include speeches and statements by prominent American politicians, but on a regular basis, Baltic diplomats, exile leaders, and Baltic Americans were featured over the Voice of America. The regular referencing of the non-recognition policy and the statements given by leaders over VOA attempted to boost the morale of Balts residing in the Soviet Union and remind them that the West did not forget them.

---

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*

The importance of symbolism must also be put into the broader context of how Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians residing in the Soviet Union could listen to the VOA. According to contemporary reports, local security forces in Kaunas and Vilnius were ordered on 1 April 1951 to confiscate all radio sets that happened to run on batteries.<sup>100</sup> Throughout the entire region, there was a shortage of radio tubes and batteries. As soon as the broadcasts began, the Soviet Union began aggressive jamming campaigns against the VOA Baltic broadcasts. Based on monitoring reports near the Eastern border of Estonia, near Leningrad, and the Polish-Lithuanian border, only three-quarters of the Baltic language broadcasts were understandable.<sup>101</sup>

Under conditions where the very supplies need to listen to shortwave radio, such as batteries and radio tubes were in short supply, where listeners were forced to listen to the radios clandestinely for fear of being arrested, and where the radio sets had to combat jamming on a regular basis, it is reasonable to assume that it made very little difference whether or not the radio broadcasts that informed Baltic listeners to world events, American news, and developments within the Baltic diasporas were under the banner of the Voice of America or Radio Free Europe.

Anecdotally, on 14 August 1951, three young Lithuanians who had fled to Sweden in a fishing boat stated that they had regularly listened to VOA Lithuanian broadcasts in Klaipeda and that they felt well informed about the international situation. When asked whether or not VOA was widely known throughout the country, they replied that knowledge of VOA broadcast in Lithuania is spreading quickly due to word of mouth. Two interesting points that the informants made though, were that VOA Lithuanian programs were of great

---

<sup>100</sup> Free Europe Press Service #162 1 May 1951. Folder: B801.5 RFE, Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 3, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>101</sup> VOA Effectiveness in the Baltic Countries 'Evidence of Penetration' Folder: B891 VOA Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 3, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

importance to the country since the Russian language is not as general as might be expected after the long Soviet occupation. Secondly, is the fact that Lithuanians feel that they have not been forgotten.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> 14 August 1951 FNS Release Np. 13/3027. Folder: B801.5 RFE Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 3, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.



## CHAPTER V

### DOMESTIC IMPLICATIONS OF BALTIC POLITICAL ACTIVISM

While most constituent requests to meet with the President of the United States are declined, citing scheduling conflicts, President Harry S. Truman met with a delegation of prominent Lithuanian Americans on 29 October 1946 at the White House.<sup>1</sup> Although the delegation primarily consisted of members of the American Lithuanian Council, other Lithuanian organizations were represented in the delegation to Washington. During the fifteen minutes that the Lithuanians were allotted, Truman and the Lithuanians discussed the two most important issues for Lithuanian Americans in the immediate postwar years – the plight of displaced persons in Europe and what the political future would hold for Lithuania. According to the meeting’s records, Truman expressed his concerns for the displaced persons, citing his encounters with Lithuanian refugees that he had during his recent trip to Germany.<sup>2</sup> Truman also reaffirmed his belief in the principles of justice for all nations, large and small. When questioned about the future of the Baltic States, the President conceded that there had been “difficulties of the period of transition from war to peace,” but he reassured the Lithuanians that “American policy regarding the Baltic States did not change, cannot change, and will not change.”<sup>3</sup>

The 29 October meeting represented a small portion of Truman’s daily schedule and the important American newspapers barely covered the event.<sup>4</sup> For Lithuanian Americans, however, the meeting with the President not only received widespread coverage in their own press, but also was a teachable moment where they discovered that they did have access to

---

<sup>1</sup> Lithuanian Democratic League of Cook County Memo, “American Lithuanian Delegation to meet with Harry S. Truman on Tuesday, October 29, 1946” Folder 314: Lithuanian Miscellaneous, Box 997, White House Central Files, HSTPL.

<sup>2</sup> “President Reaffirms American Baltic Policy” *Lithuanian Bulletin* October 1946.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> The event received small write-ups in the New York Times, Washington Post, and Chicago Tribune on 30 October 1946.

centers of political power in the American federal government.<sup>5</sup> There were no additional meetings with Truman and appearances with future American Presidents were few and far between, but written correspondences with the White House and regular meetings with the State Department would become the norm throughout the following decades.

Constituent meetings and correspondences can rightly be described as symbolic in nature. Indeed, meetings between Baltic constituent groups and American officials had very different objectives and policy implications than the meetings between the exiled diplomats or CIA-sponsored organizations and American officials. Nevertheless, over the course of the 1950s the symbolic would become increasingly important, not only in maintaining the credibility of American policy towards the Baltic republics, but in ensuring that the Cold War maintained domestic support. Internally, policymakers were quite successful in maintaining the artificial barrier between “East European exile residing in the United States” and “ethnic American.” From the perspective of the American public and members of Congress, this artificial barrier was very easily blurred. As a result, components of American foreign policy crept into the domestic debate and the symbiotic relationship between American officials and Baltic refugees deepened.

This chapter will examine three areas where the activities of Baltic exiles in the United States assumed the role of political constituents and influenced the anti-communist debate in the United States. First, the celebration of anniversaries, where the statements of leading Balts, American politicians, and the rallies associated with important anniversaries for the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians bolstered the anti-communist sentiment in public spaces. Second, publishing periodicals and books, in both the English language where the writings of Baltic academics and thinkers established a monopoly on credible information about their homelands. Third, vigorously establishing contacts with the United States

---

<sup>5</sup> The front pages of *Draugas* as well as the *Lithuanian Bulletin* featured photos of Truman with the Lithuanian Delegation in the Rose Garden.

Congress, where concurrent resolutions were passed and Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians became a small but important voting bloc in domestic American politics.

This chapter will also examine the impact that these public activities of the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians had on the creation of a cohesive discourse defining what it meant to be a politically active Balt during the Cold War. I will argue that while maintaining an identity as an exile was an important component for relations within the individual diasporas, the growing importance of an identity as a constituent in the United States allowed for a flexibility in maneuvering the political and social contours of the United States during the Cold War and a greater level of effectiveness.

First, however, it is important to understand the role that anti-Communism as well as American foreign policy had on American domestic politics during the early Cold War period. It is also important to highlight the blurring phenomenon between exiles and constituents that existed exclusively within the United States. In a period of increasing global tensions, best exemplified by the Korean War, the mainstream political debate was not between socialists and anti-communists, but between parties that differed in how best to maintain anti-communist sentiments in the United States. The domestic impact of American policy towards the Baltic republics played a small, but not insignificant component in this political dynamic.

### *Anti-Communism, American Foreign Policy, and Ethnic Anti-Communism in Domestic Politics*

Anti-communism as a political idea in the United States was not an inherently Cold War phenomenon. In the aftermath of the Russian Revolution, there was great concern that new immigrants and the burgeoning labor movement would expose the United States to a

domestic communist threat.<sup>6</sup> World War II, however, offered American communists a respite and worked towards discrediting the anti-communist movement. Some anti-communists felt that their influence was waning due to Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. Indeed, many thought that the New Deal exposed Roosevelt to be, at best, a communist sympathizer. The most significant reason for anti-communists being discredited during the early 1940s was the idea that failing to denounce them would threaten the wartime alliance with the Soviet Union – the alliance that was seen as the only hope of creating a peaceful post-war world.<sup>7</sup>

The defeat of Nazi Germany ended war in Europe, but for portions of the American public, it did not create a perception of establishing a peaceful post-war world. The failure of American-Soviet cooperation in the postwar period and Stalin's insistence on establishing a political, economic, and military sphere of influence across half of Europe rejuvenated anti-communism as a mainstream political idea in the United States. From World War II until the outbreak of the Korean War, anti-communist Americans of all political and social stripes were able to establish a broad agenda to combat communism despite differing political positions on a number of different issues.<sup>8</sup> Although they shared a broad agenda, there were continual disagreements about how best to start a civic debate to combat communism in the United States.

For instance, all anti-communists believed that the American public should be educated about the true nature of communism. However, there was disagreement about the proper method in doing so. Liberal anti-communists held the opinion that an objective discussion of communism's record was sufficient, while conservatives thought that anti-communism must be placed within a broader debate including the religious and moral

---

<sup>6</sup> See: Richard Gid Powers, *Not Without Honor: The History of American Anticommunism* (New York: The Free Press, 1995), 1-42. M.J Heale, *American Anti-Communism: Combating the Enemy Within, 1830-1970* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 42-99. & John E. Hayes, *Red Scare or Red Menace?: American Communism and Anti Communism in the Cold War Era* (Lanham, MD: Ivan R. Dee Publisher, 1995), 3-17.

<sup>7</sup> Richard Gid Powers, *Not Without Honor*, 188.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid*, 192.

imperatives of American democracy.<sup>9</sup> According to historian Richard Gid Powers, “The public’s debate on the Communist issue was none too genteel – it was messy and sometimes frightening – but it was probably the only way a great, unsophisticated, none-too-educated democracy could ever grapple with such an awesomely complex issue.”<sup>10</sup>

Anti-communist activities manifested themselves in a number of ways during the late 1940s and 1950s. Magazines and other periodicals were published as a means of educating the American public about the dangers of communism. Rallies and conferences of anti-communist grassroots organizations provided a very public face to anti-communism’s growing importance in the country. In addition, the political atmosphere allowed for the United States Congress to begin holding hearings on communist activity, such as the reconstitution of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) in 1947.<sup>11</sup>

Anti-communism’s bipartisan nature began to fray when McCarthyism began to define mainstream anti-communism from 1950-1954. McCarthy’s hearings on the Government Operation Committee’s Subcommittee on Investigations helped to redefine what anti-communism represented. Instead of exposing the true nature of the Soviet Union and highlighting the positive attributes of American democracy, anti-communism soon represented the stereotypes that the phenomenon’s opponents hoped to create – a movement that was fraught with conspiracy theories and lies.<sup>12</sup> Although anti-communism never completely recovered from Joseph McCarthy’s legacy, its opponents never were able to entirely remove the visceral role that anti-communism would play in domestic politics during the Cold War.

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 251.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> HUAC was primarily a symbol of right-wing opposition to the New Deal so the Committee’s reconstitution in 1947 should be seen through this prism.

<sup>12</sup> Craig and Logevall, *America’s Cold War: The Politics of Insecurity*, 123.

The 1952 Presidential Election offer a clear example of how deeply engrained anti-communism had become in the fabric of American politics during the 1950s. Although Dwight D. Eisenhower had supported most of Truman's foreign policy initiatives, including its policy of containment, Truman's handling of the Soviet Union and communism became an important component of the campaign. The Republican Platform accused the Democratic Party, which had controlled the White House since 1933, that containment was an amoral policy, that concessions at Yalta were responsible for the geopolitical situation in Eastern Europe, that Truman had "lost" China, and that the Americans had lost the initiative in the fight against communism in Korea.<sup>13</sup>

Grassroots anti-communist activities continued to operate despite the negative attention it gained during McCarthyism and indeed it managed to survive and flourish on a much smaller scale throughout the 1950s. One faction within the anti-communist coalition of the 1940s that became more prominent in the 1950s was the ethnic anti-communist. On one hand, ethnic anti-communism is a very specific term that refers to ethnic groups in the United States during the Cold War whose homelands fell under a communist regime.<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, the phenomenon is quite complex and encompasses a number of elements ranging from émigré politics and relations with homelands to specific lobbying activities directed at centers of political power. Perhaps the most important element of defining ethnic anti-communism is that it is predominantly an American phenomenon.<sup>15</sup>

Eastern European refugees residing in the United States were able to assume a number of identities dependent on the audience for their message. In relations with fellow émigré members, refugees portrayed themselves as fellow exiles who were fighting for the

---

<sup>13</sup> See: Athan G. Theoharis, *The Yalta Myths: An Issue in U.S. Politics, 1945-1955*, (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1970). Starting in the late 1940s and culminating in the 1952 Election, the Republican started to make inroads in Eastern European ethnic constituents claiming that the Roosevelt's Democratic Party had failed in bringing peace to Eastern Europe.

<sup>14</sup> John Radzilowski, "Ethnic Anti-Communism in the United States" in Ieva Zake ed. *Anti-Communist Minorities in the U.S.: Political Activism of Ethnic Refugees* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009), 2.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

liberation of their homelands. In relations with State Department officials refugees attempted to portray themselves as either exiles who were useful in waging the Cold War or as a domestic interest group. To members of Congress, refugees were considered an important voting bloc. Finally, to the broader American public, refugees attempted to portray themselves as loyal to the United States and supported the country in its policies against the Soviet Union.

The convergence of interests between the American public, American policymakers, and refugee groups in the United States allowed for refugees to reasonably argue that they were able to maintain their loyalty to their homeland while demonstrating American patriotism. As a result, when it came to the domestic debate about American policy towards Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union a conflict emerged between the desire of American policymakers to maintain strict boundaries between exile activities and the activities of ethnic Americans, and the perception of both groups' activities in the United States. Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were perhaps the easiest refugee groups to uphold this strict boundary between exile and ethnic American. The non-recognition policy made it clear that there were official relations between at least a handful of Baltic exiles who had no desire to assimilate into the United States – the officially accredited diplomats. Nevertheless, for even the Baltic refugees, the line between exile and ethnic American blurred.

An example that highlights this blurring is evident in the long-standing policy that exiles that were associated with the FEC were forbidden from participating in the domestic American political debate. This fact, however, did not prevent Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, Chair of the Free Lithuania Committee from drafting a letter to the *New York Times*' editor on 18 June 1952 on the 1952 Republican Platform. He wrote:

As a political exile now enjoying the hospitality of this great country, it is not my intention to meddle in its internal policy and in the relations between the two political parties. But it was a great satisfaction to the Lithuanians to note the

Republican Party in its foreign policy plan took into consideration the fate of the Baltic States.

We never dreamed that the United States should have declared war on the Soviet Union because of her aggression our countries. But we firmly believe that the part of Europe which has been enslaved and in the wake of subsequent events will be liberated.<sup>16</sup>

While Sidzikauskas provided a caveat that he was an exile and not supposed to “meddle” in American internal policy, the act of writing to the *New York Times* in praise of the 1952 Republican Platform was indeed an act of engaging in the American domestic debate. For the bulk of the *New York Times*’ readership, whether or not Sidzikauskas was an exile or not was secondary to the fact that Lithuanians were supportive of the Republican Platform’s position on Eastern Europe in 1952.

As was the case with other anti-communist groups during the late 1940s and 1950s, Baltic anti-communism was based on creating very public symbolic demonstrations opposing the Soviet occupation of their homeland. Conferences, rallies, and meetings with American officials were organized to celebrate important anniversaries and advance their own foreign policy agendas. Publications, such as pamphlets, newsletters, and monographs, were distributed to inform the American public about the dangers of communism based on their own personal experiences with Soviet oppression. Finally, relationships were built with the United States Congress in order to diversify their options in fighting for Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian independence.

The U.S. Congress eventually became a more reliable partner to Baltic refugees and ethnic activists than the White House or State Department. In spite of the relatively small electoral footprint that Baltic exiles were able to exert outside the historic Lithuanian communities across the country, the larger East European community in the United States adopted the Baltic cause very easily. The annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

---

<sup>16</sup> VACLOVAS SIDZIKKAUSKAS,. "Soviet Invasion of Baltic States." *New York Times* (1923-Current file), July 18, 1952, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed March 17, 2011).



represented a worst-case scenario and a cause that all East Europeans could rally behind. Additionally, for every elected official like Senator Glenn H. Taylor, Senator from Idaho, who justified the annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as a response by Soviet Russia to reclaim breakaway areas integral to the Russian state, comparing it the potential reaction by the American federal government should a state secede from the Union, there existed a plethora of politicians who were either ideologically in sync with Baltic Americans and/or were willing to politicize the USSR's domination in East Europe.<sup>17</sup>

Baltic domestic anti-communist activities not only added to the tapestry of American political life, but also played an increasingly important role in the formulation of American foreign policy towards the Baltic States. Recent literature on the Cold War in the United States cite that domestic policy was not just important in foreign policy in terms of electoral politics and economic development, but also in limiting the number of acceptable choices that policymakers had towards a certain situation or a certain region.<sup>18</sup> This was certainly the hope of Baltic refugees living in the United States with regard to whether or not the United States was willing to continue the non-recognition policy.

Yet, another important component of the relationship between domestic and foreign policies was the active use of politically engaged factions of the American public to bolster a particular foreign policy initiative of the United States. The State Department had no interest in reconsidering the non-recognition policy since it was a useful rhetorical tool against the Soviet Union in international forums. At the same time, there was perpetual risk that the inherently exclusionary policy as it related to the territorial Baltic republics and the symbolic nature of continuing to accredit Baltic diplomats would lose its viability as the years passed. By being willing participants in the anti-communist activities of the Baltic refugees,

---

<sup>17</sup> Gabriel Almond, *The American People and Foreign Policy* (New York City, New York, 1960), 197.

<sup>18</sup> Craig and Logevall, 3. They argue that by 1949 the United States had successfully contained the Soviet Union but that "foreign policy was still dominated by political grandstanding and an alarmist militarism." They continue for "much of the Cold War, the domestic variable predominated over the foreign one."

American policymakers not only facilitated in blurring the line between Baltic exile and Baltic American, but began the process of blurring the line between foreign and domestic policies related to the Baltic republics.

### *The Commemoration of Holidays and Anniversaries*

Baltic refugees continued to celebrate the independence days of their home countries as well as commemorating the anniversaries of the June 1941 deportations of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian citizens by the Soviet Union just as they had while residing in DP camps before 1948. Local and national organizations held assemblies, passed resolutions, and organized exhibitions on independence days as well as on 14 June. Commemorating these important dates should not only be seen in the context of providing a sense of continuity between Baltic life in Europe and Baltic life in the United States, but must also be seen in the context of domestic politics in the United States and events in the Baltic republics during the Stalinist period.

An important contribution to the anti-communism movement by Baltic refugees was the belief that they had a unique insight into the motives and actions of the Soviet Union through their firsthand encounters with Soviet occupying forces from 1940-1941 and again from 1944 onwards. Baltic refugees focused on exposing the truth about the communist regime to the American public by recounting their memories of Soviet occupation.<sup>19</sup> In addition to the annexation that occurred in 1940, the deportation of tens of thousands of civilians in 1941 represented a chilling example of the brutality, totalitarian, and arbitrary nature of the Kremlin.

Deportations, however, were not just recent historical events that were worth commemorating to influence American public opinion about the dangers of communism. The

---

<sup>19</sup> Ieva Zake, "Multiple Fronts of the Cold War: Ethnic Anti-Communism of Latvian Emigres" in Zake, *Anti-Communist Minorities in the US*, 129.

Soviet Union continued the practice of mass deportations after 1944 and actually accelerated the practice until the early 1950s. Consisting of two periods of deportations, the first in 1944-1945 and again from 1947-1949, an estimated 80,000 Estonians, 100,000 Latvians, and 260,000 Lithuanians were arrested or deported.<sup>20</sup> While Balts living in the free world generally had a difficult time receiving information about events in their homelands, contacts with partisan movements and the smuggling of information provided sufficient information about the deportations that were currently taking place in the Baltic republics.

The Baltic exiles naturally viewed the deportation of hundreds of thousands of their fellow citizens to Northern Russia, Siberia, and Central Asia as an existential threat to the future of the independent Baltic States that they were fighting for. As a result, the commemoration of the 1941 deportations provided Balts with the possibility of trying to influence the American public and their elected officials to establish new policies that could curtail future deportations in the Baltic republics. This was namely through offering Baltic deportations as a useful means for the State Department to rally against the Soviet Union in the United Nations General Assembly and for attempting to persuade the United States Senate to ratify the 1948 Genocide Convention.<sup>21</sup>

Baltic exiles, however, were not the only ones to utilize important Baltic holidays to promote foreign policy agendas. While much of the State Department's implementation of the non-recognition policy was important for the Baltic refugees, discrete policy issues – such as the decision to forego RFE broadcast in favor of VOA broadcasts, and to a lesser extent American-Soviet relations, it was important to make sure that the American decision not to

---

<sup>20</sup> Misiunas and Taagepera, *The Baltic States: Years of Dependence*, 358. For a description of the justification and manner in which people were executed see 73-99.

<sup>21</sup> See: Lawrence J. LeBlanc, *The United States and the Genocide Convention* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991). The UNGA began discussing the issue of genocide in 1946 and decided to sponsor an international legal instrument concerning it. Drafting of the convention was completed in 1948, but it was not until 1951 when enough countries had ratified the convention to bring the convention into effect. Despite President Truman and the State Department's support for the treaty's ratification, it was not until February 1986 when the Senate ratified the convention. Throughout the early Cold War years, the Genocide Convention became an important political objective for Eastern European American Constituents.

recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States became widely known among a broad segment of both domestic and international audiences. Thus, a key component of implementing the non-recognition policy was the drafting of national day messages by the State Department or White House that were sent to the Baltic representatives in the United States; responding to certain resolutions that the State Department received from various Baltic organizations; and allowing officials actively to participate in rallies and assemblies that commemorated the deportations, annexation, or national holidays.<sup>22</sup>

The two most important political means of commemorating the Baltic independence days and anniversaries of the annexation and 1941 deportations occurred through the holding of public rallies and the writing of resolutions that were submitted to American officials asking for American assistance in stopping the deportations and perceived genocide that was taking place in the Baltic republics. The decision by the State Department as well as elected officials to participate in the rallies and begin correspondences with the organizations that passed symbolic resolutions implies that these public anti-communist activities were perfectly acceptable with respect to American foreign policy. Although the State Department had certain criteria that had to be met concerning contacts with Baltic organizations in the United States, the seemingly arbitrary nature of these relations from the perception of outsiders coupled with the dual identities of leading Baltic exile figures had the effect of blurring the line between exile activities and constituent activities occurring in the United States.

Across the United States, wherever there were large numbers of Estonians, Latvians, or Lithuanians residing, local and national organizations that represented their interests held rallies, exhibits, or festivals that commemorated important dates or activities related to their

---

<sup>22</sup> See Paul A. Goble, "The Politics of a Principle: U.S. Non-Recognition Policy Before, During, and After the Recovery of Baltic Independence," in Hiden, et. al. *The Baltic Question During the Cold War*, 46. Goble claims that a close study of the national day messages reveal them to be a quite sensitive barometer of American government attitudes towards the Baltic republics.

ancestral homelands. In remembrance of Latvian Independence Day on 18 November, Estonian Independence Day on 24 February, and Lithuanian Independence Day on 16 February, the gatherings held in large cities, such as Chicago, New York, Boston, and Indianapolis featured speeches from prominent Baltic exiles that were employed by the FEC, their exiled diplomatic representatives, and on occasion elected officials.<sup>23</sup>

Perhaps the Baltic rally that received the highest profile during the 1950s was the annual Baltic States Freedom Rally that occurred in New York City annually, starting in June 1952. The Baltic States Freedom Rally was the product of efforts by the Baltic States Freedom Committee (BSFC). In a March 1952 joint meeting of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Consultative Panels, it was decided that three FEC sponsored panels should pool their efforts to commemorate the annexation of their homelands in 1940 as well as the deportations that took place in 1940 and 1941.<sup>24</sup> The rationale behind the panels' decision to create the BSFC was not only to demonstrate to the FEC that there were collaborative efforts among the three Baltic panels, but also to create a very visible rally in New York City to protest the Soviet Union and educate the American public about Soviet atrocities in the Baltic republics.<sup>25</sup> Vaclovas Sidzikauskas of the Lithuanian Panel was appointed Chairman of the BSFC and organizing a rally that would take place in June became one of the highest priority activities of the Baltic Consultative Panels throughout the spring of 1952.

Leading up to the Baltic States Freedom Rally that was to take place in New York City to commemorate the twelfth anniversary of the annexation and eleventh anniversary of the deportations, New York Governor Thomas E. Dewey issued a proclamation that 13 June 1952 would be declared as "Baltic States Freedom Day" in New York State claiming that the

---

<sup>23</sup> See Fund Memo #578 on Baltic Activities in 1951 "Folder: B801.4 Consultative Panels" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>24</sup> Unnumbered Fund Report on Baltic Activities in March 1952. "Folder: B801.4 Consultative Panels" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

United States “has quite properly declined to recognize the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.”<sup>26</sup> Throughout the day on 15 June, Baltic exiles handed out leaflets to the public throughout New York City and held an organized protest against the Soviet delegation to the United Nations with signs condemning the “lawless invasion of the Baltic States.”<sup>27</sup> The day’s events culminated in a rally at Town Hall where Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian folksongs were sung and the official messages of John Foster Dulles, W. Averell Harriman, and President Truman were read. Truman declared:

The Government and the people of the United States feel an instinctive and profound sympathy for the enslaved people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, coupled with revulsion at the acts of the occupying power whose forcible incorporation of the Baltic States we have never recognized.

We pay tribute to the determined endeavors of the diplomatic and other representatives of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on behalf of their homelands. We shall not forget our Baltic friends.

We extend through you to them, wherever they may be, our heartfelt hope that they may have the fortitude and patience to live through the grinding tyranny now imposed upon them to enjoy once again independence and freedom within the community of free nations.<sup>28</sup>

The White House’s willingness to draft a statement for the Baltic States Freedom Rally declaring that the United States continued to not recognize the Soviet annexation and imply that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania would regain their independence partly due to the efforts of Balts living in the United States not only added to the expectations of Balts in the United States that the Americans were working towards the liberation of their homelands, but it gave the appearance that American policy interests and Baltic exile interests were aligned in the public’s eyes.

---

<sup>26</sup> "Baltic Freedom Day Proclaimed." *New York Times* (1923-Current file), June 14, 1952, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed March 17, 2011).

<sup>27</sup> Undated Lithuanian Fund Memo “Folder: Li801.4 Committee for a Free Lithuania” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 11, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

<sup>28</sup> "BALTIC GROUPS HERE HOLD FREEDOM RALLY." *New York Times* (1923-Current file), June 16, 1952, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed March 25, 2011).

The positive experience in 1952 convinced the three Baltic panels to reconstitute the BSFC during a joint meeting on 6 March 1953.<sup>29</sup> Similar to the 1952 Baltic States Freedom Rally, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians met in New York City where declarations supporting the non-recognition policy and condemning deportations were read to the five hundred participants.<sup>30</sup> The internal State Department debate about the extent of cooperation between the American officials and the BSFC offers insight into the manner that policymakers dealt with events that were seen to be privately organized in the public's perception.

R.G. Johnson of the Baltic Desk relayed a memorandum to Emmet J. Hughes, Administrative Assistant to President Dwight D. Eisenhower on a recommended statement that the White House should issue to the BSFC. Johnson stated that the "BSFC was set up, in association with the National Committee for a Free Europe, primarily to coordinate the interests of various organizations of Americans of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian origin in an annual rally to commemorate the two principal tragedies in the recent history of the three Baltic States."<sup>31</sup> The State Department's recommended statement reinforced the themes that the United States continued to recognize the existing diplomatic missions of the Baltic States; condemned the deportations that were occurring; and that the Baltic States would regain their freedom in the future.<sup>32</sup>

In retrospect, it was certainly not surprising that the State Department would recommend that the White House should issue a statement of support to an activity that was

---

<sup>29</sup> Fund Memo #656 Monthly Report for March 1953 1 April 1953 "Folder: B801.4 Consultative Panels" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>30</sup> Fund Memo #739 Report for July 1953 1 August 1953. "Folder B801.4 Consultative Panels" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>31</sup> R.G. Johnson to Emmet J. Hughes "Memorandum for the White House" 3 June 1953 "Folder: B801.1 Emigre Organizations Abroad" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>32</sup> "Message to the Baltic States Freedom Committee" from Eisenhower, "Folder: B801.1 Emigre Organizations Abroad" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

an officially sanctioned event of the FEC. Although Johnson attempted specifically to segregate the BSFC's activities from those of Baltic American organizations by claiming that the BSFC was merely "coordinating the interest" of their activities, it is clear that there were no State Department objections to FEC sponsored exiles participating in events that were targeted towards a primarily domestic audience. In fact, one of the most successful aspects of the FEC's Baltic activities was harnessing the domestic political potential of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in the United States. Throughout Eisenhower's first term, the BSFC was reconstituted annually and eventually became more elaborate by including a larger number of speakers, larger audiences, and greater media coverage.<sup>33</sup>

The State Department recognized that 1950 was an important year for American policy. It marked the tenth anniversary of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and more importantly, the tenth anniversary of the United States' decision to not recognize the annexation. Leading up to the anniversary during the summer of 1950, the State Department and the White House began to receive numerous letters from individual Balts residing in the United States and resolutions from organizations demanding that the United States reaffirm its policy towards the Baltic States.<sup>34</sup> Additionally, the exiled Baltic diplomats as well as the most important Baltic organization in the country at the time, the ALT, requested audiences with President Truman to commemorate the long-standing non-recognition policy and the anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between Lithuania and the United States.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> For instance in 1954, the attendance increased by 50% and not only included the reading of submitted statements of American politicians by the BSFC, but included live speeches by politicians and the passing of official resolutions.

<sup>34</sup> There are over 200 such constituent letters filed in the State Department's Central Decimal File 1950-1954, in class "860B" NAII. in addition to numerous such letters Located in the Truman White House Central File See: Folder 472: Miscellaneous, Box 1356. Folder 314: Miscellaneous" Box 314. HSTPL.

<sup>35</sup> On 11 July 1950, Pius Grigaitis of the ALT wrote to Truman requesting a meeting on 27 July – commemorating the day that the United States granted *de jure* recognition to the Lithuanian government. "Folder: B711 Foreign Relations with the United States" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAII.



The possibility of meetings between the President and prominent Balts in the United States would not have only elevated the position of the Balts in the eyes of their fellow exiles, but also in American anti-communist circles. The meetings would also have provided the President the opportunity to very publicly make it clear to the American people as well as to international audiences that the United States supported the aspirations of small nations that had been the first victims of Soviet aggression. The outbreak of the Korean War on 25 June, however, brought about important national security questions related to meetings with the Baltic exiles. As it was clear that there was no confusing the exiled diplomats as private American citizens, the meeting between an American official and the Baltic diplomats was downgraded to the level of Assistant Secretary of State. On 27 July 1950, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs George W. Perkins met with the three Baltic diplomats to discuss the non-recognition issue as well as the deportation issue.<sup>36</sup>

The idea of a meeting between an ALT delegation and the White House proved to be an even more contentious debate. Under Secretary of State James E. Webb assumed the responsibility of making the decision about a possible meeting between any American official, let alone the President, within the Korean context. He argued to the White House:

While the question of receiving a delegation of American citizens of whatever lineage is primarily an internal matter, an audience such as the one proposed by Dr. Grigaitis would probably be regarded by the Soviet Government as an interview granted by the President to unofficial representatives of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. In view of this it is suggested that the same policy considerations guiding the Department with respect to the appointment requested by the official Baltic representatives with the Secretary are valid as well in the present case insofar as a foreign policy aspect is concerned.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, George Perkins, Povilas Žadeikis, Jules Feldmans, and Johannes Kaiv, "Aide Memoire left by Baltic representatives with Assistant Secretary Perkins on 27 July 1950" "Folder: B711 Foreign Relations with the United States" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>37</sup> On 20 July 1950, James E. Webb to Matthew Connelly (White House) "Baltic-American delegation's request for audience with the President on 27 July." "Folder: B711 Foreign Relations with the United States" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

The following day, a letter was sent to Grigaitis apologizing for the inability of the President or a senior ranking State Department official to meet with the a Lithuanian American delegation, although a scheduling conflict was used as an excuse and not the underlying foreign policy considerations.<sup>38</sup> Precedent was established that the State Department would utilize written correspondences to reaffirm American non-recognition policy on Baltic national holidays and deportation commemorations.

Every year the State Department would receive hundreds of letters from Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian organizations informing policymakers about their organization's meeting commemorating either independence day or the anniversaries of the annexation and deportations as well as the organization's passed resolutions. While the Public Views and Inquiries Section of the State Department would occasionally respond to a handful of correspondences, it eventually became policy that the Baltic Desk would handle correspondences with the most important Baltic Organizations in the United States: the ALT, ALA, and ENC.

One representative example of this phenomenon was the 17 February 1954 letter addressed to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles from Vaino Riismandel on behalf of the Estonian National Committee commemorating the 36<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Estonian independence. Riismandel informed Dulles that "Estonians all over the world and Americans of Estonian descent are gathering on February 24<sup>th</sup> in tribute to this steadfast adherence to the principle of non-recognition, in devotion for an uncompromising fight against communist imperialism, and in firm belief in the reestablishment of a free and independent Estonian state."<sup>39</sup> Riismandel continued, "The hope for the day of liberation is the source of strength to every

---

<sup>38</sup> Vedeler to Grigaitis, 21 July 1950, "Folder: B711 Foreign Relations with the United States" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>39</sup> Vaino Riismandel to John Foster Dulles, 17 February 1954, Central Decimal File, 1950-1954, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, NAI. 860B.424/2-1754.

Estonian, be he in the communist dominated Estonia or the free shores of this country.”<sup>40</sup> In response, Vedeler thanked the ENC for their support of the American liberation doctrine and reaffirmed the non-recognition policy.

Ultimately the decision whether or not to respond to a constituent letter was entirely at the discretion of State Department policymakers. On a regular basis letters would merely be filed and marked as not requiring a response. The decision to respond to the constituent letters of important Baltic organizations was an active policy decision by the State Department’s Baltic Desk. While the State Department was able to utilize constituent responses publicly to restate official American policy towards the Baltic States on national holidays and anniversaries, the Baltic constituents gained the most from regular correspondences with the State Department.

Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians regularly republished the responses they received from the State Department or the White House in their native language publications as well as their English language publications. For their fellow exile audiences, these publications were often used to elevate one organization’s standing within the broader diaspora by claiming that they had direct access to American policymakers. For the broader American audiences, these publications were often used to reinforce the Baltic claims that they had a unique perspective about the Soviet Union and were one of the most important pieces of the patchwork of American communism during the 1950s.

The regular nature of State Department correspondences to Baltic organizations to reaffirm the non-recognition policy increased Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian sensitivity to perceived changes in American policy while providing them with significant leverage over the State Department when it came to the sacrosanct nature of the non-recognition policy. Baltic organizations viewed many components of American foreign policy through the prism

---

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

of how it might impact on the American view towards the Baltic republics. In the event that there was a perceived change in any American posture towards the Soviet Union or if there was the slightest delay in an expected response from the State Department, there was a possibility that it could become a political problem, particularly during a period where the United States was seen to be actively promoting the liberation of the Soviet bloc and that the non-recognition policy was fundamentally important to a future democratic Eastern Europe.

As a result, the symbiotic relationship that developed between the prominent Baltic organizations during the 1950s and the State Department created a situation where there were broad constraints placed upon policymakers concerned with the Baltic republics. Even if international events had warranted a reassessment of the non-recognition policy and even if the policy no longer made sense in light of future developments, there was significant bureaucratic inertia behind the policy as well as significant domestic pressure placed on policymakers through the political activism of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian organizations.

### *Publications and the Monopolization of Information*

Baltic exiles engaged in a plethora of publishing activities once they arrived in the United States. The influx of refugees expanded the number of Baltic language publications not only by increasing the target audience's size, but also by improving the quality of the publications in terms of staffing and content. Baltic publishing, however, was not exclusively targeted towards their own communities. A number of publications in the English language were created with the establishment and/or expansion of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian national organizations. Baltic language publications were important in preserving the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian languages; deepening cultural developments while in exile; and expressing political disagreements within the diasporas. The English language

publications were important in that they demonstrated a certain level of solidarity among the three nationalities to non-Baltic audiences and expressed the Baltic exiles' political agenda while residing in the United States.

Latvians and Lithuanians residing in the United States were the most prolific in publishing periodicals directed towards a broader American audience. Perhaps the main reason where there were very few Estonian publications in the English language was the relatively small size of the Estonian American community and the lack of a sizable historic community in the United States. The *Lithuanian National Council of New York* sponsored the *Lithuanian Bulletin* and was a quarterly publication started in 1943. The Bulletin essentially acted as a clearinghouse of information for the American, German, and neutral-controlled media during World War II to provide information on the plight of occupied Lithuania.<sup>41</sup> In the context of the political consolidation of the Lithuanian American community, the ALT assumed control of the *Lithuanian Bulletin* in January 1947 and focused its attention on issues that were most pertinent to the Lithuanian community, such as the fate of Lithuanian DPs, the Genocide Convention, and atrocities committed by the Soviet Union.<sup>42</sup>

During the same time period, the *Latvian Information Bulletin*, provided similar information to an American audience about the historic and contemporary developments in Lithuania. Started by the Latvian Embassy in Washington in 1937, the *Bulletin* was a public diplomatic initiative that rapidly turned into a lobbying mechanism for Latvians living in the United States to influence American public opinion about their country after the 1940 annexation. However, there were clear differences between the *Lithuanian Bulletin* and the *Latvian Information Bulletin*. Since the Latvian publication continued to be the official publication of the exiled Latvian diplomatic mission, there was no way that it could be confused as a constituent publication like the Lithuanian publication. However, the

---

<sup>41</sup> See First Edition of the *Lithuanian Bulletin* published on 15 April 1943.

<sup>42</sup> *Lithuanian Bulletin* V, January -February 1947.

publications' information was rather similar, had similar audiences, and were presumably interpreted the same way by their readers.

The State Department and the FEC also played an important role in facilitating English language publishing by Baltic exiles. The State Department advocated that prominent Baltic exiles produce a White Book on Genocide in the Baltic republics that would play an important role in the event of the United States seeking to bring charges of genocide against the Soviet Union in the United Nations General Assembly. Since the FEC and State Department decided against using the Baltic Consultative Panels for radio broadcasts, officials decided that there should be close cooperation between the Baltic Consultative Panels and the FEC's Free Europe Press.

The genesis of an idea of a Baltic White Book on Genocide was during a joint Baltic Consultative Panel meeting in November 1951.<sup>43</sup> The White Book was to address the massacres and deportations of Baltic citizens by the Soviet Union from 1940 onwards and feature the stories of well known Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians who were targeted for deportation.<sup>44</sup> Throughout 1951 and 1952 all three Consultative Panels worked on the project and reached out to all segments of their diasporas for documents and personal accounts. The White Book's preparation included the collection of as many eyewitness affidavits as possible concerning Soviet genocidal acts.

In January 1952, Vedeler of the Baltic Desk forwarded a memo to the Policy Planning Staff on the proposed Baltic White Book on Genocide and its merits concerning American interests. Vedeler argued that if the White Book were both factually accurate as well as properly presented that it would be a "helpful contribution to the task of informing and

---

<sup>43</sup> Unnumbered Fund Memo on Lithuanian Panel Report November 1951 "Folder: B801.4 Consultative Panels" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>44</sup> Fund Memo #375, "Monthly Report on Estonian Panel for January 1952" 1 February 1952, "Folder: E801.4 Consultative Panels" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

alerting the free world with regard to Soviet practices.”<sup>45</sup> For the State Department, the White Book had potential importance since its contents would be useful in building a genocidal case for “possible presentation at an appropriate time in the United Nations.”<sup>46</sup>

The long-term publishing project and perhaps the Baltic Panels greatest legacy was the *Baltic Review*. In March 1952 the three Baltic Panels made the decision to reconstitute the old *Baltique Revue* that had first been published in 1940.<sup>47</sup> The *Baltic Review* was a collaborative journal published occasionally by the three Baltic Panels through the Free Europe Press. An important component of the *Baltic Review*'s collaborate nature was the rotating editorship based on nationality. That is, to ensure that one nationality would dominate the publication's content, each volume would feature an editor that would be rotate among the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. Throughout 1952 and 1953, the three Baltic Panels coordinated what their vision for the journal would be with the Free Europe Press leading to the inaugural volume being published in December 1953.

The inaugural issue explained the origin and purpose of the *Baltic Review*. While acknowledging that the journal hoped to continue the work of *Revue Baltique*, its editors described its two objectives:

The main objective of this Review is to inform the Western World of the Communist social, economic, and political system, propaganda and strategy, to acquaint the free world with the sacrifices and struggle of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples for the restoration of their independence, and to reveal the devious methods and processes of Soviet aggression and occupation. These methods and this strategy have as their aim the suppression of freedom, the extermination of peoples, and Soviet domination of the world.

Finally, and most important for the future, while promoting mutual cooperation among Baltic exile organizations, the Review will foster the idea of federation among

---

<sup>45</sup> Vedeler to Joyce “Desire of Baltic exiles to publish ‘White Book’ on Genocide Committed by Soviets in Baltic States” 15 January 1952. “Folder: B500 United Nations & Deportations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> Fund Memo #407 “Monthly Report for March 1952” 1 April 1952 “Folder: E801.4 Consultative Panels” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI. See Chapter 1 for more information on *Revue Baltique*.

Eastern and Central European nations in order that they may be included, after their liberation, in a united Europe.<sup>48</sup>

The *Baltic Review*'s two main audiences were the broader American public who would find the publication in their libraries, schools, and research institutions as well as the State Department. A careful reading of the publication's articles during its first few years reveal a specific political agenda that its authors hoped to impart upon both the American public and policymakers.

The Baltic Consultative Panels hoped to educate the American public about the true nature of the Soviet Union by exposing the Soviet Union as a nation whose values were antithetical to the conservative and religious nature of the United States. Simultaneously, the Panels hoped to show upon American policymakers that there was indeed a high level of cooperation among the three Baltic nationalities that was actually a historical phenomenon; that Baltic exiles thought that the United States should charge the Soviet Union with genocide in the United Nations; and that the Baltic Panels supported the American policy of liberating the Soviet bloc.

The *Baltic Review*'s December 1953 volume began by reminding its audience that the Baltic States were among the first victims of "Soviet Russia's aggression and her plans for world conquest" and that the "Baltic peoples form an important part of the anti-communist front" due to their geopolitical situation, Western culture, and Christian traditions.<sup>49</sup> The editorial staff believed that studying the Baltic example and keeping the international community informed on developments within the Baltic republics was important because "what happened to them could happen to the whole world."<sup>50</sup> Two prominent themes that the *Baltic Review* wished to share with international audiences on how the Soviet presence had

---

<sup>48</sup> *Baltic Review* #1 15-16.

<sup>49</sup> "To Our Readers" *Baltic Review* 1, 15.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*



demonstrably changed Baltic society for the worse include discussing the standard of living trajectory; the educational system; and the risk of Soviet inflicted genocide.

Aleksander Kütt, a prominent exiled Estonian economist, analyzed the deterioration of the Estonian living standard as a result of the Soviet occupation in March 1956. Kütt's article began by arguing that before World War II, Estonia should be seen as a country that did not quite have the standard of living as the Scandinavian countries or the United Kingdom, but was still higher than most other West European nations.<sup>51</sup> A comparison was also made to the growth of real wages in the United States by stating that from 1932-1939, Estonian wages rose 13 per cent per annum, which compared favorably with an American wage growth of 29 per cent from 1939 to 1953.<sup>52</sup> Before the Soviets arrived in 1940, Kütt claimed that Estonian farmers had been prosperous and its industrial work force had obtained near universal employment.<sup>53</sup>

Using resources made available from the Soviet Estonia media and statistics compiled by the Mid-European Studies Center, Kütt outlined the transformation process required to integrate the Estonian economy into the Soviet economy and the implications for wages and economic freedom in Soviet Estonia. Although Soviet authorities gradually increased food prices in an effort to reduce the Estonian living standard until the German Army arrived in 1941,<sup>54</sup> it was the postwar policy of maintaining wages while fluctuating the cost of goods that ultimately had a negative impact on wages in Soviet Estonia.<sup>55</sup> Kütt concluded that real wages in 1952 were 27.3 per cent of its level in 1939.<sup>56</sup> As to economic freedom, Kütt was concerned that the rapid industrial transformations that were taking place in Estonia were

---

<sup>51</sup> Aleksander Kütt, "Deterioration of the Estonian Living Standard During Soviet Occupation" *Baltic Review* 1, 15.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>53</sup> Kütt also emphasized the insignificant unemployment situation in Estonia from 1936-1940 by claiming that only .4 to 1.0 per cent of all industrial workers were registered as unemployed

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 19. The article conceded that this had been a phenomenon in other countries, such as the United States, but only 15.6 per cent less.

existential threats to its economic freedom. The decision to mandate all factories to work three shifts instead of one, the construction of new production plants, and the continuously rising working norms to fulfill the Five Year Plans were undermining the ability of Estonian citizens to pursue their own economic interests.<sup>57</sup> Additionally, the fact that Estonian economic output was being redistributed through the wider Soviet Union and to nations that the Soviet Union had trade agreements with was eroding the economic development of Estonia as an economic unit.<sup>58</sup>

It was important to draw comparisons with the economic standards of Western Europe and the United States to emphasize the similarities between Baltic economic conditions before 1940 and the changes that were ultimately made by the Soviet Union after the annexation. From the perspective of Estonians living in the free world, their home country was on a similar economic trajectory as the rest of Europe and the United States, but the Soviet annexation brought a foreign economic system that was ultimately detrimental to the nation's development. Drawing such comparisons bolstered the argument that the Soviet Union was a grave threat not only to small nations, but powerful ones such as the United States.

In the same issue, a former lawyer in Latvia who wished to remain anonymous wrote about the differences between the Latvian educational system and the changes that the Soviet Union imposed on the way that Latvians were educated.<sup>59</sup> The article attempted to undermine Soviet propaganda that the Soviet educational system was superior to the old Latvian system, through a detailed comparison of Latvia's educational system during the interwar period with what was known about the educational system in the 1950s.<sup>60</sup> The author argued that the

---

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid*, 21.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid*, 22.

<sup>59</sup> A.R. "School System in Occupied Latvia" *Baltic Review* 1, 23.

<sup>60</sup> Comparisons were made between the one year of primary school and six years of elementary school in independent Latvian versus the seven years of elementary school in Soviet Latvia; the distinctions between secondary education; as well as the differences in university life.

Soviet educational system was actually inferior to the old Latvian system due to the school system's administration as well as the importance of meeting economic and ideological objectives rather than traditional educational goals.

The author criticized the elementary school system's inability to maintain discipline among Latvia's youth or to have students complete the compulsory seven years of primary education. According to accounts from the Latvian Communist Party's main publication, *Cina*, the Minister of Education Vilis Samson revealed that there had been great "deficiencies" in the ability to halt the increase of hooliganism in schools and that many students are leaving school prematurely.<sup>61</sup> The author claimed that the main reason for children not completing their education was that the Soviet system had overloaded students with work outside of regular school assignments without any compensation.<sup>62</sup> Finally, the author described the strong ideological nature of the Soviet educational system. The article cites an editorial from Riga in 1955 that states "schools... must educate our young generation in the spirit of fierce Soviet patriotism, selfless loyalty to the Communist Party and Soviet Government."<sup>63</sup> This manifested itself in the textbooks that were used in elementary school as well as entire regiments of study at the university level. The author concluded that the Soviet Latvian educational system was incompatible with traditional Latvian values as anti-religious propaganda was taught simultaneously with communist doctrine.<sup>64</sup>

The heavy emphasis placed on the anti-religious nature of Soviet education tied in neatly with the conservative and religious anti-communists in the United States who argued that the best way to combat communism in the United States was to directly associate the

---

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid*, 31. The author pointed out that during Latvia's period of independence, Hooliganism had not been a significant problem.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid*. For example, *Cina* published on 15 May 1955 that in the near future thousands of school children would go to aid the kolkhozes to sow corn. The paper calculated that 150,000 children would participate in the activity over the course of three days, resulting in 100,000 hectares of fields being planted. In addition, children were allegedly required to perform duties around schools, including but not limited to scrubbing classroom floors and benches.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid*, 33.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid*.

Soviet Union with an assault upon traditional religious values that were mainstream in American culture. The author clearly states that “Communist education is anti-religious education. The children are taught basic sciences in the schools which are not compatible with faith in God.”<sup>65</sup> The discussion of communism as anti-religious fitted neatly within the message that religious anti-communist Americans were promoting during the 1950s.<sup>66</sup>

In June 1954, the Baltic consultative panels issued a special edition of the *Baltic Review* that addressed the issue of genocide in the Baltic States. The date was significant as June was the month that Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians living in the West commemorated the Baltic deportations. In addition to detailing specific acts of deportation and genocide in the Baltic republics, the editors hoped to make it clear that the Soviet Union was actively trying to conceal its activities in the Baltic republics from the international community.<sup>67</sup> The editors called to light the lack of access to the Baltic republics by the international press as well as the Soviet Union’s ratification of the Genocide Convention in 1954.

Contrasting the time when all major newspapers and information services had permanent representatives in the independent Baltic States, the *Baltic Review* questioned why the Soviet occupied Baltic republics had been completely closed off to the outside even though a few foreign reporters have been allowed to travel in the rest of the Soviet Union.<sup>68</sup> By detailing the history of Soviet statements on access to the Baltic republics since their incorporation, three conclusions were reached. First, the Kremlin was preparing an attack

---

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid*, 33.

<sup>66</sup> Both Catholic and Protestant anti-Communists dominated the anti-communist discourse during the late 1940s and early 1950s. Richard Gid Powers notes: “All the major religious denominations had anticommunist educational programs.” *Not Without Honor*, 251. See also John E. Hayes, *Red Scare or Red Menace? American Communism and Anticommunism in the Cold War Era*, 89-100 for a discussion on the differences between Catholic and Evangelical Christian anti-communism.

<sup>67</sup> Using accounts from recent escapees and information smuggled out of the Baltic republics from partisan activities, the *Baltic Review* detailed the deportations that took place in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania during 1941, 1945, and 1949. Additional details were provided on concerted Soviet efforts to eliminate the republics’ intelligentsia, purge religious figures, purge Bourgeois nationalists and leading politicians, and finally the prevention of births through separating wives from husbands and children from parents. See 37-50.

<sup>68</sup> “Baltic Blackout” *Baltic Review* #2 and #3, 7.

against the West and the Baltic region had become extremely important strategically.<sup>69</sup> Second, the Soviet Union had deported the entire populations of the Baltic republics to Siberia and the Baltic republics were being repopulated with foreigners.<sup>70</sup> Finally, the authors concluded that until the Baltic republics were opened to foreign visitors that there was no possibility that there could be coexistence between the Soviet Union and the West.<sup>71</sup>

On 3 May 1954, Vishinsky, serving as the Soviet Ambassador to the United Nations, deposited ratification documents of the United Nations Genocide Convention with the Secretary General. The *Baltic Review* criticized the reservation that the Soviet Union made to the Convention, stating that in the event of a disagreement, parties should not be summoned before the International Court of Justice. In essence, the Soviet Union refused to accept the jurisdiction of an international court and Soviet ratification of the Genocide Convention was merely a ploy to protect itself from accusations of genocide.<sup>72</sup> The authors argued that the Soviet ratification was merely an act of propaganda and that it was up to the international community to prevent the Soviet Union from “escaping indictment.”<sup>73</sup>

The Baltic Panels’ intentions of focusing on Soviet genocide in the Baltic States were two fold. First, they cited that the events in the Baltic republics not only as a “grave and agonizing threat” to the three Baltic nations, but they also “threatened also the existence of all nations in the future.”<sup>74</sup> Increasing the general public’s knowledge on genocide in the Baltic

---

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid*, 11. This was based upon an extrapolation on Vishinsky’s statement about the importance of the Baltic States when they were initially occupied. Vishinsky stated “Now we have a firm grip on the Baltic. And what is the Baltic? A springboard for the jump into Germany. Once we are in Berlin, the distance to London will not be as great as from Riga to Berlin.”

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid*, 12. The authors asked if the Soviets feared foreign press due to the Baltic people’s ability to speak more foreign languages than the population of Russia and that they might inform visitors about the contrived nature of Soviet “democracy;” that visitors might witness the restless nature of the Baltic peoples; that foreign visitors might notice the religious persecution taking place and the exploitation of workers.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid*, 14. Reference was made to President Eisenhower’s statement after the Bermuda Conference in December 1953 where he expressed the desire of Great Britain, France, and the United States to initiate a “relationship with the Soviet Union which will eventually bring about a free intermingling of the peoples of the East and of the West.”

<sup>72</sup> “Another Crime” *Baltic Review* #2 and #3, 27.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid*, 5.

republics not only was supposed to increase sympathy for the Baltic cause but also to serve as a reminder to Americans that vigilance and accurate information about Soviet atrocities was essential to defeating the Soviet Union. The second goal, however, was to convince policymakers that it was in their interest to levy charges of genocide against the Soviet Union.<sup>75</sup> However, the *Baltic Review* also sought to impress upon policymakers that Baltic exiles fully supported the American policy of liberation and were actively engaged in liberating their homeland.

As an FEC sponsored publication and where one of the FEC's objectives in its dealing with exile groups was to foster a sense of cooperation within each exiled diaspora, and in the case of the Baltic republics, to foster a sense of pan-Baltic cooperation, the *Baltic Review* published material that sought to the deep roots of Baltic cooperation. In addition to recounting the journal's origins, dating back to 1940, the first edition featured an article written by Sidzikauskas that gave the history of Baltic cooperation during the interwar period, starting with Jonas Sliupas' pamphlet "The Lithuanian-Latvian Republic and the Union of the Northern Nations" and ending with the 1934 Baltic Entente.<sup>76</sup> Sidzikauskas took care to conclude that "The inherent constructive characteristics of their peoples, their achievements, their policy in the past and their determined resistance to the Communist domination at present, the three Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, will undoubtedly become a sound and progressive element of tomorrow's free and united Europe."<sup>77</sup>

Ultimately by the very nature of the *Baltic Review*, its impact proved to be rather limited. Until it ceased publication in 1971, it was mainly sent to newspapers, magazines,

---

<sup>75</sup> In various editions, the *Baltic Review* published resolutions that had been passed by Baltic organizations in the United States calling for the U.S. Government to charge the Soviet Union with Genocide in the UN. See Volume 1, 45: "Be it resolved... we further urge the Government of the United States to submit the case of the present enslavement of our nations and the inhumane practices of the Government of the USSR tending to physically annihilate the nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to the United Nations for consideration."

<sup>76</sup> Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, "Our Tradition of Cooperation" *Baltic Review* #2 and #3 35-43.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid*, 44.

libraries, public officials, and influential people around the world.<sup>78</sup> Its largely scholarly-type articles meant that the journal was used as a source for information about the Baltic republics to be distributed by other means as opposed to a source that the general public would find accessible. Nevertheless, it represents the epitome of Baltic exiles establishing a monopoly on factual information about the Baltic republics within the United States. The source material that its authors used was either assembled by scholars associated with the FEC or media sources directly from the Soviet Union and other places in Europe that were initially published in the Baltic languages, Russian, German or Swedish.

Although other media outlets in the United States had the capability of providing accurate reporting on events in the Soviet Union, access to the Baltic republics by the foreign media was limited and the marginal nature of the Baltic republics reduced the interest that the American press had on Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The contacts that the Baltic Panels had with fellow exiles in Europe who had access to Baltic sources, coupled with the resources that the FEC had to obtain information in the Soviet Union, allowed Baltic exiles to consolidate their role as the most reliable source of information on events in their home countries. In the context of anti-communist literature in the United States during the 1950s, the publications of Baltic exiles contributed by clearly articulating what the Soviet occupation had done to all facets of life in traditionally Christian and democratic countries. Their literature served as a warning to Americans about the international threat that the Soviet Union posed.

The influence that Baltic exile literature had on influencing policymaking decision in the United States is difficult to assess. The greatest reason is that various government departments either explicitly or implicitly endorsed the initiation of such writings. The *Baltic White Book on Genocide* was important insofar as it provided the State Department with a

---

<sup>78</sup> Fund Memo #811, "Folder: B801.4 Consultative Panels" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

powerful and concise compilation of affidavits recounting Soviet atrocities in the Baltic republics. Its direct influence, however, was minimal in the sense that the decision to charge the Soviet Union with genocide was ultimately an American decision. The *Baltic Review*'s regular claims that cooperation among the three nationalities after liberation was a foregone conclusion, the experiences that American officials had with the presumed leaders of post-liberation Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exiled politicians tempered such expectations. Nevertheless, the *Baltic Review* was a clear example of cooperation among the three Baltic nationalities and this cooperation ultimately filtered into some aspects of Baltic life in the United States. Similarly, long editorials in exile publications supporting American liberation efforts did not increase the level of commitment that the Baltic exiles had in fighting for the liberation of their homelands. Throughout the early Cold War, Baltic exiles placed their hopes in the American government for the eventual liberation of their homeland and every aspect of their willingness to cooperate with policymakers is a testament to this fact.

### *Baltic Constituents and the United States Congress*

Although Baltic exiles in the United States placed most of their faith in the State Department and the President to liberate their home countries, they eventually began to turn to the United States Congress to help push their political agenda. East Europe's status became an important aspect of American domestic politics. Democratic operatives had been concerned about Republican plans to garner East European Americans' votes, particularly Polish Americans, as early as the 1944 Presidential elections.<sup>79</sup> It was not until the influx of hundreds of thousands of primarily Baltic and Polish refugees in the late 1940s and the failure of the Yalta Agreements to produce a favorable political environment in East Europe

---

<sup>79</sup> John L. Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947* (New York City, New York, 2000), 147. Senior Republicans, such as Senator Arthur Vandenberg complained that the Republicans had focused too much on the New Deal that had benefited many East European Americans, rather than FDR's diplomacy that had resulted in the Yalta accords.



that the Republican Party truly gained a potential political weapon against the Democrats. The 1952 General Election began the Republican onslaught against the Democratic Party over its record during the early years of the Cold War establishing its effectiveness as a political argument. Nevertheless, the precursor to 1952 occurred when the Republicans regained both the House and Senate in 1946.

Although the Democratic defeat was attributed to domestic problems that plagued a Truman administration that seemed to abdicate any sort of leadership during the period, many new Republican members of Congress represented the anti-communist wing of the party.<sup>80</sup> While preparing for the 1948 general election, Truman successfully repaired his relationship with the voters at large by rallying them against the 80th Congress. Truman's shift towards pursuing a vigorous anti-Soviet foreign policy prevented the Republican Party's new anti-communist wing from swaying Eastern European ethnic groups and held them within the Democratic tent.<sup>81</sup>

In 1951 the Republican Party began directly exploiting disaffected East Europeans. The Republican National Committee created its Ethnic Origins Division, led by former Ambassador to Poland Arthur Bliss, in an attempt to place Yalta at the center of the Republican foreign policy agenda.<sup>82</sup> Through exploiting Yalta, Republicans assailed the seemingly bipartisan strategy of containing the Soviet Union. The outbreak of the Korean War and revelations of FDR's secret wartime diplomacy helped Republicans to promote a policy of liberating East Europe from Soviet tyranny. In 1952, John Foster Dulles gave a speech in Buffalo, New York that officially inserted liberation into the Republican Party

---

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 344.

<sup>81</sup> "American President: An Online Reference Resource"

<http://millercenter.org/academic/americanpresident/truman/essays/biography/3> accessed 30 August 2010.

<sup>82</sup> Anna D. Jaroszynska-Kirchmann, *The Exile Mission: The Polish Political Diaspora and Polish Americans, 1939-1956* (Athens, Ohio, 2004), 201.

Platform.<sup>83</sup> Dwight D. Eisenhower's election as president and his fellow Republicans' overall success in 1952 was attributed to a plethora of reasons ranging from the Korean War and the Republican hardline against communism to the appeal of Eisenhower's personality.

East European exiles in general, and Balts specifically, found a political home in the Republican Party due to the perception that Roosevelt and the Democratic Party had indeed "sold-out" their homelands at Yalta. However, the Baltic exiles had a strong sense of realism. Some Latvians were concerned that politicians that promised too much were politically irresponsible, opportunistic, and that such wild promises could be inimical to the Latvian cause.<sup>84</sup> Lithuanians and Estonians attempted to use the general election to leverage both political parties to support self-determination for the Baltic States.<sup>85</sup>

Committees to investigate communist activities became a favorite pastime for Congress during the Cold War. Although Ray Madden (D-In.) organized a congressional investigation focusing on the 1940 Katyn Massacre already in 1951, the most publicized committees were not created until the 1952 Republican takeover.<sup>86</sup> In the Senate, Joseph McCarthy's Government Operation Committee's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations overshadowed Albert Jenner's (R-In.) work on the Judiciary Committee's Internal Security Subcommittee. In the House, the most important committee was the Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC).<sup>87</sup> Another highly publicized body was Charles J. Kersten's (R-Wi.) 1953 select committee to investigate the Soviet annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

---

<sup>83</sup> See Fraser J. Harbutt, *Yalta 1945: Europe and America at the Crossroads* (New York City, New York, 2010), 15 and Piotr Stefan Wandycz *The United States and Poland* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1980), 340.

<sup>84</sup> Ieva Zake, ed., *Anti-Communist Minorities in the U.S.: Political Activism of Ethnic Refugees* (New York City, New York, 2009), 142.

<sup>85</sup> Albertas Gerutis, ed., *Lithuania: 700 Years* (Woodhaven, New York, 1969), 402. The Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were successful in obtaining planks in both major political parties supporting self-determination for the Baltic peoples.

<sup>86</sup> Anna M. Cienciala and Wojciech Materski, *Katyn: A Crime Without Punishment* (New Haven, Connecticut 2008), 237.

<sup>87</sup> Holland, 313.

Kersten was a Milwaukee lawyer who won his first election to the House of Representatives in 1946 in the predominantly Democratic 5th Congressional District. He was defeated after serving one term, but returned to the House in 1950. While Kersten was applauded for his fiscal positions, he was best known for his anti-communist posturing and regular denunciations of a “bankrupt” Democratic foreign policy.<sup>88</sup> Kersten belonged to a class of congressmen such as Senator Alexander Wiley, chairman of the Foreign Relations committee, Senator William Knowland, and McCarthy. Their motivation for the liberation of East Europe had more to do with ideological conviction rather than electoral considerations.<sup>89</sup>

Before the 83rd Congress, Kersten’s crowning legislative achievement was an amendment to the Mutual Security Act during the summer of 1951. The Mutual Security Act authorized \$7.5 billion in foreign economic and military aid. On 17 August 1951, Kersten stated that the act would “mean nothing more than an armaments race. So we must begin to move in the direction of the eventual liberation of the Eastern nations of Europe.” Kersten’s amendment not only provided for funding to create the Volunteer Freedom Corps (exile armies for East European nationalities), but to possibly aid underground resistance organizations in the region.<sup>90</sup> Although Eisenhower and the State Department made it known that it was undesirable for Congress to deal with such matters, it only bolstered Kersten’s credentials with East European exiles.

While some have referred to Kersten as merely one of Joe McCarthy’s cronies,<sup>91</sup> and was allegedly influenced by “fringe exile groups,” he was one of the most ardent advocates

---

<sup>88</sup> Peter Grose, *Operation Rollback: America’s Secret War Behind the Iron Curtain* (New York City, New York, 2000), 203. Throughout his first term in office, Kersten served as chairman of a subcommittee authorized to examine education and labor in the Soviet Union. In April, he tabled a resolution promoting the liberation of the Soviet Union from Communist enslavement. Soon thereafter, he was introducing more resolutions than anyone could keep up with.

<sup>89</sup> Bennet Kovrig, *Of Walls and Bridges: The United States and East Europe* (New York City, New York, 1991), 63.

<sup>90</sup> David M. Barrett, *The CIA and Congress* (Lawrence, Kansas, 2005), 105.

<sup>91</sup> See David M. Oshinsky *A Conspiracy So Immense: the World of Joe McCarthy* (New York City, New York 2005), 149-150.

of the Republican Party's liberation policy.<sup>92</sup> Kersten was not only loyal to his large Polish American constituency, but defended virtually every East European nationality that found refuge in the United States.<sup>93</sup> Therefore it is not surprising that when Stephen Bredes, an attorney from Brooklyn and member of the American Lithuanian Council (ALT) approached Kersten with the idea of creating a congressional committee to investigate the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States, Kersten eagerly accepted and worked towards making such a committee a reality.<sup>94</sup>

On 26 March 1953, Kersten and an ALT delegation visited the White House and left President Eisenhower a memorandum calling for the American ratification of the Genocide Convention; clarification of what Eisenhower truly meant by liberating East Europe; and the need for a congressional investigation into the 1940 Soviet-rigged elections in Lithuania.<sup>95</sup> As was standard protocol, the memorandum to President Eisenhower was forwarded to the State Department for analysis. On 1 April, State Department officials forwarded comments on the memorandum back to the White House. Since the State Department failed to find any policy objections to such a committee, Kersten and the ALT were free to move forward.<sup>96</sup>

Kersten submitted H.R. 231 to the House Rules Committee on 7 May calling for the creation of a select committee to be authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union in 1940.<sup>97</sup> On 4 June, Kersten, along with ALT Secretary

---

<sup>92</sup> Arch Puddington, *Broadcasting Freedom: The Cold War Triumph of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty* (Lexington, Kentucky, 2000), 16 & 84-85.

<sup>93</sup> Grose, 203.

<sup>94</sup> Gerutis, 403.

<sup>95</sup> American Lithuanian Council to Eisenhower, on 26 March 1953, in Folder "B900: Congressional Investigation 1953," Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>96</sup> Dulles to Eisenhower on 1 April 1953, in Folder "B900: Congressional Investigation 1953," Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>97</sup> H.R. 231, 82nd Cong. (1953). From 1939 through the summer of 1940 there was a concerted and deliberate effort by the Soviet Union to annex the Baltic States. Initially, the Soviet government presented ultimatums to the Baltic governments in October 1939 for the construction of military bases in September 1939. Further accusations were made that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were conspiring against the Soviet Union and Stalin forced the Baltic States to allow Soviet troops to be garrisoned in the Baltic States in June 1940. Finally,

General Pius Grigaitis and Lithuanian American Information Center (LAIC) Director Mary Kizis, scheduled an appointment with the State Department's Baltic desk to update policymakers on H.R. 231's progress and to seek State Department assistance for the forthcoming investigation into the rigged elections. Kersten described the benefits that the investigation would have on the making of foreign policy. The investigation would not only enlighten the American people on the Baltic States' fate, but it would keep alive the story of the methods that the Soviets had used to commit aggressive actions and serve as effective international propaganda, "particularly as a means to puncture the Soviet peace offensive."<sup>98</sup>

The State Department was most concerned with a provision in H.R. 231 that allowed committee members to travel to Europe in order to conduct interviews and gather evidence. Throughout the second half of 1953, American diplomats led a concerted effort to minimize any potential conflicts that could erupt with American allies in West Europe due to the December 1953 Bermuda Conference. The State Department had learned during the early Katyn Massacre Investigations, that there were constitutional issues with members of congress holding official hearings in certain countries. The French and the British refused to allow foreign legislatures to hold formal hearings in their jurisdictions. Requesting permission to hold hearings was an irritation that the State Department had hoped to avoid.<sup>99</sup>

The 1948 Displaced Persons Act and subsequent 1950 amendments had permitted a significant number of Baltic exiles to immigrate to the United States.<sup>100</sup> Nevertheless, significant numbers of Balts still resided in Europe, including the most important Lithuanian

---

following staged elections, the Soviet Union formally annexed Lithuania on 3 August 1940, Latvia on 5 August 1940, and Estonia on 6 August 1940.

<sup>98</sup> Memorandum of Conversation on 4 June 1953 "Proposed Investigation of the Forced Incorporation of the Baltic Republics into the Soviet Union" in File "B900 - Congressional Investigation 1953," Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAII.

<sup>99</sup> The Bermuda Conference was held 4-8 December 1953 and touched upon several sensitive issues including how to handle the Soviet Union in the post-Stalinist period; the establishment of a European Defense Community, and atomic energy policy.

<sup>100</sup> The majority of Latvian and Lithuanian exiles immigrated to the United States mainly due to fears of the Soviet Union overrunning all of Europe during the late 1940s, but also due to the historically large Lithuanian communities in the United States. Estonians, however, fled to Sweden and Central Europe during World War II. As a result, the center of Estonian exile activities was not the United States, but Sweden.

worldwide organization in the 1950s: the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania (VLIK). The apparent inability of Kersten and his colleagues to travel to Europe to hold formal hearings could have potentially undermined Kersten and ALT's work. Serious discussions took place about the role that Baltic groups played in the United States, particularly the FEC affiliated Committee for a Free Latvia (CFL); Committee for a Free Estonia (CFE), and Free Lithuania Committee (FLC) should play.<sup>101</sup> It was decided that the bulk of the investigation should involve significant assistance of Baltic exile organizations and their diplomatic representatives.<sup>102</sup>

On 27 July 1953, the House passed H.R. 346 calling for a committee to be “authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of said seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the USSR and the treatment of the said Baltic peoples during the following said seizure and incorporation.”<sup>103</sup> While Baltic organizations, particularly the Lithuanians, had been successful for years in having statements inserted into the *Congressional Record* on behalf of their homelands, for the first time the exiles were able to directly influence proceedings that had the possibility of playing an active role in what they had hoped would be the liberation of their homelands.

Over the following year, the Select Committee's two major activities would consume the time of Kersten and his staff, as well as the Baltic exiles. During late 1953 and 1954, Committee members and staff investigators were responsible for deposing witnesses, gathering testimony, and collecting documents relevant to the Soviet takeover of the Baltic States and subsequent forced population displacement. This work's result was ultimately a 556-page report that detailed the history and implications of the relationship between the

---

<sup>101</sup>Memorandum of Conversation on 4 June 1953 “Proposed Investigation of the Forced Incorporation of the Baltic Republics into the Soviet Union” in File “B900 - Congressional Investigation 1953,” Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>102</sup>Barbour to the Under Secretary of State for European Affairs, on 18 June 1953, in File “B900 - Congressional Investigation 1953,” Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>103</sup>Creation of Select Committee, -H.R. 346, 83rd Cong. (1953).

USSR and the Baltic States. In addition, the Committee held hearings in Washington, New York, Detroit, and Chicago from 30 November through 11 December 1953.

Due to the apparent success of the Baltic Select Committee, the House passed H.R. 438 in 1954, expanding the Committee's mandate beyond the Baltic States to explore Communist aggression in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, East Germany, Russia, and other non-Russian nationalities in the Soviet Union.<sup>104</sup> Hearings for the renamed Select Committee, now called the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression, however, were held in London, Berlin, and at the American Consulate in Munich. The State Department not only removed any policy objections to testimonies being gathered abroad, but also received funding to hold such hearings.<sup>105</sup> The additional hearings not only increased Kersten's reputation for fighting on behalf of the captive nations, but also elevated the situation of the Baltic States to the center of the debate on the situation in East Europe.

The Select Committee's primary objective was to obtain a large volume of reliable information detailing the manner in which the USSR incorporated the independent states. The congressmen's inability to travel to the Soviet Baltic republics to conduct an investigation into the events that transpired from 1940-1941 resulted in a high-reliance on Baltic exiles to provide the empirical data. For the first time during the Cold War, the Baltic exiles were central to an overt activity conducted by the American government. The non-recognition policy allowed American officials to conveniently marginalize unofficial exiles and their organizations through dealing directly with the diplomatic representatives of the

---

<sup>104</sup> Extension and Amendment of Select Committee, H.R. 438, 83rd Cong. (1954). Concerning the success of the hearings, Kersten had received a letter from Walter B. Smith thanking the work that the Select Committee had accomplished and that the Department believed that it would be beneficial to broaden the scope of the committee's work to other communist dominated nations. Walter B. Smith to Charles J. Kersten, on 8 February 1954, in Folder "B900.1 Foreign Service Contributions to Baltic Investigation," Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>105</sup> Gerutis, 420.

three countries. The scope of what the Select Committee was trying to accomplish, however, far exceeded the capacities of the aging diplomatic corps.

Collecting information and actively aiding in the Select Committee proved to be a test case for the Baltic exiles' capacity to effectively cooperate and work together. A signature characteristic of Baltic exiles groups in the 1950s was incessant disagreements within each national group and a basic unwillingness to cooperate with the two other respective nationalities. In fact, basic disagreements within Baltic nationalities and the ineptitude of the State Department to foster rapprochement became a primary reason for the continued marginalization of exile groups in American foreign policy. An analysis of what kind of information was gathered and how it was collected by the Baltic exiles for the Committee represents a high point in Baltic cooperation, yet it is also very representative of the inherent limitations of rapprochement within first generation exiles.

Following H.R. 346's passage, the Lithuanian Ambassador Povilas Žadeikis, Estonian Consul General Johannes Kaiv, and Latvian Chargé d'affaires Anatole Dinbergs mailed letters to Kersten informing him that they were available to provide any information that the Committee might need from them. Representative of the relationship between the diplomats and the larger diasporas, their activities were somewhat autonomous due to their rigid conceptions of their relationship to their homelands and the governments that they had once represented. In addition to participating in the formal congressional hearings on the Soviet annexation, the diplomats were responsible for providing the Select Committee with a plethora of government documents and diplomatic papers.

The documents that the diplomats provided offer insights into a shared historical trajectory among the three nations, and more importantly for the Select Committee, the shared experience of Soviet aggression. Not only were the independent republics' constitutions submitted, but copies and translations of the 1920 Peace Treaties between



Soviet Russia and the three Baltic nations; non-aggression treaties concluded in 1926 and 1932; protocols renewing the non-aggression treaties; and the 1939 Mutual Assistance Pacts.<sup>106</sup>

Although the Baltic diplomats might have been the highest profile exiles to participate in the Select Committee's activities, compared to other organizations, they played a relatively minor role. National organizations such as the ALT, the American Latvian Association (ALA) and the Estonian National Committee in the United States (ENC), as well as the CFE, CFL, and FLC played the most important role. The level of involvement and cooperation with Kersten, and the quantity of material provided was directly proportional to the size of the exile communities residing in the United States. During the following year, ALT played a central role in gathering data from over 1,000 witnesses who had experienced the Soviet takeover of Lithuania. Additionally, the ALT submitted a list of more than 18,000 Lithuanians who were deported to Siberia.<sup>107</sup> Despite the fact that Latvians represented the greatest number of postwar exiles of the three nationalities, the greater Lithuanian community's ability to assimilate Lithuanian exiles necessarily meant that the ALT played the most important role in the Kersten Committee. After all, it was the relationship between ALT and Kersten that prompted the establishment of the Committee in the first place.

As early as 12 June the National Committee for a Free Latvia began collecting data that could have been potentially used for the Kersten Committee if H.R. 346 passed.<sup>108</sup> Unlike the Lithuanians, who allowed the ALT to play a central role in organizing material for the Committee, the ALA and the CFL decided during a meeting on 11 July 1953 that the CFL would play the major role of collecting documents and delegating responsibilities to smaller

---

<sup>106</sup> Non-Aggression treaties were concluded between the USSR and Lithuania in 1926, renewed in 1932, while they were concluded with Latvia and Estonia in 1932, renewed in 1934. Additionally, Žadeikis submitted the 1939 Lithuanian Treaty recognizing the transfer of the City of Vilnius and the Vilnius Province.

<sup>107</sup> Gerutis, 420.

<sup>108</sup> Fund Memo 696 "Monthly Report for May 1953," on 1 June 1953, in File "B801.4 Consultative Panels 1950-1954," Box 2, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

Latvian organizations.<sup>109</sup> Throughout the rest of the year, the CFL conferred with the ALA and the Latvian Legation in Washington to obtain all of the necessary documents for submission to the Select Committee. Additionally, the American and Canadian based Latvian language presses were informed of the committee. Information was so widely spread on the investigation, that American consulate officers in Canada became inundated with inquiries by Latvian exiles on how they could participate in the investigation.

Possibly the most significant Latvian contribution to the investigation was Alberts Jekste's film *My Latvia*. It depicted the Soviet annexation of Latvia in grim detail. Jekste had been a director of a film company since 1928 in Riga and captured footage of events in the city during June and July of 1940. He fled the country in April 1945, eventually immigrating to Baltimore in February 1952 after being classified as a DP. On 1 December 1953, Jekste testified before the House Select Committee to describe what he had seen in Riga during the annexation and the film footage that he had managed to capture.<sup>110</sup>

Unlike the Latvians and Lithuanians, the Estonian exile diaspora's center was located in Sweden and not the United States. Of the three nationalities, the Estonians suffered from the highest level of intra-fighting that was primarily a result of competing organizations in Sweden, relatively weak institutions in the United States, and a lack of cooperation among exiled diplomats. In preparing material for the Select Committee, the CFE played a pivotal role in the successful acquisition and dissemination of information. On 14 August 1953

---

<sup>109</sup> Fund Memo 739 "Monthly Report for July 1953," on 1 August 1953, in File "B801.4 Consultative Panels 1950-1954," Box 2, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>110</sup> Naturally there were significant public diplomatic advantages for the Americans to have such footage. Jekste's film was not limited to receiving exposure through the Select Committee. In August 1953, the film was in the process of being assembled with the assistance of the USIA and CIA. There were initial concerns about the quality of the finished product. C.D. Jackson commented that the raw material was excellent, but the finished product was poor. The State Department shared similar concerns about the film's usefulness as being demonstrative of basic facts and not merely a propaganda piece. The State Department's critique was that the footage was devoted to exposing Soviet atrocities through close-up shots of exhumed bodies. "Once a certain point is passed in getting the point across, and the film continues to dwell on that point, diminishing returns set in." Still, USIA utilized *My Latvia* throughout the 1950s to vividly expose Soviet aggression. CD Jackson Log 6 August 1953; R. G. Johnson to Miss Jarolman on 20 December 1954, in File "La 891 Latvia General," RG 59, Box 8, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI (quote); Nicholas Cull, *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945-1989*, (Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2009), 109.

Acting Chairman of the Committee, Adolf Perandi, informed Kersten that Estonians had established a special commission (with significant impetus by the CFE) that would streamline the efforts of the major Estonian organizations in the free world: the CFE, Estonian World Council, and Association of Estonian War Veterans.<sup>111</sup> Within the year, this organization became formalized as the Estonian Joint Committee for Cooperation with the Select Committee. Eventually it increased its scope of the cooperation to include organizations in Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and World Organization of Free Estonians (VEKO) in Stockholm.<sup>112</sup>

Altogether, roughly 1150 pages of personal statements from 208 individual testimonies were filed by the Estonian exiles residing in the United States, including translations from Estonian into English. Per the Select Committee's request, the Estonians gave priority to documents that directly related to the staged elections that occurred in July 1940, but also included a large number of eyewitness accounts of atrocities committed by Soviets in Estonia immediately following the annexation. By the middle of 1954, the Estonian Joint Committee and Kaiv's office had yet another 500 pages of statements and documents to be submitted to the committee.

Acting on its own initiative, the Estonian National Council in Sweden (ERN), an organization that continually attempted to undermine the position of Kaiv and other leading Estonians in the United States, submitted its own collection of documents to the Select Committee in September and December 1953. Altogether ERN President August Rei submitted 393 pages of material to the American Embassy in Stockholm for transfer to Kersten in Washington. The ERN's documents ranged from a selection of literature on the

---

<sup>111</sup> 14 August 1953 Adolf Perandi to Charles J. Kersten, on 14 August 1953, in Folder "Committee for a Free Estonia," Box 18, RG 233, Records of the House of Representatives, 83rd Congress Select Committee on Communist Aggression, U.S National Archives I, further referred to as NAI.

<sup>112</sup> 8 August 1954 Vaino Riismandel to Kersten, on 8 August 1954, in Folder "Estonia," Box 18, RG 233, Records of the House of Representatives, 83rd Congress Select Committee on Communist Aggression, NAI.

annexation, occupation, and Sovietization of Estonia to statements of leading Estonian figures in the interwar period who had fled Soviet Estonia for Sweden.<sup>113</sup>

The only significant collaboration among the three nationalities for preparing documents and information for Kersten's investigation occurred between the CFL, CFE, and LFC. An important reason for the continued sponsorship of the National Committees for a Free Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania was the hope that the organizations could foster a sense of unity among Baltic exiles. Not only were the committees expected to foster a sense of unification within each individual diaspora, officials also hoped they could initiate closer cooperation among the three nationalities. Of the many symbols of Baltic cooperation during the 1950s on behalf of the FEC, the two most important were the eventual publication of the *Baltic Review*, an English-language journal with a rotating editorship and the Baltic States Freedom House located in New York. On 17 February 1953, the Baltic States Freedom House's formal opening coincided with the celebration of Estonian and Lithuanian independence days.<sup>114</sup>

While in New York, Select Committee staff members Will Allen and Richard Walsh conducted the majority of interviews at the Baltic States Freedom House during the second half of September in 1953. The manner that the interviews were conducted at the facility is very much representative of the activities that occurred at the House during the 1950s. Although individual members of the Baltic National Committees cooperated on several levels, very few events were held that took on a decidedly Baltic nature. If the Latvians wanted to use the space, they were able to without any interference from the other two

---

<sup>113</sup> Arvo Horm (Executive Secretary of ERN) to Charles Kersten on 4 December 1953, in Folder "Depositions - Overseas," Box 18, RG 233, Records of the House of Representatives, 83rd Congress Select Committee on Communist Aggression, NAI.

<sup>114</sup> Fund Memo 631 "Monthly Report for February 1953," on 1 March 1953, in File "B801.4 Consultative Panels 1950-1954," Box 2, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

nationalities. Similarly, with the interviews, Allen and Walsh conducted testimonies on a strictly national basis.<sup>115</sup>

The State Department's involvement went well beyond the tacitly endorsing the Select Committee. Throughout the Select Committee's mandate, the State Department provided assistance on three discrete levels. First, Secretary of State Dulles was personally involved with the Select Committee. Second, current and former senior diplomats, who had played a role in formulating American policy towards the Baltic States in 1940-1941, offered their testimonies and advice to the Select Committee. Third, the Foreign Service provided material assistance to the Select Committee during informal visits abroad.

The first round of the Select Committee's testimony occurred from 30 November -11 December 1953. Secretary Dulles was the first witness. The Secretary broke his testimony into three main parts evoking the past, the present and the future. Dulles forcefully argued that the Baltic States had become entitled to American recognition through maintaining internal economic and political stability and had demonstrated that despite their "meager natural resources," the people had achieved a high level of economic and cultural well being. Soviet Russia cynically denied the Baltic States the freedom that they had initially earned in 1920 through the aggressive acts of 1939 and 1940. In closing, Dulles evoked the memory of Old Testament nations that had been oppressed for thousands of years only to rise again.<sup>116</sup> He concluded: "Some may think that it is unrealistic and impractical not to recognize the enforced incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union. We believe, however, that a despotism of the Soviet type cannot indefinitely perpetuate its rule over

---

<sup>115</sup> See the individual folders in RG 233 in the USNA dealing with the Kersten Committee on how the interviews were organized in New York.

<sup>116</sup> See Note 1 above.

hundreds of millions of people who love God, who love country, and who have a sense of personal dignity.”<sup>117</sup>

Immediately following the first round of testimonies in Washington, State Department Baltic desk staff members began contacting former American diplomats who had been stationed in the Baltic States in 1940 to assist in the Select Committee’s report. John C. Wiley, the former Charge d’affaires to Latvia, was the most important diplomat involved. On 4 December 1953, Assistant Secretary Thurston Morton wrote Wiley asking: “The Committee is interested in your recollections of events and changes in the daily lives of the Baltic peoples in 1939 and 1940, witnessed by you personally. Your letter should not refer to actions performed or reports made in your official capacity as a Legation officer.”<sup>118</sup> In all, State assisted the Select Committee in obtaining written or oral testimonies from eleven American diplomats that had been assigned to the embassies on Riga and Kaunas, as well as the Consul General in Tallinn.<sup>119</sup>

The information received from the diplomats went well beyond the official Foreign Service correspondences sent from the Baltic States to the State Department during 1940. Head of the “Russian Section” at the Embassy in Riga, Bertel E. Kuniholm described the “nervousness” felt throughout the three Baltic countries once the August 1939 Molotov-Ribbentrop negotiations commenced. He described that although there was no immediate pressure placed on Latvia through the negotiations, it was understood that “German-Soviet rapprochement could mean only one thing: the final act in the sell-out of Poland.” Being in close proximity to this focal point of potential conflict naturally made Latvian officials uneasy. Kuniholm continued by disclosing that the American government was unwilling to

---

<sup>117</sup> *Hearings on H.R. 346, Day 1, Before the Select Committee to Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the USSR*, 83rd Cong. (1953) (statement of John Foster Dulles, United States Secretary of State), 4.

<sup>118</sup> Thurston Morton to John C. Wiley, on 4 December 1953, in Folder “B900.1 Foreign Service Contributions to Baltic Investigation,” Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>119</sup> See Unclassified State Memorandum “House Baltic Committee Request for Information from American Diplomatic Representatives Formerly Accredited to the Baltic States,” on 13 January 1954, in Folder “B900.1 Foreign Service Contributions to Baltic Investigation,” Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

assist in evacuating non-American members of his staff, knowing fully that should the Soviet military occupy Latvia, they would be arrested “en bloc.” Instead, Kuniform secured an additional month’s salary for his staff and assisted in moving them to Sweden.<sup>120</sup>

Despite the State Department’s misgivings, Kersten made two highly publicized trips to Europe over the course of his committee’s investigations. In September and October 1953, Kersten traveled to West Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, and France to meet various Baltic leaders who resided in Europe. Kersten had successful and uneventful meetings with Mykolas Krupavičius, President of the VLIK in Reutlingen, Germany; and with Pope Pius XII in Rome, and collected a variety of documents useful for the investigation. During his meeting with the head of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Services Abroad, Stasys Lozoraitis Paris quickly complained to interlocutors at the American Embassy in Paris that Kersten’s ‘entourage’ was dismissive and quick to stop certain people from approaching the congressman.<sup>121</sup> Although the Embassy’s First Secretary Landreth M. Harrison stated that Kersten had made a “very favorable impression on the émigré leaders,”<sup>122</sup> Harrison personally intervened to calm the concerns of Lozoraitis over the event. The fact that the Secretary was personally involved in the investigations mandated that the State Department had to intervene in the matter.

Kersten’s second trip to Europe was significantly more ambitious, as it was under the mandate of the expanded Communist Aggression Committee. This time, the hearings held in Munich, Berlin, and London during a six-week period of time covering May, June, and July of 1954 received significantly greater private backing from both the State Department and the CIA. On 9 July 1954, Edward O’Connor, the committee’s staff director told Allen Dulles that

---

<sup>120</sup> B.E. Kuniholm to Charles J. Kersten, on 15 January 1954, in Folder “B900.1 Foreign Service Contributions to Baltic Investigation,” Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>121</sup> Conversation between Landreth M. Harrison, First Secretary of Embassy in Paris and Lozoraitis on 25 September 1953, in Folder “B900.1 Foreign Service Contributions to Baltic Investigation,” Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>122</sup> Harrison to Walworth Barbour, on 5 October 1953, in Folder “B900.1 Foreign Service Contributions to Baltic Investigation,” Box 3, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

“without the Agency’s help, the committee’s overseas effort would have been like a “hay-wagon with only three wheels on it.”<sup>123</sup>

After two years of intense research by the Select Committees staff and the Baltic exiles’ efforts, the Congress published three voluminous reports. The First Report in 1954 published the Hearings that took place before the Select Committee in late 1953. It documented the testimonies of individuals including Secretary of State Dulles; former President Herbert Hoover, the Baltic exile diplomatic representatives accredited to the United States; leading Baltic exiles; and private American citizens who had experiences with the Baltic States while they were independent or experiences with communist tyranny while being held captive by North Koreans. On one hand, the witnesses described, in intricate detail, the techniques the USSR employed to undermine the political, economic, and social independence of the three Baltic States.<sup>124</sup>

The Second Interim Report published the testimony of 112 witnesses interviewed in the committee’s six-week European trip in 1954. While offering a sample of the experiences that the witnesses had under Soviet rule in Eastern and Central Europe, the report offered some insight into how communism took over countries and how the Soviets were successful in consolidating their power. The litany of preliminary findings that the Select Committee presented sought to discredit the Soviet overtures of peaceful coexistence. The Select Committee stated that “treaties, mutual-assistance pacts, nonaggression pacts, or covenants were never respected by the Soviets and the United States was seen as the main roadblock to the Soviets’ plan for “world conquest.”<sup>125</sup> The capstone Third Interim Report returned the Select Committee’s focus to the Baltic republics. The 537 page document entitled “The Baltic States: A Study of Their Origin and National Development; Their Seizure and

---

<sup>123</sup> Quoted in Holland, 313.

<sup>124</sup> *Hearings on H.R. 346, Day 2, Before the Select Committee to Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the USSR*, 83rd Cong. (1953) (Statement of Zenta Vizbulis), 85.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid*, 24.



Incorporation into the USSR,” presented a detailed history of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania from their legal status within the Russian Empire through the Soviet annexation in 1940.<sup>126</sup> The study was prepared jointly between the Library of Congress’ Mid-European Law Project and the Legislative Reference Service, based almost exclusively on documents and testimonies provided by Baltic exiles. While the empirical data was strictly based on the experience of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the focus was clearly to use these countries’ experiences to demonstrate precisely the willingness and the capability of the Soviets to annex territory and subjugate independent peoples.

Much of American foreign policy in the 1950s that attempted to hasten the liberation of East Europe and the destruction of the USSR was based on the utilization of East European exiles and ethnic Americans residing in the United States (or in Europe). Although there were few covert radios and no clandestine paramilitary operations, the quality of the Select Committee’s investigations was entirely contingent on the level of cooperation and the quality of information that Baltic exiles provided. Like the radio broadcasts in which the exiles participated, the results of the Kersten investigations was decidedly mixed from the perspective of American policy makers, Baltic exiles, and for members of Congress.

Foreign policy makers had specific goals in mind when they approved of, and actively participated in Kersten’s investigation. The most realistic expectation was to utilize the results of the Committee in the propaganda campaign against the USSR. The highly publicized investigations not only raised the awareness of average Americans to the situation in East Europe, the testimonies given to the committee were used in American efforts abroad. Most notably, the Voice of America covered the Kersten proceedings as they had happened. Many of the Eastern European broadcasting languages for VOA and RFE adapted parts of the committee’s findings for regular broadcasts behind the Iron Curtain.

---

<sup>126</sup> See Select Comm. to Investigate Communist Aggression, H.R. 438 and H.R. 346, R.R. Rep. No. 53753.

Policymakers' more ambitious goal was to utilize the Select Committee's findings in the United Nations to charge the USSR not only with territorial aggression, but also genocide. The hierarchy of policy considerations, however, never permitted the American mission at the UN to move forward with such allegations. The American government had always been reticent about charging the USSR with aggression against the Baltic States for fear that a negative reaction in the General Assembly would undermine the non-recognition policy. As late as 1955, Kersten's advocates continued to press the State Department to move forward in the UN. The official line continued to be that "the Department did not agree that to seek actions in the UN 'naming the USSR as an aggressor against the nations enslaved by communism' would be useful in bringing about a clear indictment of the USSR for its policies of aggression and subversion. This position's basis included the extreme unlikelihood of obtaining majority support for such action."<sup>127</sup> Additionally, such a move would have "seriously adverse implications for the present positive propaganda values" gained through public and covert media outlets.<sup>128</sup> The dissemination of *My Latvia* through the USIA was viewed as being equally effective as pursuing formal actions against the USSR in the UN.

Like many of the Baltic exiles' activities during the early Cold War, the policy effectiveness for the Select Committee resulted in a mixed record. On one hand, the ALT was successful in persuading Charles J. Kersten to consider creating a congressional committee to investigate the 1940 fixed elections. The ALT was even successful in persuading the Congress, White House, and State Department to participate in the Select Committee's proceedings. The fact that the Baltic exiles were able to influence the direction of the Select Committee and the information that it used to reach its conclusions demonstrates a significant

---

<sup>127</sup> State Department Memo to Legion of Estonian Liberation, Inc. in Oregon, on 18 July 1955, in Folder "B500 United Nations and Deportations," Box 1, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*

amount of leverage over politicians. On the other hand, the 26 March 1953 appeal to the White House explicitly connected the necessity of congressional investigations into the fixed elections with the desire of moving the Baltic debate to the floor of the United Nations General Assembly. The inability of the exiles to convince State Department bureaucrats to take the Baltic case to the United Nations clearly represents the limits of Baltic groups to influence policy makers.

Since the creation of the UN, Baltic exiles, particularly the diplomats, attempted either to lobby the UN directly or get the Americans to bring the Baltic plight before the General Assembly. In 1947 and 1948, the three Baltic diplomats in the United States composed joint letters to the respective presidents of the UNGA protesting “against the suppression of the independence and enslavement of our countries by the USSR.”<sup>129</sup> By 1950, the State Department’s Baltic Desk moved forward with language on a proposed American statement on behalf of the UN on the Baltic States, “calling upon the UN to take cognizance of the fact that the Baltic republics have endured wave after wave of arrests and deportations by Soviet authorities since August 1940.”<sup>130</sup> The heightened international tensions due to the Korean War, however, resulted in a decision by State that it was “inadvisable to have this item placed on the agenda at the General Assembly at this session.”<sup>131</sup> Continued Baltic activism on the UN issue continued after the conclusion of the House Committee, but for the State Department, the primacy of non-recognition prevented any realistic chances that the exiles had in furthering this part of their agenda.

The State Department’s decision to avoid discussing the Baltic States in the UN during the Korean War was representative of its Baltic policy’s implementation when

---

<sup>129</sup> Johannes Kaiv, Alfreds Bilmanis, and Povilas Žadeikis to Oswaldo Aranha, President of the UNGA on 12 November 1947, in Folder “B500 United Nations and Deportations,” Box 1, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>130</sup> Undated memo attached to 17 October 1950 Letter from Harold Vedeler to James Simsarian in Folder “B500 United Nations and Deportations,” Box 1, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAI.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*

international tensions created crises. On 11 July 1950, ALT requested a meeting with President Truman to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Soviet annexation. The White House contacted the Baltic Desk for policy guidance and replied that the State Department had a “desire not to disturb unnecessarily our relations with the Soviet government during this critical period.”<sup>132</sup> The meeting with ALT was ultimately rescheduled. American policymakers’ unwillingness to further increase tensions during wartime over East Europe exposes the inherent contradiction between American rhetoric of rollback and the implementation of such a policy. This case also demonstrates the clear limits of the usefulness of the Baltic case for the United States. While raising the Baltic issue was an easy rhetorical tool during peacetime, it clearly remained a sensitive issue in American-Soviet relations.

There are two additional significant points that can be drawn from the active Baltic participation in the Select Committee’s investigation. First, Baltic organizations were granted the ability to learn how lobbying members of congress could be beneficial to their own agenda. Despite the failure of Congress and the Balts to push the State Department to confront the Soviet Union more aggressively, a closer relationship was in its nascent period that would prove to be mutually beneficial. Second, the vast amounts of information that Baltic exiles provided to the Select Committee helped to create a truly Baltic historical narrative of exile. Notwithstanding futile efforts at Baltic cooperation during the interwar period, flourishes of cooperation between exiled diplomats and American-backed National committees, and the lumping together of the three countries by the Americans, during the late 1940s and early 1950s, there was little shared experience of the three individual nationalities. The creation of the Interim Reports can be seen as a small step towards unifying the historical memories of the three exiled diasporas.

---

<sup>132</sup> Webb to Connelly on 20 July 1950 in Folder “B-711: Foreign Relations with the United States,” Box 1, RG 59. Records of the Department of State, Baltic Lot File 1940-1961, NAIL.

While the Lithuanians had always been successful at having significant holidays and events added to the *Congressional Record*, the relationship between Lithuanian Americans and Congress was primarily based on representatives and the votes of their constituents. Activism on behalf of the Select Committee slowly began a process of transforming this relationship into one of shared interests and partnership. The transformation was even more dramatic for the Latvians and Estonians. Since there had never been large Estonian or Latvian communities in the United States and the assimilation process of the former Displaced Persons had not yet been completed, the experience of participating in the Select Committee elevated the communities from their initial position of extreme marginality to one that placed them in the center of the American anti-Communist struggle.

The American Government's failure to act decisively amidst the 1956 Hungarian Revolution forever bankrupted the idea that the United States would actively promote East Europe's liberation and a policy of gradualism was soon adopted. An implication of this shift in policy was a reassessment about the usefulness of East European exiles to the conduct of American foreign policy.<sup>133</sup> Notwithstanding this setback, Baltic exiles continued to pursue their activist agenda of promoting the continuation of the non-recognition policy, rejecting peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union, and gaining access to the exile-led activities that the Americans continued to sponsor -- namely cooperation with the FEC. In the decades that followed 1956, partnership with members of Congress, not the White House or State Department via the exiled diplomatic missions, would be the most viable path for successful Baltic exile activism. The Select Committee served as an important learning experience in which Baltic exiles were introduced to essential constituent activities such as Congressional lobbying and introducing their narrative to the American polity.

---

<sup>133</sup> Although George F. Kennan was a proponent of using East European exiles as actors in the Cold War, he often expressed concerns about sustaining unity among the exiles. He concluded: "I am skeptical about the wisdom of getting ourselves hooked to the ambitions of noisy, skeptical, immature, and extremist exile figures." Quoted in Scott, 200. There were more instances of failed policies using exiles than successes.

The Baltic exiles' historical memory of the 1930s and World War II was necessarily complex. On one hand, the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were among the first peoples to experience military aggression by a neighboring country in Europe. For the majority of Balts, World War II was a war of several occupations, deportations, forced conscription, and genocide. Political leaders and community leaders, such as professors, shop-owners, physicians, and teachers, who were fortunate to escape to the West represented the political, economic, and social elites of the independent interwar republics. On the other hand, what was it that those who escaped really represented? The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian governments had slipped into right-wing authoritarian dictatorships during the 1930s.<sup>134</sup>

Complicating matters further, the issue of collaboration with the Nazis from 1941-1944 could have played an impact on Baltic credibility during the hearings. Private exchanges between prominent Baltic exiles and Jewish Americans, such as the one between Alfreds Bilmanis and David Berkingoff in 1947 demonstrated the tensions between several historical narratives concerning World War II's legacies that remain irreconcilable<sup>135</sup>. For Baltic exiles, World War II represented a personal and collective struggle to survive both Nazi and Soviet atrocities, while for Jews, personal and national survival was not a legitimate excuse for any type of collaboration. The Soviet Union's rise as the United States' preeminent threat in the late 1940s meant that the Baltic historical narrative arguing that the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were the first peoples oppressed by the Soviet Union in World War II became more important than the Jewish historical narrative that some Balts had been collaborators in the Holocaust. This is most evident in the noticeable lack of any discussion of collaboration during the Congressional investigations. The committees' mandates had been specifically to address the issue of Soviet aggression and any evidence

---

<sup>134</sup> For a discussion on the shift from democratic governments to authoritarian governments in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania see: Andres Kasekamp, *The History of the Baltic States* (New York City, New York, 2010), 106-112.

<sup>135</sup> See page 85 of dissertation.

that might undermine the narrative, which members of Congress were trying to pursue were conveniently not addressed. This is one instance where there was a high-level of synchronization between Baltic exile and Congressional interests.

In the Third Interim Report, the three most important historical events studied were the individual countries' declarations of independence and recognition by the international community; the 1940 annexation by the Soviet Union; and the 1941 deportations. Although the report treated each nation as an individual case study, the political agenda of the Select Committee necessitated drawing parallels among the three experiences.

One of the most important acts of commemoration that were practiced by Baltic DPs revolved around the Summer 1941 Deportations.<sup>136</sup> Naturally, this practice traveled with the DPs to wherever they settled in the western world. The three most significant commemorations for Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians while in exile were celebrations of independence days; commemoration of the July 1940 annexation and subsequent American non-recognition; and commemorating the June 1941 deportations.

When describing the events leading to the independence and international recognition of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1918-1919, the Select Committee concluded that the "Relatively small armies of the three respective Baltic States, poorly equipped, but under determined leadership and motivated by the great inspiration of national independence, succeeded in defeating the large Red Russian Army."<sup>137</sup> The Select Committee was careful to demonstrate that the events that surrounded the takeover of the three countries were a concerted effort by the Soviet Union to exploit Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania simultaneously. Finally, specific attention was paid to NKVD Order #001223, calling for the destruction of

---

<sup>136</sup> Laura June Hilton, "Prisoners of Peace: Rebuilding Community, Identity, and Nationality in Displaced Persons Camps in Germany, 1945-1952, (PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 2001), 395-399.

<sup>137</sup> Select Comm. to Investigate Communist Aggression, H.R. 438 and H.R. 346, R.R. Rep. No. 53753., 2.

all elements of the population likely to resist the plans for Sovietization, climaxing with the 13-14 June 1941 deportations that occurred in all three countries.<sup>138</sup>

Throughout the investigations, little attention was paid to the less positive attributes of the Baltic governments during the 1930s. On 5 December 1953 in New York, President Herbert Hoover testified before the Select Committee on the political situation in Estonia and Latvia when he visited the countries in 1938. Hoover stated: “The contrast was enormous [compared to Soviet Russia] and I should say that those three states had made more progress from the very low beginnings they had 19 years before than probably had ever been made by any series of states on record.”<sup>139</sup> Hoover continued by stating that the three nations had “good governments” and “magnificent leadership.” He was most struck by Latvian President Kārlis Ulmanis who had long ties to the United States and had studied at the University of Nebraska.

Baltic exiles claimed that their homelands were democratic and prosperous during the interwar period. Chairman of IBM’s Board of Directors Thomas J. Watson bolstered this argument with his testimony. Watson traveled to the region in 1938 as President of the International Chamber of Commerce. Watson described an almost idyllic society in Latvia. He testified, “Everybody appeared to be happy, well-dressed, and well-fed... I found that they were doing an outstanding job in agriculture. They were developing industries... The stores all looked prosperous. We stayed at a very good hotel; everything was up to date. I had no occasion to complain about anything while we were in the country. The people were very courteous.”<sup>140</sup> Speaking generally about the situation in Estonia and Latvia, Watson concluded, “They were a contented [sic] people, happy, and prosperous.”<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>139</sup> *Hearings on H.R. 346, Day 5, Before the Select Committee to Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the USSR*, 83rd Cong. (1953) (statement of Herbert Hoover), 217.

<sup>140</sup> *Hearings on H.R. 346, Day 1, Before the Select Committee to Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the USSR*, 83rd Cong. (1953) (testimony of Thomas J. Watson), 4. 166.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.* 170.



The Baltic peoples' historical narrative, bolstered by the testimony of respected American citizens about how they perceived life in the interwar nations ultimately served the exiles well. Not only was it made clear to the international community that the Baltic States were victims of Soviet aggression, but a viable case was made to the American public that there were shared values between Americans and Balts, such as an appreciation of independence, diligence, and spirituality. Although the issue of Nazi collaboration would appear again in the late 1970s and early 1980s through accusations made primarily against Latvians by the U.S. Justice Department's Immigration and Naturalization Services and several non-governmental activists and Jewish organizations, the predominant story of the Baltic States was of independent states that suffered the ultimate expression of Soviet aggression and genocide.<sup>142</sup>

The Select Committee had a very limited impact on American foreign policy during the 1950s. Kersten's activism ultimately had little impact on his career in electoral politics. Although Kersten remained popular with his Polish-American constituents in his district, his close association with the most fervent anti-Communists in the Congress made him politically vulnerable. Republicans in the 1954 elections lost control of the Congress primarily due to public dissatisfaction with McCarthyism, and Democrat Henry S. Reuss swept Kersten out of office. In 1955 Kersten served as a White House Consultant on Psychological Warfare, but came back to Milwaukee shortly thereafter to return to his private law practice. The Select Committee, however, proved to be highly significant for Baltic Americans. Much of the historiography that addresses the controversial Liberation Policy during the 1950s focuses on the implications that pursuing such a policy had on American foreign policy, American domestic policy, and the promises not kept to the Soviet satellite states. Little has been written to address the significance that the policy had on groups that

---

<sup>142</sup> See Zake, *American Latvians: Politics of a Refugee Community* (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 2010), 89-124 for More on the Issue of Latvians and Nazi Collaboration.

were responsible for being willing participants in the half-hearted American attempts at liberating East Europe: the East European exiles.

Throughout the early 1950s, Balts in the United States were in a marginal position due to their relatively small numbers. Though the Select Committee had a very limited impact on American foreign policy during the 1950s, Kersten presented them with an opportunity to play a central role in shaping policy. Baltic exiles were quite successful at navigating the policy guidelines established by individuals such as Kersten because for one thing, there was virtually no ideological disparity between Kersten and the Baltic exiles.

### Conclusion

The activities of Baltic exiles in the United States were not exclusively focused on formulating foreign policy objectives of American policymakers. Indeed, there was some acknowledgment that there were limits on how much impact their activities would play in influencing elite policymaking opinion and the limits that American policymakers would have on the situation in the Baltic republics. An equally important focus of Baltic political activism during the late 1940s and 1950s was on the broader American domestic audience. While the State Department maintained strict divisions between American citizens of Baltic descent and Baltic exiles, elected officials as well as the general public did not necessarily make such distinctions. As a result, Balts living in the United States worked towards monopolizing all information pertaining to their homelands and gradually diversified their contacts with American officials, namely through the United States Congress.

McCarthyism ultimately tempered the American appetite for engaging in virulent anti-communist activities, but there remained a majority of Americans who were ideologically sympathetic towards those who continued to hold strong anti-communist positions throughout the first half of the 1950s. As a result, Estonians, Latvians, and

Lithuanians actually had a rather understanding audience in the United States when they held rallies commemorating their annual days of independence, and anniversaries of the 1940 annexation and 1941 deportations. Publications, such as the *Baltic Review*, ensured that mainstream thinking about the plight of the Baltic States continued to focus on the radical changes that the Soviet Union had forced upon the three former independent nations. The hope was that this would maintain a level of alertness in the United States to the persistent communist threat. Although the results were decidedly mixed, the public face of Baltic political activism constitutes an important component in the anti-communist fabric of the United States during the 1950s.

While Baltic exile politics abroad were predominantly characterized by a persistent state of dysfunction, Baltic constituents worked towards presenting a unified force against communism in the United States. The Baltic National Committees sponsored by the FEC might have been ineffective in creating a unified pan-Baltic anti-communist base throughout the world, but on a number of technical issues, such as the *Baltic Review*, they were successful in laying the groundwork for future pan-Baltic cooperation within the United States. Within each ethnic community in the United States, the politics of exile did not encumber the ability of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians to work within their individual communities on projects such as holding rallies, publishing material, and lobbying the United States Congress. Indeed, the only way that they were able to achieve the most minor influence with members of Congress was to give the impression that they were a unified voting bloc in congressional districts throughout the country. Participation in the Kersten Committee not only represented a high point in Baltic influence in the United States Congress, but laid the groundwork for future Baltic constituent activities.

Nevertheless, Baltic political activism in the United States was not exclusively about changing the direction of American foreign policy. The most important policy concern for the

Baltic exiles was not about changing policy, but maintaining the American non-recognition policy. The political activism also created opportunities for the exiles to elevate their own standing in American society and eventually create a shared sense of history that transcended the national narratives, creating a Baltic narrative. The actions of the State Department and Truman and Eisenhower administrations concerning the Baltic States make it clear that in spite of the non-recognition policy outside pressure was crucial to maintain the policy as the Cold War continued for an indefinite number of years and consumed an enormous amount of resources.

## CHAPTER VI

### 1956 REVOLUTIONS AND REAPPRAISAL OF POLICIES

In April 1956, rumors began to grow within the Baltic exile community as well in diplomatic circles about a drastic change in Soviet policy concerning Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. *Stockholms Tidningen* reported on 5 April 1956 that their sources in London revealed that the Kremlin had started to consider liberalizing its policy towards the Baltic republics and transform them into so-called People's Republics – the equivalent of satellite status.<sup>1</sup> Throughout the month various other European newspapers reported on the topic, culminating with the Hamburg paper, *Das Ostpreussen Blatt* stating: “It is a fact that the leading personalities of the Communist Congress in Moscow to enact the so-called restoration of independence to the Baltic States, as proposed by the omnipotent Politburo.”<sup>2</sup>

The idea of a liberalized Soviet position towards the Baltic republics provided hope for those who sought to reduce Cold War tensions. Such a policy would have allowed for an opening for Baltic nationalism after more than a decade of severe oppression that was a period characterized by deportations and restrictions on all facets of life. In addition this could provide an opportunity for other national minorities within the Soviet Union to demand for independence. The transformation of the Baltic republics into people's democracies would have been proof positive that Khrushchev's rhetoric of peaceful coexistence could be matched by actual deeds.<sup>3</sup>

For many Baltic exiles, however, such a change in the Kremlin's policy towards the Soviet Union represented two sets of challenges. First, Baltic exiles argued that the in reality, a shift in the Kremlin's policy did not demonstrably change the relationship between the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Stockholms Tidningen* on 5 April 1956 quoted in *Baltic Review* 7, 16 June 1956.

<sup>2</sup> *Das Ostpreussen Blatt*, 21 April 1956. The various other newspapers to publish similar stories include *Norges-Handels och Sjöfarts Tidende* in Oslo on 6 April 1956, *Uusi Suomi* in Helsinki as well as *Norddeutsche Nachrichten* on 11 April 1956.

<sup>3</sup> On Khrushchev and his initial thoughts on “peaceful coexistence” as a means of conducting foreign policy see: Aleksandr Fursenko and Timothy Naftali, *Khrushchev's Cold War: The Inside Story of An American Adversary* (New York: Norton, 2006), 23.

Baltic States and the Soviet Union, but instead would provide the Khrushchev with a major propaganda victory.<sup>4</sup> Even worse, they viewed the establishment of Baltic people's democracies as a way for the Soviet Union to consolidate its rule even further in Eastern Europe and in international organizations by strengthening the outward appearance of the Warsaw Pact and adding three pro-Soviet seats to the United Nations.<sup>5</sup> Second, a fundamental change in the legal relationship between the Soviet Union and the Baltic republics would necessarily mean a reassessment in American policy towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The very real possibility of abandoning the non-recognition policy would not only limit the prospect of the United States assisting in the liberation of the Baltic republics, but would affect the standing of Baltic exiles living in the United States as well as potentially undermining their standing with compatriots living behind the Iron Curtain.

The optimism in Spring 1956 about the possible liberalization of Soviet policy towards the Baltic States was quickly tempered by the realities surrounding the suppression of revolution in the satellite states in October and November 1956. The June 1956 workers' riots in Poznań not only resulted in the ascension of Władysław Gomułka as First Secretary of the Polish Communist Party but sparked sympathy protests in Hungary that October, which gave way to a full-scale uprising in Hungary.<sup>6</sup> The suppression of the Hungarian Revolution on 28 October 1956 not only exposed Khrushchev's rhetoric of peaceful coexistence as being entirely hollow, but it immediately raised questions about the American inability to follow through on its policy of liberating the Soviet bloc.

---

<sup>4</sup> The June 1956 edition of the *Baltic Review* featured an article that argued several points about how the change in the Baltic States' status would not truly change the relationship with the Kremlin and would provide Khrushchev with a major propaganda victory. The article argued on the political front that "As long as the Baltic States are controlled by the Communist Party, they will never be free from the Kremlin's control." On the economic front, since the satellite countries are generally not permitted any economic dealings with Western Europe, the Baltic economies would remain oriented towards Moscow. Finally, on the social front, little would change in working conditions or media communications. See *Baltic Review* June 1956, "Kremlin Tactics in Converting the Baltic States into Satellites: Soviet Strategy and Tactics Since 1940."

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 15.

<sup>6</sup> See: Pawel Machcewicz, *Rebellious Satellite: Poland 1956* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009).

Rumors that the Baltic republics would be transformed ultimately proved to be untrue. As a result, Baltic exiles were never forced to confront policy changes in the United States due to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania becoming people's democracies. However, the aftermath of the Hungarian Revolution did create major policy questions within the State Department concerning the entire Soviet bloc. This chapter will examine the three main areas of policy discussion towards the Baltic republics after 1956. First, the continuation of the private-public network, where the question of whether or not the United States should continue to directly support Baltic exile activity became a central debate. Second, the importance of Baltic diplomatic missions, where a number of aging exiled diplomats representing nations that were becoming mere memories of the past were becoming less important. Third, the continuation of the non-recognition policy, where policymakers questioned its value since it was implicitly clear that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were not going to regain their independence in the foreseeable future.

This chapter will also examine some of the reactions from prominent Baltic exiles within the United States and abroad. I will argue that Baltic exiles raised legitimate criticism with the State Department as well as other American interlocutors concerning their policy of building relations with certain groups of Baltic exiles. The failure to liberate Hungary undermined American credibility internationally and had possibly negative implications for the historical development of the Soviet bloc, but its biggest blowback was that it undermined American credibility with those that had worked the closest with the United States to bring about the liberation of the Soviet bloc – the Eastern European exiles. I will also argue that Baltic disappointment in the State Department after 1956 paved the way for the diversification of Baltic political activities in the 1960s and beyond.

First, however, it is important to understand the implications that the Hungarian Revolution had on broader American foreign policy interests in the Soviet bloc. Not only did

the Hungarian Revolution temper American expectations in the region, but also raised serious policy debates about how best to pursue American regional interests whilst maintaining its values in combatting Soviet oppression. The role of the FEC in the Hungarian Revolution and the resulting change in policy directives is analyzed below.

### *The Perceived Failure of Radio Free Europe and the Establishment of New Directives*

Since November 1956, perhaps the two most important questions concerning American-Hungarian relations were: did RFE broadcasts urge Hungarian citizens to fight the Red Army? and Did RFE broadcasts promise military assistance from the West?<sup>7</sup> A voluminous amount of literature has criticized the role of American broadcasts in the Hungarian Revolution's descent into violence.<sup>8</sup> While this historical debate continues, it is often obscured, partially due to the continued classification of documents from the period as well as the emotional nature of the topic.<sup>9</sup> What is true is that the "Hungarian debacle" permanently changed the perception of RFE not only to the listeners and broadcasters, but also the policymakers who oversaw its policy directives.<sup>10</sup>

The FEC, CIA, State Department, Council of Europe, as well as the United Nations conducted reviews concerning the role of RFE broadcasting during the Hungarian Revolution. While, RFE was generally cleared of any wrongdoing,<sup>11</sup> the internal FEC and State Department reviews were actually quite critical. The FEC's Office of the Political Advisor conducted the most rigorous internal review that covered 70% of all non-news broadcasts

---

<sup>7</sup> A. Ross Johnson, *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty: The CIA Years and Beyond*, (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010), 88-89.

<sup>8</sup> See: Charles Gati, *Failed Illusions: Moscow, Washington, Budapest, and the 1956 Hungarian Revolt*, (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006). Tim Weiner, *Legacy of Ashes: The History of the CIA*, (New York: Anchor, 2008), 141-157. Johanna Granville, "Caught with Jam on our Fingers" *Diplomatic History* 29, Issue 5 (2005): 811-839.

<sup>9</sup> The best scholarly work includes Johnson, *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, but it is important to note that Johnson has served as a professional advisor to RFE/RL.

<sup>10</sup> Arch Puddington, *Broadcasting Freedom: The Cold War Triumph of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, 111.

<sup>11</sup> Johnson, 106.



during the period. Letter grades were assigned to all broadcasts and only 171 of 308 broadcasts received the grades “A” or “B,” while 56 programs were judged to be at the “D” or “F” level.<sup>12</sup> The State Department argued that the broadcasts had not caused the uprising nor promised American aid, but that “over-zealous Hungarian employees of RFE” encouraged the revolutionaries and supplied tactical advice.<sup>13</sup>

Although the reorganization of the Hungarian Broadcasting Service in 1957 improved the quality of Hungarian broadcasts, personnel shuffles on the American side proved to be a detriment to the FEC. American successors were less knowledgeable about Eastern Europe and were less capable managers.<sup>14</sup> Equally important was the decision by the State Department to reassert its control over RFE policy guidance.<sup>15</sup> Although the State Department had always cleared the policy guidelines that had developed, the Office of East European Affairs sought to bring all RFE operations under the umbrella of the State Department and involve State Department officials in daily broadcasting.<sup>16</sup> The establishment of the Committee on Radio Broadcasting Policy (CRBP) as an interagency organization consisting of the State Department, CIA, and USIA worked towards redefining RFE’s purpose in 1957.

While acknowledging that the ultimate goal was to promote freedom from communism, RFE’s new objectives, which were deemed more realistic, were “to foster an evolutionary development resulting in the weakening of Soviet controls and the progressive attainment of national independence.” Simultaneously, RFE sought to promote national communist regimes that would be able to exercise a greater degree of independent authority

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 111-112.

<sup>15</sup> Puddington, 118.

<sup>16</sup> According to Johnson, the State Department had four main objects: to halt RFE technical modernization and give budgetary priority to VOA; to restructure RL and devote part of its capabilities to Asian-African broadcasts; to phase down RFE Polish and Hungarian broadcasts; and to reduce émigré involvement in RFE. See 122.

over its own affairs.<sup>17</sup> In an attempt to ensure that RFE would not be culpable for any future uprisings in the Soviet bloc, the guidance also explicitly stated that it was “neither feasible nor desirable that the United States run the risk of instigating either local or general hostilities by encouraging popular resistance.”<sup>18</sup>

Interestingly, the CRBP sought to extricate the American aspects from RFE and argued that RFE would be more effective by being more European. RFE was supposed to broadcast information from the perspective of Europeans and in a European context, while the VOA was to remain the exclusive medium from broadcasting information about the United States. The debate over establishing an RFE European Advisory Committee, which had been first advocated by the Council of Europe, was yet another means of trying to remove the American footprint from the broadcasting.

Ironically, while RFE was trying to reduce American influence over its broadcasts to the satellite countries, the late 1950s saw the rapid increase in American influence in the administration of the radio. In what Johnson describes as the “Doldrums at RFE after 1956,” the State Department’s demand for more control over RFE was just one component of the general decline that the FEC suffered from until the early 1960s. Fervent anti-communists on the American political right criticized RFE for being too soft on communism and financial mismanagement.<sup>19</sup> In addition, RFE lost a significant amount of credibility in the media and among anti-communist movements primarily located in Europe.

Before resigning as FEC President in 1958, Lt. General Willis D. Crittenger drafted a letter to other members of the FEC articulating problems about the idea of the European Advisory Group. Crittenger described the difficulties at the Polish Radio Desk where its head, Jan Nowak, threatened to walk off the job with his entire staff unless the FEC

---

<sup>17</sup> Puddington, 118.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* See Also Johnson, 123.

<sup>19</sup> Johnson, 126.

showed the willingness to discuss the status of two elder Polish exiles who were seeking pensions from the FEC.<sup>20</sup>

The Sudeten German Association of Land Groups also levied criticism against the idea of the European Advisory Group in a thirteen-page document entitled “American Cold War Propaganda in Twilight.” The pamphlet was assumed to be distributed among influential German politicians as well as important non-communist groups in an attempt to further damage the FEC’s credibility. The Free Europe Exile Relations branch was accused of directly funding the National Committees and the ACEN, which are mere propaganda agencies and all of their members were “yes men.” The Free Europe Press was accused of being “made up of average writers and has done such harm by causing many arrests of innocent peoples in Czechoslovakia and Hungary through its methods of obtaining information and through the balloon operations.”<sup>21</sup> Finally, the Free Europe University in Exile was an “amateurish organization which is dying out.”<sup>22</sup>

The period immediately following the Hungarian Revolution can be characterized as a period of general decline for Radio Free Europe. The realities of Hungary necessarily meant that the strategic goals of radio broadcasting had become more modest. The growing bureaucratic jostling resulted in increased staffing turnovers on the American side. An even greater staffing problem, however, was the necessity of replacing an aging cadre of exile broadcasters. Some had died and some were approaching retirement age.<sup>23</sup> Throughout the 1950s, Eastern European governments had become more efficient in preventing the emigration of dissidents and as a result the pool of qualified broadcasters became smaller at

---

<sup>20</sup> Lt. General Willis D. Crittenberger to FEC “Opposition to European Advisory Group” on 21 April 1958 Folder: Free Europe Committee, 1958. Box 53: Free Europe Committee Budget, CD Jackson Papers, DDEPL.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> Puddington, 127.

the same time that higher standards were expected from the radios.<sup>24</sup> By the end of the 1950s, there had been a growing concern among policymakers as well as exile broadcasters as to whether or not there was any utility in “gray” broadcasting behind the Iron Curtain. This fundamental question not only would impact FEC sponsored radio broadcasts, but also every other facets of the organization’s operations.

### Reassessment of FEC Exile Relations

In November 1958, the FEC sought to clarify its relationship with its sponsored exiles in a document describing the function of the European Advisory Board. The Free Europe Exile relations assisted exiles in three main ways. First, by promoting the interest of those in the free world to assist in the peaceful restoration of independence to the exiles’ home nations; second, by sustaining the morale of all exiles through supporting the efforts of a select few; third, by helping in providing information about life behind the Iron Curtain as a means of combatting communist influence in the free world.<sup>25</sup> In addition, the document attempted to offer greater separation between the exile national committees and any notion of political or diplomatic recognition by the United States Government. The FEC reiterated that that no national committee had the status of a government-in-exile. What was new, however, was the assertion that “it is not the purpose of the Committee to support the ambition of any émigré group to restore, in any sense, the *status quo ante bellum* in any East European country.”<sup>26</sup>

From the perspective of the exiles that cooperated with the FEC, however there was an implicit acceptance that the national committees would be an important component in reestablishing democratic institutions in Eastern Europe after liberation had taken place. It

---

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid*, 128.

<sup>25</sup> 1 November 1958 Memo: “Proposed European Advisory Committee” Folder: Free Europe Committee, 1958. Box 53: Free Europe Committee Budget, CD Jackson Papers, DDEPL.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid*.

was significant that the FEC absolved itself from supporting national committees that would be used to restore governments representing the interwar period in the Soviet bloc should the political conditions for such a transformation become reality. It was representative of a changing belief that political transformation in the former Soviet bloc would consist of a gradual evolution as opposed to rapid revolutions or Western interventions. It was also representative of the FEC's (and by default the State Department's) interest in reducing the ambition of its relationship with the émigré groups in which they sponsored.<sup>27</sup>

The 1960 budget prepared by FEC President Archibald S. Alexander detailed the fundamental changes that were about to take place in the FEC's dealing with Eastern European exile groups. Alexander's number one priority was to reorient the FEC's exile support. He observed that the FEC would spend over one million dollars to support the national committees, the ACEN and other exile groups.<sup>28</sup> Alexander claimed that such an expenditure was not only beyond the budgetary capabilities of the FEC, but also was not essential to accomplish the FEC's program aims. Therefore, he proposed to reduce expenditures by \$335,000 and reorganize the structure of FEC exile relations.<sup>29</sup>

Going forward, the FEC directed the majority of exile activities towards the ACEN to allow drastic cuts to be made to the budgets of individual national committees. To achieve this goal, four policy changes were made. First, deserving exile council members who were no longer able to contribute to effective work would be granted small stipends for their prior activities. Second, sixteen of the most effective national committee members would become

---

<sup>27</sup> As early as 1955, American officials began to seriously reconsider whether or not the United States wanted to pursue revolutionary changes in Eastern Europe. NSC 5505/1 "Exploitation of Soviet and European Satellite Vulnerabilities," passed on 31 January 1955 called for "evolutionary rather than revolutionary change" in the satellites. This only deepened the contradictions between stated American policy towards the satellites in 1955-1956 and the reality of the American position. After Hungary 1956, there were no illusions that the United States could rollback communist influence in Eastern Europe so policymakers could no longer justify the expenditures associated with Emigre national councils.

<sup>28</sup> 27 January 1960, 'Proposed Budget for Executive Committee and FEC Board of Directors' Folder: Free Europe Committee, 1960 (3). Box 53: Free Europe Committee Budget, CD Jackson Papers, DDEPL.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

delegates to the ACEN and would only receive a salary for their activities with the ACEN. Third, separate office space and staffs for individual committees would be eliminated and the remaining exiles associated with the FEC would share new office space. Fourth, support for individual national programs would be trimmed from \$122,200 per year to \$51,400 where a portion of the saved funds could be utilized for ad hoc publications in the future.<sup>30</sup>

The FEC hoped that the ACEN would be a cumulatively more effective body in organizing the political potentials of the exiles than the individual national committees. Through reducing the scope of the national committees and streamlining exile efforts through the ACEN, officials assumed that through reassessing the relationships with certain exiles would increase the body's overall quality through assessing an exile's ability to possess several key attributes. Exiles were sought who had the ability to understand the problems that the West faced at the end of the 1950s and had the flexibility to meet new international conditions with new programs. Exiles should ideally have a minimal amount of stature with other exiles as well as diplomats, politicians, educators, and journalists. Most importantly, exiles should have been able to rise above the intermittent strife that had dominated exile politics through the entire decade.<sup>31</sup>

The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian national committees were not immune to the FEC's restructuring of exile relations. The FEC's 1959 operating budget for Baltic operations was \$134,200. The proposed 1960 operating budget was reduced to \$58,200, or a 56% reduction.<sup>32</sup> Ironically, the already minimal activities that the Baltic National Committees had in relation to the FEC's overall agenda meant that the long-term impact that the funding cuts had on the national committee's future activities was decidedly mixed. On one hand, the number of exiles that received direct funding from the FEC was slashed. In 1959, five

---

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.* For a comparison, the Albanian funding was decreased by 59%, the Bulgarian funding was decreased by 72%, the Czechoslovak funding was decreased by 74%, the Hungarian funding was decreased by 62%, the Polish funding was decreased by 40%, and the Romanian funding was decreased by 65%.

Estonians, four Latvians, and Eight Lithuanians were directly sponsored by the FEC. The proposed reorganization of the national committees meant that only two Lithuanians, one Latvian and one Estonian would be affiliated with the ACEN. On the other hand, the Baltic language publications as well as the *Baltic Review* continued to be published into the 1960s, which meant that Baltic committees continued to have a level of autonomy despite the prominent role that the ACEN would assume.

The revised ACEN was supposed to be a streamlined representational organization that consisted of a general committee and secretary general that would keep the issue of Eastern Europe alive in world opinion, but also keep the international community informed on developments in the Soviet bloc and build relations with anti-communist organizations internationally.<sup>33</sup> In reality, the ACEN continued to function as it had during the post-1956 period. Formal meetings were held regularly where declarations were made, rallies were organized surrounding important anniversaries, and resolutions were passed that were then forwarded to UN delegates.<sup>34</sup> In the aftermath of the Hungarian Revolution, the representative nature of the ACEN among all Eastern European nations began to decline. The developments within Hungary and the rehabilitation of relations between Kadar and the United States were naturally important developments in the region. This phenomenon was compounded by the fact that the most active ACEN delegates after 1956 were Hungarians.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> The General Committee would establish policy, improve existing programs, and have the ability to employ and dismiss the Secretary General and other officials. The Committee consisted of nine voting members, one from each of the nine captive nations, and one observer representing each of the four international groups represented (International Peasant Union, International Centre of Free Trade Unionists in Exile, Socialist Union of Central and Eastern Europe, and Christian Democratic Union). In an attempt to change the deliberative nature of the ACEN, regular plenary sessions were abolished and special plenary sessions were to be organized if international developments warranted.

<sup>34</sup> 1 July 1963 Memorandum for the Record: Subject: The Assembly of Captive European Nations (ACEN). Folder: Free Europe Committee Budget, 1963. Box 53: Free Europe Committee Budget, CD Jackson Papers, DDEPL.

<sup>35</sup> An analysis of the correspondences that the ACEN participated in after 1956 in addition to the topics discussed during General Committee meetings during the same period of time demonstrates that the majority of time was devoted to what should be done concerning Hungary going forward. In essence, issues pertaining to all other nationalities represented in the ACEN were squeezed out of debates and discussions. Refer to Minutes of General Committee Meetings, Folders: Minutes of General Committee Meetings, 1957; Minutes of General

Throughout the ACEN's existence, its relationship with Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exiles had always been contentious. Due to the relatively small number of Baltic exiles compared to larger nationalities such as the Poles, Hungarians and Czechoslovaks and the importance that the FEC placed on satellite countries, issues that were directly related to the Baltic republics were simply crowded out. The fact that ACEN delegates had predominantly been leading diplomats and politicians of Eastern European governments during the interwar period gave a certain amount of legitimacy for the satellite nations, but was seen as a potential liability for the Baltic republics as it related to the non-recognition policy. The preeminent position that Hungary played after 1956 further diminished the importance of the Baltic issue within the ACEN and resulted in the Baltic national committees continuing their comparatively small activities under the FEC's umbrella.

The consolidation of exile activities by the FEC represented one component of a broader American policy to reassess the various covert relations that developed during the late 1940s and 1950s between American officials and exile organizations. The growing concerns of communists engaging in subversive activities against the VLIK in 1955, in addition to the inability of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Corps and the VLIK to reconcile their differences resulted in a reappraisal of the wisdom in continuing to support the Lithuanian exile organization financially. Throughout the spring of 1955, the State Department, CIA, and VLIK members held discussions about the possibility of transferring the organization from Reutlingen, Germany to the United States.<sup>36</sup>

The official rationale for the transfer of VLIK from Germany to the United States was presented to Vedeler on 9 March 1955 in a meeting with a VLIK delegation that had visited

---

Committee Meetings, 1958; Box 61 & FEC Correspondence Folders 1956-1961, Box 3 Assembly of Captive European Nations Collection IHRC.

<sup>36</sup> References to meetings with the CIA are noted on documents related to various meetings between the State Department's Baltic desk and Lithuanian diplomats. "Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.



the United States. The delegates argued that due to pressure in the United States that all Lithuanian activities towards the liberation of Lithuania should take place in America. They continued by noting that the “intellectual competence among the Lithuanian exiles is concentrated in the United States” and that the “atmosphere in Europe is not considered so favorable as that in the United States to useful activity on behalf of the liberation of Lithuania.”<sup>37</sup> Despite some of the arguments that could be used to oppose such a transfer, such as that there was already a sufficient organizational structure for the liberation of Lithuania through the Free Lithuanian Committee and the ALT, all interested parties agreed that a move to the United States was the best situation going forward.

In May 1955, VLIK made the decision to begin the moving process to New York.<sup>38</sup> There was considerable expense involved in the move and the organization would enter into a transitional phase where three members of the VLIK Executive Council would remain in Europe.<sup>39</sup> During the process, however, the VLIK underwent a transformation from exclusively an exile organization that sought to liberate its homeland to a small but important constituent organization in the United States. The beginning of this transformation occurred at the VLIK’s annual meeting in New York from 24-27 November 1955. During the meeting it was agreed that the Committee, which had formerly been composed of only Lithuanian citizens, should also allow Americans of Lithuanian descent to serve as members of the Committee.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, “The Question of the Transfer of VLIK to the US” on 9 March 1955 “Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>38</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Žadeikis and Vedeler on “Transfer of VLIK Committee from Germany” 27 May 1955 “Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> Povilas Žadeikis to Howard Trivers (Baltic Desk) 5 December 1955 “Folder: Li801.1 Emigre Organizations” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 10, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

Although the transfer reduced the Lithuanian exile presence in Central Europe considerably, it served to strengthen the political cohesiveness of Lithuanians residing in the United States. VLIK did play an important role in maintaining contacts with Lithuanian partisan figures during the 1940s and the early 1950s, but as time went on, its self-appointed position as the central exile organization for Lithuanians became a divisive issue in Lithuanian politics. Over time, the VLIK's political agenda diminished and the organization began to build better relationships with the other Lithuanian organizations as well as the exiled diplomatic missions. Ultimately, a powerful Lithuanian presence in the United States would be a more important political development than a diverse political diaspora scattered throughout the West.

#### *The Fate of the Non-Recognition Policy*

During the 1940s and first half of the 1950s, the non-recognition policy was the non-negotiable component of American policy towards the Baltic republics. It helped to frame all policy concerns towards the Baltic republics ranging from whether or not to accept Soviet officials who originated from the Baltic republics to deciding how and what kind of psychological warfare would be deployed against the Baltic republics. The non-recognition policy also served as a powerful reminder to the international community that the United States was rhetorically opposed to Soviet territorial aggression. It also served as a rallying call for all Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exiles who sought American assistance in liberating their homelands. The events of 1956 offered American policymakers perhaps the first real opportunity to assess the centrality of the non-recognition policy to American interests in the Baltic region.

Based on available State Department and Eisenhower Administration material, however, there were never any serious discussions within the John Foster Dulles' State

Department or the White House about abandoning the non-recognition policy. While there was certainly bureaucratic inertia behind the non-recognition policy within the State Department, it is very likely that the decision not to question the policy came directly from Secretary Dulles. On 2 February 1956, Thomas A. Donovan, a State Department official in the Office of Eastern European affairs had a telephone conversation with Representative Don Hayworth (D-MI) about the status of Latvian blocked assets in the United States. Over the course of the conversation, Hayworth asked “How long will the funds be blocked?” Donovan responded, “For the foreseeable future. The policy not to recognize the Soviet seizure of the countries... was made when Mr. Hull was Secretary of State, and had been continued by later Secretaries.” He added “Since non-recognition of the Soviet claims in the Baltic was of personal interest to Secretary Dulles, I saw no likelihood that the policy would be modified in the present conditions.”<sup>41</sup>

Indeed, as early as January 1957, Eisenhower and Dulles continued to use the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union as an important rhetorical tool in describing the nature of the Soviet Union to the American public. During Eisenhower’s address before Congress on 5 January 1957 where he sought congressional authorization to use the United States military to protect the sovereignty of Middle Eastern nations and declared that force would not be used for any aggressive purposes, the President explicitly mentioned the Baltic republics:

Remember Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania! In 1939 the Soviet Union entered into mutual assistance pacts with these then independent countries; and the Soviet foreign minister, addressing the Extraordinary Fifth Session of the Supreme Soviet in October 1939, solemnly and publicly declared that “we stand for the scrupulous and punctilious observance of the pacts on the basis of complete reciprocity, and we declare that all of the nonsensical talk about the Sovietization of the Baltic countries

---

<sup>41</sup> 2 February 1956, Memorandum of Conversation, “Talk with Representative Haworth of Michigan about U.S. Policy on Latvian Assets in the United States.” Representative Hayworth and Thomas A. Donovan. Central Decimal File, 1955-1959, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 611.60C221/2-258. Dulles was not just instrumental in the 1952 Republican Platform, which explicitly mentioned the Baltic States incorporation into the Soviet Union, but rhetorically used the non-recognition policy on numerous occasions during Eisenhower’s first term. See Kersten Committee Testimony.

is only to the interest of our common enemies and of all anti-Soviet provocateurs.” Yes in 1940, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.<sup>42</sup>

Although the State Department was largely responsible for drafting Eisenhower’s speech, the fact that Eisenhower and Dulles did meet on two separate occasions to discuss the speech’s content and the equal role that the Soviet crackdown in Hungary played in the speech, suggests that the continuation of the non-recognition policy emanated from the Secretary of State’s office.<sup>43</sup>

An important component of implementing the non-recognition policy was issuing statements commemorating the national anniversaries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. By 1955, the number of constituent and exile requests for letters clarifying American policy on the national holidays and the deportation anniversaries resulted in the Baltic Desk deciding that separate letters to the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian were becoming too time consuming and a poor utilization of resources.<sup>44</sup> During the annual review process in January 1957 about letters of congratulations to not only the exiled diplomats but to Baltic organizations, State Department officials acknowledged the sensitivity of the issue given events of the preceding year. Elbrick of the Office of European Affairs wrote to Dulles stating “A number of American citizens of Baltic origin have expressed concerns to the Department... They feared that the U.S. might be losing interest in the fate of the Baltic peoples. The omission of an anniversary statement this year could, therefore, give rise to undesirable and unwarranted speculation as to a possible change in our long-standing policy

---

<sup>42</sup> Dwight D. Eisenhower Address Before Congress on 5 June 1957.

<sup>43</sup> Eisenhower placed the Hungarian crackdown in the context of the role of the United Nations to protect the rights of small nations. According to records in the Speech Series of the John Foster Dulles papers, there were thirteen drafts of the 5 January speech and the Baltic States are first references in the third draft on 22 December 1956. This suggests that it was decided early on in the drafting process that reference to the Baltic republics should be included. See: Draft Presidential Correspondence and Speech Series of the John Foster Dulles Papers and White House Memoranda Series of the John Foster Dulles Papers, DDEPL.

<sup>44</sup> 7 February 1955, Barbour (EUR) to Secretary Dulles “Proposed Statement on the Thirty-Seventh Anniversary of the Declarations of Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian Independence” “Folder: B815 Holidays, Anniversaries and Charities” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

on this subject.”<sup>45</sup> In the aftermath of the Hungarian Uprising, the State Department honored the Balts “continuing courageous determination to regain their national rights of which they have been so cruelly and unjustly deprived.”<sup>46</sup>

The continued use of the Baltic States by senior American officials to describe the nature of Soviet foreign policy and the decision to send congratulations letters to commemorate the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian declarations of independence demonstrated that the United States still wished to maintain the non-recognition policy in principle, but these acts did not clarify what continued non-recognition would mean for other aspects of American policy towards the Soviet Union. NSC 5811: “United States Policy toward the Soviet-Dominated Nations of Eastern Europe” in May 1958 clarified the implications of the non-recognition policy for broader policy concerns.

An appendix to NSC 5811 described the special policy considerations that officials should consider when faced with a policy intrinsically linked to Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania. First, the United States should continue its policy of non-recognition towards the Soviet annexation and maintain diplomatic relations with the exiled missions that were established in Washington and New York by the last free governments of the Baltic States.<sup>47</sup> Second, the document outlined what constituted contacts with the Baltic States.<sup>48</sup> The non-recognition policy still precluded American contacts of an official nature with the Baltic republics, but endorsed the idea that the non-recognition policy should not inhibit the travel of American

---

<sup>45</sup> 25 January 1957, Elbrick to John Foster Dulles “Proposed Statement on the Thirty-Ninth Anniversary of the Declarations of Lithuania, Estonian, and Latvian independence. “Folder: B815 Holidays, Anniversaries and Charities” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>46</sup> John Foster Dulles Statement of the Thirty-Ninth Anniversary of the Declarations of Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian Independence” 26 January 1957. “Folder: B815 Holidays, Anniversaries and Charities” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 3, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>47</sup> NSC 5811 Appendix, Page 2. Baltic States “Folder: B890.2 Policy” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>48</sup> A major component of the non-recognition policy during the 1940s and the 1950s was that the United States would establish zero contacts within or around the Soviet occupied Baltic republics.

citizens to the Baltic States as a tourist or other personal reasons, such as holiday or religious groups.<sup>49</sup> Within the broader context of American policy towards Eastern Europe where cultural exchanges were becoming more important, the contact between private American citizens and Baltic citizens was seen as a reasonable compromise between the exclusionary nature of the non-recognition policy and the desire to expand American culture into the Soviet Union.<sup>50</sup>

NSC 5811 also clarified American broadcasting policies towards the Baltic republics in a manner that reflected the changing role of Radio Free Europe as well as Voice of America to the United States. The NSC argued that the United States should encourage the circulation of any American informational media in the Baltic States and that broadcasts should be designed to maintain an interest among Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in developments in the free world generally, and in the United States specifically.<sup>51</sup> In addition, American sponsored broadcasts should “avoid making public statements which could reasonably be interpreted as inciting the Baltic peoples to open revolt or indicating that this country is prepared to resort to force to eliminate Soviet domination.”<sup>52</sup> Exiled leaders should be discouraged from using American broadcasting facilities to reduce the chance that such public statements are broadcast.<sup>53</sup>

Finally, the document codified the use of the non-recognition policy by American officials in both the domestic and international arenas. The NSC confirmed that the United States government should reiterate its policy towards the Baltic republics publicly on appropriate occasions. Such statements were important since they were thought to boost the

---

<sup>49</sup> NSC 5811 Appendix, Page 3. “Folder: B890.2 Policy” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>50</sup> For a detailed analysis of cultural exchanges and interactions in the Soviet bloc see: Richmond Yale, *Practicing Public Diplomacy: A Cold War Odyssey* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), 42-127.

<sup>51</sup> NSC 5811 Appendix, Page 3: “Folder: B890.1 Basic Studies” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 2, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.* The one exception was that the accredited exiled diplomats should be allowed to send messages on anniversaries or other special occasions.

morale to Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians around the world and they demonstrated that the United States did not condone aggression against smaller nations.<sup>54</sup> American officials were also encouraged to use the record of Soviet relations with the Baltic republics as an example “illustrating the readiness of the Soviets to disregard clear objections under existing treaties where such action appears to serve their purposes.”<sup>55</sup>

Although there were small changes made in defining the content of contacts with the Baltic republics and how American broadcasts in the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian languages were to be presented, the broad changes made to American policy towards Eastern Europe after 1956 did not change policy towards the Baltic republics substantively. So long as the non-recognition policy remained useful to American foreign policy interests in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union its continuation was secure. The recognition that change was not envisaged in the region, however, reduced the ability of the United States to promote the expansion of a non-recognition doctrine internationally.

#### *Reducing Diplomatic Missions Abroad*

From the beginning of the non-recognition policy, the State Department supported the aspirations of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian diplomats who lived in the Free World to continue their work. The release of blocked funds to finance Baltic diplomatic missions in Western Europe and throughout the Western hemisphere was perceived to serve American interests in the areas that the missions served. During World War II, the missions were important to curtail the influence of Nazi Germany in South America. During the early Cold War, the missions provided psychological warfare benefits by promoting anti-communist attitudes and the greater the number of Baltic missions internationally, the more viable was American non-recognition policy viewed.

---

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

By the late 1950s, it became apparent to the State Department that exile Baltic diplomatic activity financed by frozen Baltic friends would have to be streamlined. Although the investment of frozen assets helped in allowing Baltic missions to remain fiscally solvent through the 1950s, Estonian and Lithuanian expenses were exceeding the interest earned on the principal.<sup>56</sup> The American government emphasized that the Baltic diplomatic missions in Washington and New York were self-financed. The necessity to use American government funds to support the Baltic diplomatic missions would have severely undermined the entire non-recognition policy. As a result, the State Department began to look for ways to drastically cut the annual budgets of the missions. Simultaneously, there were demographic and political problems that plagued certain missions abroad. Nearly twenty years after the annexation of the Baltic States, many of the exiled diplomats were aging and there were very few viable replacements for elderly diplomats. The governments where many Baltic diplomatic missions functioned also began reassessing the value of accrediting Baltic missions in their country.

In 1959, the British disclosed to the Americans that the British government provided 12,500 pounds sterling per year from “secret funds” to maintain the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian missions in London.<sup>57</sup> Due to austerity measures in the United Kingdom, the British foreign office made the decision to withdraw the subsidy. The meeting with the Americans was to inquire whether the Americans felt whether it would be more “humane” to tell the diplomats that upon their death the funding would cease or take a more gradual

---

<sup>56</sup> Information from 1959 allows us to evaluate the success of the investment plans in preserving the principal of the funds. In preparing the 1960 budgets, Estonian assets were figured at \$551,921; Latvian assets at \$8,06 million, and Lithuanian assets at \$1,833 million. The invested assets were earning \$19,454 for the Estonians, \$136,375, and \$45,878 for the Lithuanians. As a result, the net drain on Estonian assets was \$47,536, \$6,200 for the Latvians, and \$90,979 for the Lithuanians. See: 4 December 1959 East Europe Memorandum for State Files “Level of Baltic States Deposits in Federal Reserve Bank” “Folder: B402 Annual Budgets” Records Relating to the Baltic States 1940-1961. Box 1 RG 59 Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, NAI.

<sup>57</sup> Memorandum of Conversation “Elimination of British Subsidy for Maintenance of Baltic States Representation in London” 19 January 1960” “Folder: B702 Recognition” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.



approach to winding down the Baltic missions in London.<sup>58</sup> Although American officials were concerned about upsetting the Baltic diasporas, their primary concern was whether or not the United States would be forced to incorporate the Baltic missions in the United Kingdom in the annual budgets that the State and Treasury Departments approved for the Baltic missions in the United States.<sup>59</sup>

The challenge of adding the missions in the United Kingdom to the Baltic budgets was exacerbated by rumors that the Baltic diplomats were contemplating their presence in Latin America. Anticipating that the Baltic diplomats were seeking to expand their presence throughout Latin America in their 1960 budgets, in October 1959, the State Department initiated a detailed study of the overall effectiveness of the Baltic diplomatic missions to date, and the advisability and possibility of encouraging additional Baltic representatives in the region. There were naturally some very important political considerations that had to be accounted for, such as the willingness of Latin American nations to accept official representatives of the interwar Baltic Republics.

Despite these considerations, there were some more fundamental factors directly related to the activities of the Baltic representatives, resulting in the conclusion that “while additional Baltic States representation could be of some advantage in Latin American countries, past experience would indicate that this advantage would be very moderate and would require ideal circumstances which would be hard to find.”<sup>60</sup> What precisely was the advantage desired? According to the American Embassy in Rio de Janeiro: “the embassy doubts that the present diplomatic representatives in Rio de Janeiro exercise considerable influence in combating the spread of Communist influence in Brazil.”<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>60</sup> Henderson from Kohler to Henderson, 13 October 1959 “Question of Encouraging Additional Baltic States Representation in Latin America “Folder: B403 Annual Budget” Records Relating to the Baltic States 1940-1961. Box 1 RG 59 Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25 , NAI

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

Such problems were not just limited to the Baltic diplomats in Brazil. Of the eighteen missions that were funded from frozen assets under American custodianship, only half were actively conducting consular duties, and were moderately participating in political, cultural, and social activities. The American embassy in Montevideo stated that although the representative in Uruguay was important in demonstrating the Uruguayan government's attitude towards the Soviet Union, the Baltic representation was seen of being "of very minor value."<sup>62</sup>

There are three main reasons for the growing ineffectiveness of Baltic diplomatic missions to the United States. First, the passing of time had a dramatic effect on the ability of missions to play an active role. During the late 1940s and early 1950s as there existed a large number of individuals carrying Baltic passports that needed consular assistance in Europe as displaced persons and latter in settling in Western nations. By 1960, it was harder to justify their continued existence and the diplomats assumed a more symbolic role. Inherently related was the age of the Baltic diplomats. In the U.S. Embassy in Rio de Janeiro's assessment of the Lithuanian Chargé's effectiveness, the memo stated: "that he is ill and lives in a resort at a considerable distance from the city."<sup>63</sup>

Of course it would have been easy to locate within the vast Baltic community qualified people to serve as honorary consular representatives. The preference, however, was to select individuals that served as representatives of the prewar governments as they would have an "air of legitimacy."<sup>64</sup> The purpose of increasing the number of Baltic diplomats was to promote anti-Communist interests, that would be defeated if there was a "a person in

---

<sup>62</sup> Embassy Montevideo to State 14 September 1959 "Folder: B403 Annual Budget" Records Relating to the Baltic States 1940-1961. Box 1 RG 59 Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25 , NAI

<sup>63</sup> 22 September 1959 from Embassy Rio de Janeiro to State 22 September 1959, "Folder: B403 Annual Budget" Records Relating to the Baltic States 1940-1961. Box 1 RG 59 Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25 , NAI

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

failing health who spends most of his time in seclusion in the countryside.”<sup>65</sup> Further, the legitimacy of missions was based on the use of frozen Baltic funds. It was calculated that a full-time diplomatic post would cost \$8,000-\$10,000 per year.<sup>66</sup> At this rate, it was determined that Estonian and Lithuanian funds in 1960, at present annual spending would be exhausted within fifteen years. Such a situation would force the “U.S. government to be faced with the choice of permitting Estonian and Lithuanian posts throughout the world to close, or financing their continued operation with U.S. funds.”<sup>67</sup>

Finally, the expansion of the operation of unofficial organizations, such as the ACEN and local Baltic organizations proved to be more effective in combating communism. Before unofficial organizations of recent East European immigrants could be created, the network of Baltic diplomats had been particularly useful in demonstrating Soviet aggression. When projecting this attitude forward, the State Department stated:

It must be kept in mind, however, that the above functions can also be performed by unofficial organizations of Baltic States nationals, in regions where a Baltic community exists, and by international bodies such as ACEN. Experience in the U.S. and abroad suggests that the officers of these Baltic societies are more active than local Baltic States diplomatic and consular representatives in promoting various anti-Communist national causes.<sup>68</sup>

As a result, the 1960 approved budgets did not include expanded Baltic missions to Latin America.

Even if the State Department had approved the expansion of more Baltic missions throughout Latin America, political changes in the early 1960s throughout the region altered the diplomatic landscape that had permitted them to continue functioning during the 1950s. Nowhere was this more pronounced than in Brazil during the short but eventful presidency of

---

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> “Baltic Budgets in Brazil” Memo on 17 March 1959 “Folder: B403 Annual Budget” Records Relating to the Baltic States 1940-1961. Box 1 RG 59 Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25 , NAI

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>68</sup> Henderson from Kohler to Henderson on 13 October 1959, “Conclusion Concerning Usefulness of Baltic Representatives” “Folder: B403 Annual Budget” Records Relating to the Baltic States 1940-1961. Box 1 RG 59 Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25 , NAI

Janio da Silva Quadros (January-August 1961).<sup>69</sup> As a result of establishing diplomatic relations with both Fidel Castro's Cuba and the Soviet Union after assuming the presidency, the Brazilian Foreign Minister Afonso Arinos was instructed to inform the Latvian and Lithuanian legations as well as the Estonian consul that official relations between the Republic of Brazil and the Baltic diplomatic missions were being severed. On 11 March 1961, Arinos had memoranda delivered to the Baltic diplomats stating: "I have the honor to inform you that the Brazilian Government has today decided to terminate its relations with the legations. Under these circumstances, the Brazilian government will not recognize the official activities of the Legations of Lithuania, Estonia, or Latvia."<sup>70</sup> Although the Brazilians permitted the diplomats to continue residing in Brazil, it was a major blow to the viability of Baltic diplomatic missions in the region.<sup>71</sup>

On 4 April 1961, Baltic constituents throughout the United States asked the State Department whether or not there was some sort of pressure that the United States was willing to apply to the Brazilian government over their new position towards the Baltic missions.<sup>72</sup> Following the State Department being informed about the situation, the American Ambassador in Brazil met with Arinos to reiterate the American position towards the Baltic republics and to stress that the "United States strongly favors the continuation of diplomatic relations with the representatives of the Baltic nations by all the governments of the Free

---

<sup>69</sup> See Stephen G. Rabe, *The Most Dangerous Area in the World: John F. Kennedy Confronts Communist Revolution in Latin America*, (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 64-71.

<sup>70</sup> State Memo on "Brazil Terminates Relations with Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." 15 March 1961 "Folder: B702 Recognition" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>71</sup> Arinos continued by informing the diplomats that "I am happy to inform you that the Brazilian government is ready to grant you authorization for permanent residence in the national territory if this is your desire, as well as freedom to engage in any non-official activities, for the purposes of which you will be accorded the right to certain courtesies and advantages.

<sup>72</sup> Karlis Kreivs to State Department on 4 April 1961 "Folder: B702 Recognition" Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

World.”<sup>73</sup> The State Department sympathized with Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians living in the United States over the situation, but made it clear that the “withdrawal or maintenance of diplomatic recognition by Brazil is a matter of sovereignty of that government.”<sup>74</sup>

The unwillingness of the United States to apply pressure upon the Brazilian government over the loss of several Baltic diplomatic missions is representative of the attitude that the State Department had towards exiled diplomats at the beginning of the 1960s. From 1940 until 1960, Baltic diplomatic missions operating in any country that was willing to allow them to continue functioning were an international expression against Soviet aggression against small nation states. By the end of the 1950s, American ambitions on promoting Baltic missions had been reduced to the point where there was general acknowledgement that they were important only so in so far as they allowed the United States some semblance of legitimacy in maintaining the non-recognition policy. As the Cold War assumed more global dynamics and Baltic independence was not seen on the horizon, the limited funds frozen in the United States were to be used exclusively to maintain the Lithuanian and Latvian legations in Washington and the Estonian Consulate General in New York. Simply, the political and financial burdens of expanding Baltic missions in the Western hemisphere or Europe were more than the State Department was willing to carry.

### Conclusion

In 1948, senior American policymakers and the thousands of Eastern European exiles who fled from their homelands shared a vision of the future where Soviet hegemony in the people’s republics had ended, the Baltic republics would be allowed to reassert their

---

<sup>73</sup> J.W. Wilson (Brazilian Desk) to Karlis Kreivs on 4 April 1961 “Folder: B702 Recognition” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 1, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAIL.

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

independence, and the Soviet Union would become a more pluralistic society. For American officials in the State Department and the CIA, the exiles constituted a unique weapon in not only trying to cause disturbances within the Soviet bloc, but were also a useful political resource to curtail Soviet sympathies in the West. For the Eastern European exiles, the United States was the one nation that had the political, economic, and military tools capable of liberating their homelands.

The State-Private Network that established American sponsored psychological warfare activities against Eastern Europe; promoted exiled organizations abroad that did not quite constitute exile governments; and significantly added to anti-communist sentiment at home and abroad was symptomatic of the symbiotic relationship that developed between Eastern European exiles and the United States. The covert nature of many programs exacerbated tensions within exiled diasporas, as various exile organizations began competing with each other over access to important American financing. The concept of plausible deniability prevented American officials from issuing clear policy directives for the exile organizations that they sponsored, which allowed exile organizations greater latitude in pursuing their own agenda. Finally, there was no realistic policy about how Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe was supposed to end.

After the Soviet Union obtained the atomic bomb, it became the basic policy of the United States to avoid a direct military confrontation with the Soviet Union. Simply, a nuclear war between the two superpowers was unimaginable. Short of war, there were very few ways that policymakers or exiles who could realistically believe that political change in Eastern Europe could be reached in the 1950s. Those that believed that American psychological warfare and anti-communist rhetoric would facilitate significant political change overestimated the ability of the United States to control events in the region and underestimated the Soviet Union's willingness to intervene militarily to suppress uprisings in

its sphere of influence. Both the American and Soviet responses to the 1956 Hungarian Revolution clarified their attitudes towards the region. The Soviet Union refused to tolerate radical political change within its sphere of influence and the United States refused to intervene in the affairs of a satellite country. As a result, it was unrealistic to believe that the relationship between the exiles and their American contacts would continue unchanged. Candid assessments by Baltic exiles about the American government and American officials about their sponsored exile organizations shed light on the mutual dissatisfaction with the status quo.

As early as 1955, Estonian exiles began criticizing the way that the State Department handled their relationship with the broad spectrum of Estonian exiles around the world. In May, Aleksander Warma, a leading member of the ERN wrote to the State Department reflecting on the tumultuous relationship that had been ongoing between Estonian groups in Sweden and the State Department. Warma expresses a sense of having great difficulties understanding why the United States had such a negative attitude about organizations like the ERN that had “activized [sic] great masses of anti-Communist refugees inciting them to do incessant national and political activities and that their local sections and hundreds of other organizations work at preserving their national culture and traditions, which ought to be of great importance for the future liberation of these countries and the reintroduction of democratic traditions and free cultural forms.”<sup>75</sup>

Warma levied criticism against the American decision to establish organizations of its own, where refugees were on American government payrolls. He argued, “exiles employed in these organizations are estranged from and lose contact with the political organization of their exile countrymen.”<sup>76</sup> He also pointed on the contradiction that most of the American support,

---

<sup>75</sup> 23 May 1955 Warma to Vedeler on 23 May 1955 “Folder: E716 Foreign Relations Scandinavia” Records Relating to the Baltic States, 1940-1961. Box 5, RG 59, Stack Area 150, Row 69, Compartment 25, Records of the Department of State, NAI.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*

provided to émigré groups, has been to organizations that had been largely based in the United States. Refugee organizations in Europe were closer to their homelands and had “incomparably” better resources to collect valuable information and data and to inject information and material into the Soviet Union. The only stated drawback of the organizations in Europe, particularly Sweden, was that in official foreign policy circles, it was not desirable to have exile activities happen in their country. Warma warned that it was very possible that the European organizations that had been successful at organizing thousands of people would eventually disintegrate and from his view on American foreign policy – “this would mean a loss of tens of thousands of voluntary allies, helpmates, and practical anti-Communist fighters whose organized force would disperse and tire when their central organizations ceased to exist.”<sup>77</sup>

Warma concluded by offering a positive agenda for the Americans to develop relations with the exiles. He argued that the American State Department should propose a package that would be similar to the Marshall Aid for European reconstruction after World War II. He suggested that there was no need for the American officials to dictate to exiles exactly what should be accomplished, just as American officials did not carry out the entire reconstruction of Western Europe. In summary, Warma made the point that “this was left entirely to their own creative power and administrations of the concerned countries... Would it not be right and natural to employ the same tactics regarding the exiles?”<sup>78</sup>

It was unrealistic for Warma to think that the United States would put together a large aid package for exile organizations in a manner similar to Marshall Aid money for Western European nations, but his criticism does provide insight into ways that prominent exile organizations that lacked American sponsorship viewed the State Department, FEC, or CIA. The ERN was just as anti-communist as any other Estonian exile organization and

---

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*



represented a large number of prominent Estonians in the country with the largest community of exiled Estonians. Yet, because of limited American resources and contacts with Estonians in the United States who did enjoy good relations with the ERN, the ERN never had the possibility of earning American support.

During negotiations over the 1964 ACEN budgets, the FEC assessed the work that the ACEN had accomplished since the FEC's restructuring of exile relations. FEC officials criticized the attitude that many of the ACEN delegates had over the years. They claimed that the ACEN had become "a residual symbol of East European opposition to Communist domination, but there is very little to indicate that it is widely known or highly regarded in Eastern Europe itself."<sup>79</sup> On the ability of the ACEN to maintain high quality exiles:

Since ACEN's membership is made up of men who last served as ministers, diplomats and officials in their own countries between ten and twenty – in some cases every twenty-five years ago, it is a group which has an unavoidable orientation toward the past. Since the group has not been refreshed by new membership (and is unlikely to be to any significant extent) it will, over time, inevitably decline. It is thus not an asset which can be maintained indefinitely.<sup>80</sup>

Finally, on the usefulness of the ACEN's propaganda, they argued that "ACEN tends to harp on the past and to concentrate on negative themes. Much of what it says adds up merely to the assertion that Communism is bad."<sup>81</sup>

The fact that the ACEN continued to pursue the same agenda that they had before 1956 and the general acceptance by American officials that its utility was fading demonstrates the asymmetry in the relationship. For the United States, the political situation in East Europe was a serious foreign policy problem only so far that it provided a buffer to the Soviet Union and posed a security threat to American interests in Western Europe. During the 1950s, while the Cold War's central argument was over the postwar situation in Europe,

---

<sup>79</sup> 1 July 1963 Memorandum for the Record "The Assembly of Captive European Nations (ACEN)" Folder: Free Europe Committee Budget, etc. 1963 (1). Box 53: Free Europe Committee Budget, CD Jackson Papers, DDEPL.

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

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

Eastern Europe also became an important symbol that outlined Soviet aggression. For the exiles, changing the political status of their homelands so that they could return and assume their old political positions was their central motivating factor during the 1950s.

While the failure to liberate Eastern Europe was a small blow to American prestige and gradually undermined American credibility among those behind the Iron Curtain who thought the United States might liberate them, the exiles that had cast their lot with the Americans during the 1950s suffered the hardest blow from the hollowness of American liberation rhetoric. Not only had they placed their faith in American willingness to help liberate their homelands, but they devoted their careers and potential credibility with their peers by being willing partners in the State-Private network. The continued Soviet presence in Eastern Europe after 1956 did not demonstrably change the lives of East Europeans, the American public, or American policymakers. However, it did force Eastern European exiles who believed that they would be returning home sooner, rather than later, to face the fact that they may never be able to return home and that some level of assimilation into American culture should occur.

By the end of the 1950s, the major source of misinterpretation in the American-Baltic relationship was a sense of rigidity in the main objectives of American diplomats as well as Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exiles. Any policy that could be conceivably related to the Baltic republics were judged not on their merits, but on how they could impact the non-recognition policy. The most important aspect of American dealings with Baltic exiles was that no decision could undermine the non-recognition policy. For the Baltic exiles, the search for political continuity with interwar Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian governments framed virtually every argument that they made in attempting to cooperate with the Americans. This dynamic caused significant tensions between the would-be partners.

The non-recognition policy provided American politicians an easy to understand and powerful symbol to use when describing the virtues of the United States and the destructive nature of the Soviet Union. The policy also provided Baltic exiled diplomat the tools necessary to continue their work. In retrospect, the non-recognition policy provided Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania the legal and political arguments to claim that the Soviet annexation was illegal once they had reclaimed their independence in 1991.<sup>82</sup> However, during the late 1940s and 1950s, the non-recognition policy, by its very nature, was an exclusionary policy.

Although the State Department and the FEC argued that budgetary constraints prohibited Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian involvement in RFE broadcasts, the non-recognition policy provided the political cover for the State Department to exclude Baltic exiles from utilizing all tools at the FEC's disposal. Contacts with Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exile organizations that might have been useful proxies to engage in psychological warfare in Europe were shunned since there was the threat that a government-in-exile might undermine the non-recognition policy. Indeed, close relations with unofficial exiles were limited because of the non-recognition policy. Finally, the non-recognition policy contributed to isolating the Baltic republics in the international community during the 1950s. While the Soviet Union significantly reduced contacts with the Baltic republics during the 1950s, the official policy of disallowing any contacts between Americans and Balts amplified the occupied republics' segregation from the rest of the world.

Meanwhile, Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian exiles were at least successful in establishing a level of political continuity between the interwar republics and prominent exile

---

<sup>82</sup> Upon regaining independence in 1991, there were debates within all three Baltic countries, but particularly Estonia and Latvia that they should pursue a strongly nationalist vision of "restoring" the nation-states rather than merely reclaiming independence. The continued non-recognition of the Soviet annexation by the United States and other Western countries provided a political, if not a legal, justification for pursuing policies that worked towards "restoring" the nation-states rather than just reasserting their sovereignty. This most directly manifested itself in the citizenship legislation that Estonia and Latvia passed where citizenship laws from the 1930s were used to determine Estonian and Latvian citizenship in the 1990s. See David J. Smith, "Estonia: Independence and European Integration" in Smith, et. al. eds. *The Baltic States: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania*, 72.

organizations during the early Cold War. Although the Estonian exile governments failed to garner the recognition of the international community, the existence of the government allowed both the political discussions and the conflicts between Estonians residing in exile to continue throughout the Cold War. Latvian and Lithuanian political traditions were kept alive, most notably through the existence of the VLIK and (insert Latvian exile organization in Europe). The continued accreditation of Baltic diplomats provided a clear case of diplomatic continuity to the interwar republics.

The quest for political continuity, however, undermined the ability of Baltic exiles to work effectively with the Americans. The insistence that broadcasting over VOA would undermine the political legitimacy of the exiles and the continued push for Baltic language RFE broadcasts frayed relations with Americans and eventually constricted their ability to reestablish communication lines with their home countries. The issue of establishing governments-in-exile provided the State Department the pretext to ignore the political demands of important exile organizations outside the United States. Finally, the concept of political continuity meant that the exiles generally refused to try to establish traditional contacts with their occupied homelands. Denying the legitimacy of the Soviet government was essential to upholding the exile's political legitimacy and any contacts that could be misconstrued as providing legitimacy to the Soviet government were avoided.

Political continuity also inhibited cooperation among the three Baltic diasporas while in exile. American policymakers viewed Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as a bloc of nations that had the same historical background; shared the same political position in the Soviet Union; and all three shared the non-recognition policy. To an extent, the State Department hoped that the three exiled diasporas would be willing to work together to fight towards the liberation of their homeland. In reality, most Baltic exiles were primarily concerned with fighting their own political battles rather than engaging with the other two exiled nations. The

only success of deep Baltic cooperation during this period was the cooperation among the three FEC sponsored committees, best exemplified by the reestablishment of the *Baltic Review*.

If the ultimate goal of Baltic exiles and the United States was to work towards the eventual liberation of Eastern Europe, neither the non-recognition policy nor the quest for political continuity were successful. Although both issues helped to frame the Baltic question during the early Cold War, contacts between those who exclusively defined themselves as exiles had exceptionally marginal contacts with the United States. Baltic émigrés who were able to maintain a semblance of legitimacy within their diasporas while being able to present themselves as American constituents had a far greater ability to frame American policy questions towards Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Unlike the ERN and the VLIK who were refused meetings with American centers of political power because they were exiled organizations pursuing the establishment of governments-in-exile, American based organizations, such as the ALT, ALA, and ENC were regularly granted audiences with senior State Department officials and occasionally with the President of the United States. Members of Congress viewed such organizations as important constituent groups, particularly in the Northeast and Midwest. The major distinction was that American citizenship was an important factor for American policymakers in deciding whether or not to grant an audience with an organization. The ability to vote was also an important attribute for Members of Congress who sought patronage with Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. The naturalization of an American citizen, however, was not a disqualifying factor for maintaining a semblance of legitimacy within the exiled communities. It was natural that many exiles would begin the process of slowly assimilating into the countries they had moved to, particularly as the years went by.

Baltic constituents in the United States were engaged in the same objective of fighting for the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania that Baltic exiles residing outside the United States pursued. Like the exiles, however, the Baltic constituents were no more successful in liberating Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Unlike the exiles, constituent organizations immediately began a process of dialogue with policymakers instead of being completely unable to establish any sort of communication lines. The relationships that the constituents built over time with Members of Congress as well as the State Department meant that they were able to create a framework to limit the scope of acceptable policy decisions by government officials.

The pressure that Baltic organizations directly placed on the State Department through letter writing campaigns and regular meetings with State Department officials, in addition to indirect pressure through relations with Congress and other anti-communist organizations, resulted in the non-recognition policy slowly being transformed from an obscure foreign policy debate to a central domestic policy debate as it related to the status of Eastern Europe as the Cold War continued. Although there were no plans to abandon the non-recognition policy during Eisenhower's second term, the structural relationships between Baltic organizations, other Eastern European organizations, and elected officials began to crystallize, which would prove difficult for future administrations to consider changing policy.. The consolidation of Baltic political activities in the United States based on the transfer of organizations such as the VLIK to the United States only strengthened the political potential that Baltic constituents possessed.

Although the continuation of the non-recognition policy did not have any demonstrable impact on the political situation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania during the Cold War, it was an important rallying call for Baltic constituents in the United States. It provided a realistic policy objective for organizations to push officials to continue regardless

of the international climate of various periods during the Cold War. The non-recognition policy ultimately played a minor role in American diplomacy during the Cold War, but it was the central question for Baltic political activism from 1940 through 1960.

## EPILOGUE

### THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES

On 17 July 1959, President Eisenhower signed into law the Captive Nations Week Resolution designating the third week of July as “Captive Nations Week.”<sup>1</sup> The law not only provided an avenue for Eastern European constituents and their elected officials to organize rallies and protests to condemn the actions of the Soviet Union in July 1959, but also established a precedent where all future administrations would declare the third week in July as Captive Nations Week.<sup>2</sup> The establishment of Captive Nations Week was an important step towards the transformation of Eastern European exile politics from being a small yet important component of foreign relations to a mainly domestic political phenomenon. In Eisenhower’s original declaration he asked Americans “to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of these peoples and to observe Captive Nations Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.”<sup>3</sup>

The parades and rallies orchestrated by Captive Nations Week committees across the country allowed all Eastern European Americans the ability to display their solidarity to the American people as well as to Soviet observers. Although the events might have exposed Soviet sensitivities to, at times, their tenuous standing in Eastern Europe, Captive Nations Week had no demonstrable positive impact on American policy in its relations within the Soviet bloc. In fact, when Kennedy was elected, his ambassador to Yugoslavia, George F.

---

<sup>1</sup> Public Law 86-90 Captive Nations Week Resolution.

<sup>2</sup> After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the focus of Captive Nations Week has been on countries such as Belarus, Burma, Cuba, North Korea, Syria, Iran, Sudan, and Zimbabwe. In more recent years, however, the White House has reduced references to specific countries and began drawing more general contrasts between governments that represent the will of their polity and those governments in the world that do not.

<sup>3</sup> "President Proclaims Captive Nations Week." New York Times (1923-Current file), July 18, 1959, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed April 10, 2011).



Kennan, attempted to dissuade Kennedy from issuing a Captive Nations Week declaration arguing that such declarations were “foolish and gratuitously offensive to Moscow”<sup>4</sup>

If the changes in American policy towards exile groups after 1956; acceptance that only gradual change in the Soviet bloc could be realistically expected; and the attempts to transfer the political focus of émigré groups away from the realm of foreign relations to the domestic sphere demonstrated that the United States felt that the political situation in Eastern Europe was a settled issue, events surrounding the Berlin situation in 1961 confirmed this new reality. High-stakes brinksmanship by American president John F. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev concerning the status of Berlin and the possibility of a separate East German-Soviet peace treaty resulted in the construction of the Berlin Wall on 13 August 1961.<sup>5</sup>

The Berlin Wall not only ended the greatest existential threat to Walter Ulbricht’s regime in East Germany - the constant flow of East Berliners to West Berlin, but also symbolically represented the reality of the Cold War in Europe for more than a decade. The proximity of Soviet and NATO forces in Berlin increased the likelihood of a total military confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. From the outset of the Cold War, the United States had sought to avoid such a situation and Berlin forced American policymakers to recognize the realities of Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe. Kennedy conceded “it seems particularly stupid to risk killing millions of Americans... because

---

<sup>4</sup> Walter L. Hixson, *George F. Kennan: Cold War Iconoclast*, 203. Kennan complained that “the tyranny which the exile groups and right-wing elements in both parties exercised over the formulation of policy towards Eastern Europe would only drive the Satellite nations and Yugoslavia closer to the Kremlin.”

<sup>5</sup> By 1961, nearly 30,000 East Berliners, primarily consisting of professionals who would be hard to replace, were fleeing to West Berlin each month. This not only threatened the legitimacy of the East German state, but by extension, the legitimacy of the Soviet presence in Eastern Europe. Out of the Vienna Summit with Kennedy, Khrushchev threatened to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, terminating the Soviet commitment to postwar occupation rights of the city. This exposed the inherently weak position that the United States had in its enclave in the GDR and had the potential to escalate to a direct military confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. For an analysis of Khrushchev’s decision to erect the Berlin Wall see: Fursenko and Naftali, *Khrushchev’s Cold War: The Inside Story of an American Adversary*, 367-387. For perhaps the most thorough study on Kennedy’s response to the ongoing Berlin crisis see: W.R. Smyser, *Kennedy and the Berlin Wall: ‘A Hell of a Lot Better than a War.’* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2009).

Germans want Germany to be unified... If I am going to threaten nuclear war it will have to be for much bigger... reasons than that.”<sup>6</sup> Through tacitly accepting the Berlin Wall’s construction, the United States shifted the focus of the Cold War away from Europe to the developing world and recognized the existence of a fragile peace in Europe held together by American hegemony in Western Europe and Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe.

1961 was also an important year of reassessment for politically active Baltic constituents in the United States. Organizations such as the ALA, ALT, and the ENC were particularly successful in unifying the political interests of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in the United States. The methods used to promote their goal of fighting for the liberation of their homeland, however unrealistic the goals might be, were ultimately unsuccessful. As a new generation of émigrés grew into their political consciousness during the early 1960s, complaints were levied against the national organizations for being overly concerned with maintaining institutional stability at the expense of allowing dissent and vigorous debate to occur.<sup>7</sup>

In an attempt to streamline the political efforts of Balts represented by the ALA, ALT, and ENC and to demonstrate that the large organizations were able to change directions when necessary, the leaders of the three organizations began initial discussions about establishing an organization that would help to consolidate Baltic political efforts on 28 April 1961.<sup>8</sup> Throughout 1961, the JBANC’s activities involved little more than correspondence between the Chairman of the ENC, Julius Kangur, President of the ALA, Peter Lejins, and ALT President Leonard Šimutis about a host of issues that concerned all three Baltic nationalities

---

<sup>6</sup> W.R. Smyser, *Kennedy and the Berlin Wall: ‘A Hell of a Lot Better than a War,’* 75.

<sup>7</sup> Ieva Zake, *American Latvians*, 42.

<sup>8</sup> Bruno Albats and Visvaldis Klīve. *ALA 35: 1951-1986*. (Riga: Amerikas latviešu apvienība, 1986), 46.

and addressed concerns that prominent members of each organization had about deepening cooperation with the other two Baltic communities.<sup>9</sup>

Representatives of the ALA, ENC, and ALT met for the first time on 19 November 1961 in Chicago to organize the structure and the political agenda of a new joint Baltic organization. During the meeting, it was acknowledged that the Lithuanians had the most well established organization of the three Baltic nationalities and there were inherent concerns that one nationality would dominate the new organization.<sup>10</sup> To assuage such concerns, a compromise was reached over the new organization's chairmanship. The Joint Baltic American National Committee (JBANC) chairmanship started each August and would rotate on an annual basis in the following sequence: "first - Latvians, second - Lithuanians, third - Estonians."<sup>11</sup> In addition, all major initiatives that the JBANC sought to begin would have to gain the explicit approval of the three national organizations.

The 19 November meeting was also significant as it established the basic platform of this Baltic umbrella organization for the 1960s. The JBANC created a broad lobbying platform directed at all centers of political power in the United States. Contacts with the White House would focus on ensuring that American Presidents continued to declare the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. Baltic constituents persisted in lobbying the FEC as well as the State Department to start Baltic language broadcasts of RFE. Pressure was maintained on members of Congress to pass resolutions on behalf of the Baltic republics, most importantly to try to force the American government to take the Baltic cause before the UN. Finally, regularly press events were held to keep the Baltic cause alive before the media.

---

<sup>9</sup> Issues ranged from how the organizations should react to the ongoing crisis in Berlin to an inflammatory article written by C.I. Sulzberger in the *New York Times* in July 1961. Additionally, there were debates about where the JBANC's first meeting should take place. See: "Folder: Joint Baltic Committee Correspondences 1961" Box 39, JBANC Collection, IHRC.

<sup>10</sup> Minutes of 18 November JBANC Meeting in Chicago, 4. "Folder: JBANC Minute Minutes 1961-1971" Box 39, JBANC Collection, IHRC.

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

The JBANC's first press conference at Willard Hotel in Washington DC on 12 December 1961 demonstrated the level of professionalism that the committee sought as a serious lobbying organization in the nation's capital. 600 invitations were sent out to members of the press as well as to prominent figures in Washington to "outline a new approach" by an organization that "represents more than one thousand organizations and more than one million citizens of Baltic origin or descent."<sup>12</sup> During the press conference, the JBANC announced that they were issuing a press release to the State Department urging the United States to charge the Soviet Union with genocide before the United Nations.<sup>13</sup>

The professionalism of Baltic lobbying was not limited to the East Coast. In February 1961, Senator Thomas Kuchel and Representative Glenard P. Lipscomb of California introduced resolutions before the House and the Senate requesting that the United States "bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets to withdraw all Soviet troops... and return all Baltic exiles from Siberia."<sup>14</sup> In August 1961, Baltic constituents in California took advantage of the Kuchel-Lipscomb Resolution and established Americans for Congressional Action to Free the Baltic States.

On issues that involved decision-making by a small number of policymakers with little oversight, such as the FEC and CIA's control over RFE broadcasts, Baltic-lobbying organizations had very little success. The insular nature of such organizations deflected any domestic pressure from policy considerations. Baltic constituents were significantly more effective in pressing members of Congress to sponsor resolutions on behalf of the Baltic States. Such resolutions ranged from reaffirming America's position of non-recognition to

---

<sup>12</sup> JBANC Press Event Invitation, Folder: Joint Baltic Committee Correspondences, 1961, Box 39, JBANC Collection, IHRC.

<sup>13</sup> James K. Anderson "U.S. Asked to Help Free Baltic Nations" *Detroit Daily News*, in Folder: Joint Baltic Committee Correspondences, 1961, Box 39, JBANC Collection, IHRC.

<sup>14</sup> The Kuchel-Lipscomb Resolution (S. Con. Res. 12 and H. Con. Res. 153) February 1961, RFE/RL Corporate Record Collection, Hoover Institution Archives, Box 153 Folder 9.

requesting the President to charge the Soviet Union with genocide in the Baltic States. The opening statement of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs' hearings on "Conditions in the Baltic States and in Other Countries of Eastern Europe" from 17-18 May 1965 offers insight into Baltic lobbying effectiveness with the Congress. The chairman stated that "there are over seventy resolutions introduced in the House which are related to the status of the Baltic countries."<sup>15</sup> In most cases there were matching Senate concurring resolutions.

The ability of Baltic constituents to influence enough members of the House of Representatives to sponsor over seventy resolutions was an impressive, if not unrealistic feat. Concurrent resolutions, however, are not legally binding. Thus, the resolutions by themselves had little influence in American politics outside of electoral considerations. The true policy implications of the relationship between Baltic constituents and the United States Congress rest with the relationship between members of Congress and the State Department. As a matter of protocol, members of Congress would request policy guidance from the State Department on all resolutions that might influence the direction of American foreign policy. Consequently, State Department officials were compelled to acknowledge and comment on over seventy congressional resolutions dealing with the Baltic republics.

One such example revolves around S.Con.Res 33, which was submitted by Senator Frank Lausche of Ohio on 19 March 1963. The resolution called on the President to bring the Baltic question before the United Nations and to call on the UN to force the Soviet Union to withdraw troops from the Baltic States; return all exiles from Siberia; punish those who committed crimes against the Baltic peoples; and conduct free elections in the Baltic States

---

<sup>15</sup> Congressional Record: 17-18 May 1965 Subcommittee Hearings on "Conditions in the Baltic States and in Other Countries of Eastern Europe" The resolutions include: H.Con.Res 14, 25, 26, 40, 41, 43, 51, 68, 69, 75, 76, 82, 87, 96, 99, 105, 106, 118, 119, 134, 135, 138, 159, 166, 168, 170, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 302, 303, 307, 318, 336, 353, 356, 357, 363, 365, 366, , 368, 369, 371, 372, 374, 376, 390, 394, 395, 397, 398, 399, 404, 416, 417, 418, 421, 422, 423.

under direct UN supervision.<sup>16</sup> Throughout Spring 1963, the State Department received letters from not only Chairman J.W. Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but from the co-sponsors of the resolution and Baltic constituents seeking guidance and asking for State Department approval of the resolution.

The State Department's responses highlight the inherent contradictions in American policy towards the Baltic republics throughout the Cold War, but particularly in the early 1960s. In what became pro forma letters, the State Department's policy guidance consisted of two arguments. First, Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton reaffirmed the basic framework of American policy towards the Baltic States:

The Department is in full sympathy with the desire to see the Baltic States freed of alien rule and restored to independence. In this connection it should be pointed out that self-determination for the Baltic peoples is firmly established United States policy and one that this government has never failed to keep on record before the world. We have consistently and emphatically withheld recognition of the illegal annexation of those peoples and their territories by the Soviet Government.

Second, Dutton routinely made the case that taking the Baltic case before the United Nations would undermine the credibility of the non-recognition policy:

Unfortunately, an overwhelming majority of United Nations members do recognize the incorporation of the Baltic States into the USSR. They would construe any formal proposal to have the General Assembly call on the Soviet Union to withdraw from the Baltic States and to permit United Nations - supervised elections as a move primarily designed to embarrass the Soviet Union rather than to alleviate the plight of the Baltic peoples. Therefore, such a proposal would not be likely to commend widespread support. A United States move on behalf of the Baltic States in this form would, by its probable failure, be more likely to set back than to further their cause.<sup>17</sup>

The State Department's continued refusal to take the Baltic case to the United Nations

demonstrated the limits that the Congress had in influencing the direction of foreign policy.

However insular decision-making in the State Department might be, its bureaucracy was not totally immune from domestic pressure. The sheer volume of correspondences that officials

---

<sup>16</sup> Tear sheet of S.Con.Res 33 19 March 1963, 88th Congress 1st Session in Folder: POL - Political Affairs and Religion, Baltic States, Box 3689 Subject Numeric File, 1961-1963. Records of the Department of State, RG 59, NAI.

<sup>17</sup> Frederick G. Dutton to J. W Fulbright 15 April 1963 Folder: POL - Political Affairs and Religion, Baltic States, Box 3689. Subject Numeric File, 1961-1963. Records of the Department of State, RG 59, NAI.

had to make concerning Congressional resolutions sent a strong message that the Baltic States had vocal and persistent supporters not only in the American public, but also in the halls of Congress. Being rebuked by the State Department only reinforced the disappointment that Baltic constituents had in the Department going back to the 1950s. As resolutions were rejected by the State Department, inevitably, another resolution would be sponsored. Ironically, instead of squashing the domestic pressure, the official State Department position only increased sensitivities in the Baltic American community to any changes in American policy that could have an impact on the non-recognition policy.

There remains the question whether or not Baltic Americans were right to be concerned about the possibility that the United States would shift its policy towards the Baltic republics? Throughout Dean Rusk's tenure at the State Department, he established the Open Forum Panel, an avenue for policymakers to stimulate new ideas for the future conduct of American foreign relations.<sup>18</sup> During the Open Forum Panel of 1967, the future of the non-recognition policy was addressed. The Panel suggested that the United States adopt a more flexible Baltic policy. The proposal opened by stating: "Realistically, we must reckon with the fact that the Soviet Union will not liberate the Baltic States, or grant them any change in status."<sup>19</sup> The author continued by arguing:

while our current policy of not recognizing the incorporation of the Baltic States into the USSR may satisfy certain domestic political considerations, it hampers our attempts to improve relations with the Soviet Union. Every manifestation of our Baltic policy is interpreted by the Soviets as a direct cold war initiative, inconsistent with our efforts to deal with substantive issues by negotiation.<sup>20</sup>

Although the document conceded that domestic political considerations would preclude the State Department from moving towards any recognition of the Soviet

---

<sup>18</sup> Dean Rusk to John M. Leddy (EUR) 30 October 1967, POL 17-4 Latvia, Folder: POL-Political Affairs & Religion, Latvia. Box 3900 Subject Numeric File, 1967-1969. Records of the Department of State, RG 59. NAI.

<sup>19</sup> "Policy Proposal: That We Adopt a More Flexible Baltic Policy" Attached to Rusk to Leddy Memo. Folder: POL-Political Affairs & Religion, Latvia. Box 3900 Subject Numeric File, 1967-1969. Records of the Department of State, RG 59. NAI.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, it did contend that the State Department could “permit it to wither away.”<sup>21</sup> The author offered six main ways that the State Department could “hasten the withering process.” The six policy changes would fall into changes in the way that the State Department executed its policy and changes in the way that the State Department would interact with Baltic Americans.

The most important structural change in the State Department would have been changing the title of the Department’s Baltic Desk Officer and expanding its duties to include additional segments of Eastern European affairs.<sup>22</sup> Second, the State Department could increase official American travel to and expand contact with the Baltic States. It was argued that all American embassy personnel in Moscow below the Ambassadorial level should increase contacts with officials and everyday citizens in the Baltic republics.<sup>23</sup> Finally, the State Department should continue to oppose the suggestions from constituents or members of Congress to introduce the Baltic States issue into the United Nations.

The Open Forum Panel proposal also sought to radically alter the relationship between the State Department and members of the Baltic American community. Most importantly, it argued that the United States should stop recognizing émigré diplomatic representatives of the Baltic States with the death of the current representatives.<sup>24</sup> Given that all of the diplomats in 1967 were commissioned as diplomatic officers by the interwar governments, it was logical to assume that at some point there would be no Estonians, Latvians, or Lithuanians who possessed such credentials. Thus, it was logical to not extend

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.* The alternative option would be to transfer the responsibility of Baltic affairs to the office of Soviet Union Affairs.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* The logical outgrowth was then to include the Baltic capital cities on the itineraries of American exchange exhibits or performing arts tours, as well as permit American student exchangees to attend universities in the Baltic States.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*



diplomatic credentials beyond the current diplomats.<sup>25</sup> In the short-term, the State Department was urged to consider dropping the sending of messages commemorating the national days of the three Baltic States. Such letters were naturally sensitive for the Soviet Union regardless of how innocuous the text happened to be. Finally, the State Department should not allow American foreign policy to become “frozen” in order to satisfy a small but vocal group of émigré organizations that sought to get the United States to support the restoration of Baltic independence. As a result, the State Department should avoid responding to Baltic émigré groups whenever possible.

Rusk asked for the Open Forum Panel Baltic Policy Proposal during the process of drafting the 1967 letters to the Baltic diplomats, commemorating the anniversaries of the nations’ independence. It appears that Rusk seriously considered the proposal’s suggestion as he asked John M. Leddy of the Office of European affairs what the policies of European allies happened to be towards the Baltic republics, implying that American policy could eventually converge with the policies of European allies.<sup>26</sup> Leddy responded on 13 November 1967 strongly repudiating the suggestion that the United States should alter its policy of national day messages:

Such a change at this time would be regarded as an indication of a major shift in our policy by the many American citizens of Baltic descent and their Congressional supporters and would be particularly unfortunate in view of the recent 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the October Revolution and of the forthcoming 50<sup>th</sup> anniversaries of the independence of the Baltic States.

We consider it inadvisable at this particular sensitive time to change our basic letter in any way that is likely to be attacked as a unilateral concession to the Soviet Union having no demonstrable advantage to the United States and repudiating a traditional principle of our policy which has been given support at the highest levels.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> The author acknowledged that the situation is probably at least 10 to 15 years away since one of the representatives was in his 70s, while the other two are considerably younger, in their 40s and 50s.

<sup>26</sup> Dean Rusk to John M. Leddy (EUR) 30 October 1967, POL 17-4 Latvia, Folder: POL-Political Affairs & Religion, Latvia. Box 3900 Subject Numeric File, 1967-1969. Records of the Department of State, RG 59. NAI.

<sup>27</sup> John M. Leddy to Dean Rusk 13 November 1967, POL 17-4 Latvia, Folder: POL-Political Affairs & Religion, Latvia. Box 3900 Subject Numeric File, 1967-1969. Records of the Department of State, RG 59. NAI.

As a result, on 14 November 1967, Rusk wrote to the Baltic diplomats commemorating them for the forty-ninth anniversary of independence and reaffirmed the continued American policy of non-recognition.<sup>28</sup>

The non-recognition policy continued to be the main framework for analyzing all positions towards the Baltic republics were analyzed through. Commemoration letters continued to be sent by Rusk during the last years of the Johnson administration and became standard procedure in William Rogers' State Department. American Baltic policy, however, did not necessarily remain entirely frozen. Changes in attitude concerning several important issues occurred during the late 1960s that would have been inconceivable during the 1950s particularly in the area of cultural exchanges.

In 1968, the American Embassy in Moscow received a telegram from the State Department noting that an American scholar had applied for a grant to do research in Vilnius, Lithuania. Richmond Yale, the American officer in Moscow in charge of cultural exchanges broached the topic of allowing cultural exchanges to take place in the Baltic republics with Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson. Thompson agreed with Yale that the time had come to allow such exchanges with the Baltic republics to start.<sup>29</sup> Later, when Yale served as Deputy Director at the State Department for Soviet and East European Exchanges, he consulted with the JBANC and asked what their opinion was on permitting a greater number of cultural exchanges with the Baltic republics. The JBANC delegation agreed with Yale's argument but refused to go on the record in support in order to prevent any political issues within the Baltic American community.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Dean Rusk to Arnolds Spekke, 14 November 1967, POL 17-4 Latvia, FolderL POL-Political Affairs & Religion, Latvia. Box 3900 Subject Numeric File, 1967-1969. Records of the Department of State, RG 59. NAI.

<sup>29</sup> Richmond Yale, *Practicing Public Diplomacy: A Cold War Odyssey*, 114.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* The first non-academic cultural exchange took place in 1973 when the José Limón Dance Company traveled to the Baltic capitals.

The State Department would probably have initiated mainstream cultural exchanges to the Baltic republics without the approval from Baltic lobbying organizations such as the JBANC. However, it is clear that the State Department realized that any sudden changes in American policy, such as cultural exchanges, without any input from Baltic constituents, would have created political problems not only for the State Department, but also for the President. The difficult question of whether or not American bureaucrats merely used constituent concerns as a justification for an augmentation in policy or whether or not the pressure brought to bear by the constituents forced a change in policy is only of secondary importance. The fact that the State Department contacted Baltic constituents about changes in cultural exchanges is demonstrable proof that the constituent concerns remained a small, but important component in the making of foreign policy.

At the most ambitious level, the persistent lobbying by Baltic constituents during the 1960s placed clear limits on the ability of American policymakers to reconsider the basic tenants of American policy towards the Baltic States. As the United States moved towards a policy of detente with the Soviet Union during the Nixon administration, the maintenance of a rather antiquated, yet confrontational policy towards a relatively settled political issue in Eastern Europe seemed paradoxical to a basic hope of reducing tensions with the Soviet Union. There was every reason to believe that some quid pro quo over the Baltic issue could result in the ability to improve its standing not only with the Soviet Union, but improve its bargaining position.

It could also be argued that the Baltic question by the late 1960s had become so unimportant in international politics that it cost the United States very little to maintain the policy. There is some evidence that Soviet sensitivities towards the Baltic States were exaggerated. Alexandr Kokorev of the Soviet Embassy in Washington had lunch with Edward Hurwitz of the State Department on 1 February 1973. During the lunch, the issue of

the Baltic States came up and Kokorev stated that the matter “did not play any real role on US-Soviet relations.”<sup>31</sup> However, if the State Department was completely immune to domestic pressure on the non-recognition policy, it would have been quite easy to allow the policy to wither away. Although the non-recognition policy had essentially been transformed into a domestic political issue, it could eventually have international implications in the future and its continuation was ensured by the activities of Baltic constituents during the 1960s.

At the very least, lobbying activity provided the Baltic American community the opportunity to cooperate with each other. Even after a generational change had taken place in the community and there were no reasonable expectations to return to Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania in the foreseeable future, political activism was an additional justification for the communities to continue preserving the cultural heritage of the Baltic republics. There remained the hope that the Baltic republics would regain their independence from the Soviet Union. This continued rejection of Soviet dominance in the Baltic region provided a rationale for Baltic Americans to continue to preserve the cultural traditions of the interwar republics. While the political continuity that the first generation of exiles hoped to preserve had been discredited, the continuation of the non-recognition policy provided the political and legal justification to Baltic constituents to continue their struggle to fight for the independence of the Baltic States.

The first generation exiles played no role in explicitly fostering the non-recognition policy throughout the 1950s. This framework was important in the making of American foreign policy and served an important rhetorical tool to both the Truman and Eisenhower

---

<sup>31</sup> Memorandum of Conversation Alexandr Kokorev and Edward Hurwitz 1 February 1973 Box 1613 Subject-Numeric File, 1971-1973. Records of the Department of State, RG 59, NAI. Whether or not this is an accurate representation of Soviet sensitivities to the Baltic question remain in doubt. While the Soviet Union certainly did not allow the Baltic question to hamper negotiations with the United States during the early 1970s, the reaction to the Helsinki Final Act in 1975 in the Human Rights Basket demonstrates that the Soviet Union was indeed sensitive to the issue.

administrations. For all of the flaws in the first generation of exiles, ranging from their inability to cooperate with each other to their primary objective of preserving their political legitimacy so they could reclaim their positions in future independent states, they were fundamental in the establishment of a vivid Baltic constituent community in the United States.

Perhaps the greatest legacy of the first generation of exiles was to allow a second generation to develop that continued to perceive themselves as a unique group of ethnic Americans who had a singular political mission towards the home countries, which they had fled as small children. American policymakers had believed that after the exiles they had established relations with from 1948-1952 grew old and passed away then the continued implications of the State-Private network with exile groups would fade. In reality, as the Baltic question appeared to become more settled throughout the 1960s and 1970s, Baltic constituents became more vigorous in their lobbying efforts and were critical in preventing the Baltic States in passing through the memory hole of history.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### ARCHIVES CONSULTED

*United States National Archives, Washington, D.C. and College Park, Maryland.*

Records of the Department of State (RG 59)  
Foreign Service Post Files (RG 84)  
Records of the United States Information Agency (RG 306)  
Records of the United States House of Representatives (RG 233)  
Records of the United States Senate (RG 46)

*Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, Abilene, Kansas*

Dwight D. Eisenhower: Records as President, White House Central Files  
John Foster Dulles Papers  
National Security Council Staff Papers  
C.D. Jackson Papers

*Harry S. Truman Presidential Library, Independence, Missouri*

White House Central Files  
Psychological Strategy Board Collection  
Forrest McCluney Papers

*Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Stanford, California*

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Corporate Records Collection  
Jules Feldmans Papers  
Alfreds Bilmanis Papers  
Arch Puddington Collection  
Kaarel Robert Pusta Papers

*Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota*

Assembly of Captive European Nations Records Collection  
Joint Baltic American Committee Records Collection  
American Latvian Association Records Collection

*Lithuanian Research and Studies Center, Chicago Illinois*

American Lithuanian Council Papers  
Joint Baltic American Committee Papers  
Vaclovas Sidzikauskas Papers

*Rahvusarhiiv, Tallinn, Estonia*

Consulate General of Estonia in New York Papers  
Johannes Kaiv Papers

## **PRIVATE COLLECTIONS**

*Office of United Baltic Appeal, New York City, New York*

Baltic Appeal to the United Nations Papers

## **PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS**

United States Department of State. *Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS)* 1940-1955. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1959-1992.

United States President. *Public Papers of the United States President*. Harry S. Truman 1945-1952; Dwight D. Eisenhower 1953-1956. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1962-1975.

## **CONTEMPORARY NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS**

The New York Times  
The Chicago Tribune  
The Lithuanian Bulletin  
The Baltic Review  
The Latvian Information Bulletin

## MONOGRAPHS

- Ahrari, Mohammed E. ed. *Ethnic Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1987.
- Albert, Michael. *They Chose Minnesota: A Survey of the State's Ethnic Groups*. Minneapolis: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1981.
- Albats, Bruno and Visvaldis Klīve. *ALA 35: 1951-1986*. Riga: Amerikas latviešu apvienība, 1986.
- Almond, Gabriel. *The American People and Foreign Policy*. New York: Praeger, 1960.
- Ambrosio, Thomas. Ed. *Ethnic Identity Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Praeger, 2002.
- Audenas, Juozas. *Twenty Years' Struggle for Freedom of Lithuania*. New York: ELTA, 1963.
- Barrett, David M. *The CIA and the Untold Story from Truman to Kennedy*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The CIA and Congress*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2005.
- Bassler, Gerhard P. *Alfreds Valdmanis and the Politics of Survival*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.
- Beisner, Robert L. *Dean Acheson: A Life in the Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Bilmanis, Alfred. *Latvia as an Independent State*
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A History of Latvia*.
- Bowie, Robert R. And Richard H. *Waging Peace: How Eisenhower Shaped an Enduring Cold War Strategy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Brands, H.W. *Inside the Cold War: Loy Henderson and the Rise of the American Empire, 1918-1961*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Budreckis, Algirdas Martin. *Lithuania 700 Years*. New York: Maryland Books, 1969.
- Byrnes, Robert F. *Soviet-American Academic Exchanges, 1958-1975*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976.
- Cienciela, Anna M. and Wojciech Materski. *Katyn: A Crime without Punishment*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Cigler, Allan J. and Burdett A. Loomis, eds. *Interest Group Politics, 5th Ed*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1998.



- Christol, Helene and Serge Ricard. *Hyphenated Diplomacy: European Immigration and U.S. Foreign Policy, 1914-1984*. Marseilles. 1985.
- Corke, Sarah-Jane. *U.S. Covert Operations and Cold War Strategy: Truman, Secret Warfare, and the CIA, 1945-53*. New York, Routledge, 2008.
- Craig, Campbell and Fredrick Logevall. *America's Cold War: The Politics of Insecurity*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Cull, Nicholas J. *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945-1989*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Cummings, Richard H. *Cold War Radio: The Dangerous History of American Broadcasting in Europe, 1950-1989*. New York: McFarland, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Radio Free Europe's Crusade for Freedom: Rallying Americans Behind Cold War Broadcasting*. New York: McFarland, 2010.
- Dawisha, Karen. *The International Dimension of Post-Communist Transitions in Russia and the New States of Eurasia*. M.E. Sharpe, 1997.
- DeConde, Alexander. *Ethnicity, Race, and American Foreign Policy: A History, Northeastern*, 1992.
- Eideintas, Alfonsas, Vytautas, Zaly, and Edvardas Tuskenis, *Lithuania in European Politics: The Years of the First Republic, 1918-1940*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1999.
- Eksteins, Modris. *Walking Since Daybreak: A Story of Eastern Europe, World War II, and the Heart of our Century*. New York: Mariner Books, 2000.
- Fainhauz, David. *Lithuanians in the USA: Aspects of Ethnic Identity*. Chicago: Lithuanian Library Press, 1991.
- Feingold, Henry L. *Silent No More: Saving the Jews of Russia, the American Jewish Effort, 1967-1989*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2006.
- Fursenko, Aleksandr and Timothy Naftali. *Khrushchev's Cold War: The Inside Story of an American Adversary*. New York: Norton, 2006.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy During the Cold War 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005
- \_\_\_\_\_. *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

- Garthoff, Raymond L. *A Journey Through the Cold War: A Memoir of Containment and Coexistence*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001.
- Gati, Charles. *Failed Illusions: Moscow, Washington, Budapest and the 1956 Hungarian Revolution*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Grose, Peter. *Operation Rollback: America's Secret War behind the Iron Curtain*. Boston/New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2000.
- Harbutt, Fraser J. *Yalta 1945: Europe and America at the Crossroads*. Cambridge University Press: New York, 2010.
- Hayes, John E. *Red Scare or Red Menace?: American Communism and Anti Communism in the Cold War Era*. Lanham, MD: Ivan R. Dee Publishers, 1995.
- Heale, M.J. *American Anti-Communism: Combating the Enemy Within, 1830-1970*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
- Heil, Alan L. Jr. *Voice of America: A History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.
- Hidden, John and Thomas Lane. *The Baltic and the Outbreak of the Second World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Hidden, John, Vahur Made, and David J. Smith, eds. *The Baltic Question During the Cold War*. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Hidden, John and Patrick Salmon. *The Baltic Nations and Europe: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in the 20th Century*. New York: Longman Publishing Group, 1995.
- Hilton, Laura. *Prisoners of Peace: Rebuilding Community, Identity, and Nationality in Displaced Persons Camps in Germany, 1945-1952* Dissertation: The Ohio State University, 2001.
- Hinrikus, Rutt. *Estonian life Stories*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2009.
- Hixson, Walter L. *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945-1961*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *George F. Kennan: Cold War Iconoclast*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Hollinger, David A. *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books, 2006.
- Hough, William J. *The Baltic States and its Effect on the Development of Law Prohibiting Forcible Seizure of Territory* F. Rothman, 1985.
- Hovi, Olavi. *The Baltic Area in British Policy, 1918-1921: From the Compiègne Armistice to the Implementation of the Versailles Treaty* Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society, 1980.

- Jaakson, Ernst. *Eestile*. Tallinn: SE & JS, 1995.s
- Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann, Anna D. *Exile Mission: Polish Political Diaspora and Polish Americans, 1939-1956*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2004.
- Jasiunas, E. *The Second Transatlantic Flight of Lithuanian-Americans*, 1986.
- Johnson, A. Ross. *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty: The CIA Years and Beyond*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Johnson, Robert David. *Congress and the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Judt, Tony. *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945*. New York: Penguin Books, 2005.
- Kapeikis, Harry S. *Exile from Latvia: My World War II Childhood – From Survival to Opportunity*. New York: Trafford Publishing, 2007.
- Kasekamp, Andres. *The History of the Baltic States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010
- Kaslas, Bronis J. *The Baltic Nations: The Quest for Regional Integration and Political Liberty: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland*. (Pittsburgh, PA: Euroamerica Press, 1976.
- Kegley, Charles W. ed. *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy: Insights and Evidence*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.
- Kirby, David. *The Baltic World 1772-1993: Europe's Northern Periphery in an Age of Change*. London: Longman, 1995.
- Knowles, Valerie. *Strangers at Our Gates: Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-2007*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2007.
- Krugler, David F. *The Voice of America and the Domestic Propaganda Battles, 1945-1953*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2000.
- Kovrig, Bennett. *The Myth of Liberation: East-Central Europe in U.S. Diplomacy and Politics since 1941*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Of Walls and Bridges: The United States and Eastern Europe*. New York, 1991.
- Laar, Mart. *War in the Woods: Estonia's Struggle for Survival, 1944-1956*. New York: Howells House, 1992.
- LeBlanc, Lawrence J. *The United States and the Genocide Convention*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Leffler, Melvyn. *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, The Truman Administration*

- and the Cold War*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Lehti, Marko. *A Baltic League as a Construct of the New Europe*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 1999.
- Lane, Thomas. Artis Pabriks, Aldis Purs, and David J. Smith. *The Baltic States: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania*. Routledge, 2002.
- Lucas, W. Scott. *Freedom's War: The American Crusade Against the Soviet Union*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Lumans, Valdis O. *Latvia in World War II*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2006.
- Lundestad, Geir. *The American Non-Policy Towards Eastern Europe, 1943-1947: Universalism in an Area not of Essential Interest to the United States*. Tromsø/Oslo/Bergen: Universitetsforlaget, 1978.
- Machcewicz, Pawel. *Rebellious Satellite: Poland 1956*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.
- Mälksoo, Lauri. *Illegal Annexation and State Continuity: The Case of the Incorporation of the Baltic States by the USSR*. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 2003.
- Matthews, John P.C. *Tinderbox: East-Central Europe in the Spring, Summer, and Early Fall of 1956*. Tuscan: Fenestra Books, 2003.
- McHugh James T. And James S. Percy. *Diplomats without a Country: Baltic Diplomacy, International Law and the Cold War*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- Meija, Silvija D. *Latvians in Michigan*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2005.
- Mickelson, Sig. *America's Other Voice: The Story of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*. New York: Praeger, 1983.
- Miljan, Toivo. *Historical Dictionary of Estonia* New York: The Scarecrow Press, 2004.
- Miscamble, Wilson D. *George F. Kennan and the Making of American Foreign Policy, 1947-1950*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Misiunas, Romauld and Rein Taagepera. *The Baltic States: Years of Dependence 1940-1990, Expanded and Updated Edition*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Mitrovich, Gregory. *Undermining the Kremlin: America's Strategy to Subvert the Soviet Bloc, 1947-1956*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Mälksoo, Lauri. *Illegal Annexation and State Continuity: The Case of the Incorporation of the Baltic States by the USSR*. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 2003.
- Nelson, Michael. *War of the Black Heavens: The Battles of Western Broadcasting in the Cold War*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1997.

- Novick, Peter. *The Holocaust in American Life*. New York: Mariner Books, 2000.
- Osgood, Kenneth. *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad*, 2008.
- Oshinsky, David M. *A Conspiracy So Immense: The World of Joe McCarthy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Parmet, Herbert S. *Eisenhower and the American Crusades*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1998.
- Parry-Giles, Shawn J. *The Rhetorical Presidency, Propaganda, and the Cold War, 1945-1953*. Westport, Conn: Praeger, 2002.
- Parta, R. Eugene. *Discovering the Hidden Listener: An Assessment of Radio Liberty and Western Broadcasting to the U.S.S.R during the Cold War*. Stanford CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2007.
- Pennar, Jaan. *Estonians in America, 1627-1975: A Chronology and Fact Book*. New York: Oceana Publications, 1975.
- Plakans, Andrejs ed. *Experiencing Totalitarianism: The Invasion and Occupation of Latvia by the USSR and Nazi Germany 1939-1991*. AuthorHouse, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Latvians: A Short History*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1995.
- Paterson, Thomas G., J. Garry Clifford, Shane J. Maddock, Deborah Kisatsky, and Kenneth J. Hagan. *American Foreign Relations: A History Since 1895 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Boston/New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2005.
- Powers, Richard Gid. *Not Without Honor: The History of American Anticommunism*. New York: Free Press, 1995.
- Prados, John. *President's Secret Wars: CIA and Pentagon Covert Operations from World War II Through the Persian Gulf War*. 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Safe for Democracy: The Secret Wars of the CIA*, 2006.
- Puddington, Arch. *Broadcasting Freedom: The Cold War Triumph of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2003.
- Pula, James S. *Polish Americans: An Ethnic Community*. New York: Macmillan, 1995.
- Rabe, Stephen G. *The Most Dangerous Area in the World: John F. Kennedy Confronts Communist Revolution in Latin America*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Raun, Toivo. *Estonia and the Estonians*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2002.

- Richmond, Yale. *Practicing Public Diplomacy*, New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *U.S. –Soviet Cultural Exchanges, 1958-1986: Who Wins?* Boulder, CO: Westview, 1987.
- Rose, Peter. *The Dispossessed: An Anatomy of Exile*. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2004.
- Said, Abdul Aziz, ed. *Ethnicity and U.S. Foreign Policy*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 1981.
- Saldukas, Linas. *Lithuanian Diaspora*. Vilnius: VAGA Publishers, 2002.
- Saunders, Frances Stonor. *The Cultural Cold war: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters*, 2001.
- Senn, Alfred Erich. *Lithuania 1940: Revolution from Above*. Amsterdam Rodopi, 2007.
- Scott-Smith, Giles. *The Politics of Apolitical Culture: The Congress for Cultural Freedom, the CIA, and Postwar American Hegemony*. London: Routledge, 2002. (BSB)
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945-1960*. London: Frank Cass, 2003.
- Shulman, Holly Cowan. *The Voice of America: Propaganda and Democracy, 1941-1945*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.
- Simpson, Christopher. *Blowback: The First Full Account of America's Recruitment of Nazis and its Disastrous Effect on the Cold War, our Domestic and Foreign Policy*. New York: Macmillan, 1989. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare 1945-1960*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Shain, Yossi. *Kinship and Diasporas in International Affairs*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Frontier of Loyalty: Political Exiles in the Age of the Nation-State*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1989.
- Shephard, Ben. *The Long Road Home: The Aftermath of the Second World War*. New York: Random House, 2010.
- Smith, David J., Artis Pabriks, and Aldis Purs. *The Baltic States: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Smith, Tony. *Foreign Attachments: The Power of Ethnic Groups in the Making of American Foreign Policy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Smyser, W.R. *Kennedy and the Berlin Wall: 'A Hell of a Lot Better than a War.'* New York:

- Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2009.
- Snyder, Timothy. *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin*. New York: Basic Books, 2010.
- Sosin, Gene. *Sparks of Liberty: An Insider's Memoir of Radio Liberty*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.
- Spalding, Elizabeth Edwards. *The First Cold Warrior: Harry Truman, Containment, and the Remaking of Liberal Internationalism*.
- Spekke, A. *Latvia and the Baltic Problem: Sketch of Recent History*. London: Latvian Information Bureau, 1955.
- Sprudz, Adolf and Armins Rūsis (Eds). *Res Baltica*. Leydon: A. W. Sijthoff, 1968.
- Stanka, Vladas. *The Baltic University in Figures and Pictures, 1946-1949*. Pinneberg, 1949.
- Steel, Ronald. *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.
- Stern, John Allen. "Propaganda in the Employ of Democracy: Fighting the Cold War with Words" Ph.D. diss, SUNY at Stony Brook, 2002.
- Subrenat, Jean-Jacques. *Estonia: Identity and Independence*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004.
- Tērauda, Anita and Irēne Karule, *ALA 1986-2000*. Riga: Amerikas latviešu apvienība, 2001.
- Theorharis, Athan G. *The Yalta Myths: An Issue in U.S. Politics, 1944-1955*. Columbia, MD: University of Missouri Press, 1970.
- Trachtenberg, Marc. *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Tudda, Chris. *The Truth Is Our Weapon: The Rhetorical Diplomacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.
- Tarulis, Albert N. *American-Baltic Relations 1918-1922: The Struggle Over Recognition*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1965.
- Urban, George R. *Radio Free Europe and the Pursuit of Democracy: My War within the Cold War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Vitas, Robert A. *The United States and Lithuania: The Stimson Doctrine of Nonrecognition*. Westport: Praeger, 1990.
- Vogeler, Kuhio. *For Your Freedom and Ours: The Prolonged Occupations of Hawaii and*

- the Baltic States*. Unpublished Dissertation, 2009.
- Von Rauch, Georg. *The Baltic States: The Years of Independence 1917-1940*. London, 1970.
- Wandycz, Piotr Stefan. *The United States and Poland*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Waller, J. Michael. *The Public Diplomacy Reader* Lulu.com, 2007.
- Walzer, Michael et. al. *The Politics of Ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Weiner, Tim. *Legacy of Ashes: The History of the CIA*. New York: Anchor, 2008.
- Weiss-Wendt, Anton. *Murder without Hatred: Estonians and the Holocaust*. Syracuse NY: Syracuse University Press, 2009.
- Whitfield, Stephen J. *The Culture of the Cold War*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Wilford, Hugh. *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- William, William Appleman. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy (50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Edition)*. New York: W. H. Norton & Company, 2009.
- Wilson, Ernest J. *Diversity and U.S. Foreign Policy: A Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Winner, Irene. *The Dynamics of East European Ethnicity Outside of Eastern Europe: With Special Emphasis on the American Case*. 1983
- Wyman, Mark. *DPs: Europe's Displaced Persons, 1945-1951*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Zevelev, Igor. *Russia and its New Diasporas*, United States Institute of Peace, 2001.
- Zake, Ieva. *American Latvians: Politics of a Refugee Community*. New York: Transaction Publishers, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Anti-Communist Minorities in the U.S.: Political Activism of Ethnic Refugees*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

## Articles

- Aldrich, Richard J. "Liberation: Rolling Back the Frontiers of Clandestine Cold War History?" *Cold War History* 1 (January 2001) 127-139.
- Anderson, Edgar. "British Policy Toward the Baltic States, 1940-1941." *Journal of Baltic Studies*. #11 (Winter 1980) 325-333.



- Apšistis, Astra. "Documenting the Postwar Baltic Diaspora: The Gap Between DP and American Resettlement," *Spectrum* 6, 34-37.
- Auers, Daunis. *Latvia and the USA: From Captive Nation to Strategic Partner*.
- Balkelis, Tomas. "Nation-Building and World War I Refugees in Lithuania, 1918-1924" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #34 (Winter 2003) 432-456.
- Bonnell, Andrew G. "America's Man in Kaunas, 1926-1928: Notes from a Diary" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #28 (Autumn 1997) 255-270.
- Borhi, Laszlo, "Rollback, Liberation, Containment, or inaction? U.S. Policy and Eastern Europe in the 1950s," *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 1 #3 (Fall 1999) 67-110.
- Carafano, James Jay. "Mobilizing Europe's Stateless: America's Plan for a Cold War Army." *Journal of Cold War Studies* #1 (Spring 1999) 61-85.
- Carruthers, Susan L. "Between Camps: Eastern Bloc "Escapees" and Cold War Borderlands" *American Quarterly* #57 (September 2005) 911-942.
- Critchlow, James. "Review Essay: Western Cold War Broadcasting," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 1 #3 (Fall 1999) 168-175.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Public Diplomacy During the Cold War: The Record and its Implications," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 6 #1 (Winter 2004) 75-89.
- Foglesong, David S. "The United States, Self-Determination and the Struggle Against Bolshevism in the East Baltic, 1918-1920." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #26 (Summer 1995), 107-144.
- Frazier, Robert. "Kennan, "Universalism," and the Truman Doctrine" *Journal of Cold War Studies* #11 (Spring 2009) 3-34.
- Garrett, Stephen A. "Eastern European Ethnic Groups and American Foreign Policy." *Political Science Quarterly* 93, no. 2 (1978): 301-23.
- Gatrell, Peter. "Population Displacement in the Baltic Region in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century: From "Refugee Studies" to Refugee History" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #38 (March 2007) 43-60.
- Gedmintas, Aleksandras. "Organizational Relationships in the Development of the Binghamton Lithuanian Community." *Journal of Baltic Studies* (Winter 1980) 315- 324.
- Genys, John B. "The Joint Baltic American Committee and the European Security Conference." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #9 (Autumn 1978) 245-258.
- Girnius, Kestutis K. "The Opposition Movement in Postwar Lithuania." *The Journal of Baltic Studies* #13 (Spring 1982) 66-73.

- Granville, Johanna. "Caught with Jam on our Fingers" *Diplomatic History* 29, (2005) 811-839.
- Hackmann, Jürg and Robert Schweitzer. "Introduction: North Eastern Europe as a Historical Region" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #33 (Winter 2002) 361-368.
- Hartman, Gary. "Dollars, Diplomacy, and Dignity: United States Economic Involvement in Lithuania, 1914-1940" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #28 (Summer 1997) 153-170.
- Hinkle, Maija. "Latvian-Americans in the post-Soviet Era: Cultural Factors on Return Migration in Oral History Interviews" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #37 (Spring 2006), 48-67.
- Holland, Max. "Operation PBHISTORY: The Aftermath of SUCCESS" *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 17 (2004) 300-332.
- Hopkins, Michael F. "Continuing Debate and New Approaches in Cold War History" *The Historical Journal*, 50 (2007) 913-934.
- Isawjiw, Wsevolod W. "Ethnic Identity Retention in Four Ethnic Groups: Does it Matter?" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #21 (Autumn 1990) 289-304.
- Ivask, Ivar. "Baltic Literature in Exile: Balance of a Quarter Century." *Journal of Baltic Studies*. #3 (Spring 1972) 1-17.
- Ivaska, Astride, "IS the Voice in me a Maimed Whisper? Young Latvian Exile Poets of the Seventies" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #5 (Spring 1974), 26-33.
- Jaanson, Kaido. "The Baltic Sea Region in International Relations of the Twentieth Century: The Seminal Nature of the Interwar Period" *Journal of Baltic Studies*. #32 (Autumn 2001), 267-288.
- Johnson, Robert David. "Congress and the Cold War" *Journal of Cold War Studies* #3 (Spring 2001) 76-100.
- Juda, Lawrence. "United States' Nonrecognition of the Baltic States: Politics and Law" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #6 (Winter 1975), 272-290.
- Kennedy, Liam and Scott Lucas "Enduring Freedom: Public Diplomacy and U.S. Foreign Policy" *American Quarterly* 57 (June 2005) 309-333.
- Kochavi, Arie J. "Britain, the Soviet Union, and the question of the Baltic States in 1943" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #22 (Summer 1991) 173-182.
- Laar, Kadri-Ann. "Estonian Ethnic Identity: Language Maintenance and Shift." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #21 (Autumn 1990) 239-258.
- Laszlo, Borhi. "Rollback, Liberation, Containment, or Inaction?: U.S. Policy and Eastern Europe in the 1950s" *Journal of Cold War Studies* #1 (Fall 1999) 67-110.

- Lehti, Marko. "Mapping the Study of the Baltic Sea Area: From Nation-Centric to Multinational History" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #33 (Winter 2002), 431-446.
- Legge, Jerome S. Jr. "The Karl Linnas Deportation Case, the Office of Special Investigations, and American Ethnic Politics" *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* #24 (Spring 2010) 26-55.
- Llivak, Arno. "Soviet Responses to Western Non-Recognition of Baltic Annexation." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #18. (Winter 1987) 329-348.
- Marchio, James. "The Planning Coordination Group: Bureaucratic Casualty in the Cold War Campaign to Exploit Soviet-bloc Vulnerabilities" *Journal of Cold War Studies*. #4 (Fall 2002) 3-28.
- Mathias, Charles McCurdy, Jr. "Ethnic Groups and Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs* 59 (1981): 975-98.
- Miezitis-Matiss, Ilze A. and Solveiga Miezitis. "Changing Profile of Latvian School Students: A Fifteen-Year Follow-Up." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #21 (Autumn 1990) 201-214.
- Miezitis-Matiss, Ilze A. "Patterns of Language Use in Second Generation Families of Latvian Origin" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #21 (Autumn 1990) 231-238.
- Miezitis, Solveiga. "Ethnic Identity Development: A Comparative Study of Active and Non-Active Second Generation Youth in Latvian Community." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #21 (Autumn 1990) 259-288.
- Norvilas, Algis. "Which Language Shall we Speak" Language Choice Among Young Lithuanian Bilinguals." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #21 (Autumn 1990) 201-214.
- O'Gorman Ned. "'The One Word the Kremlin Fears': CD Jackson, Cold War 'Liberation,' and American Political-Economic Adventurism" *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 12 (Fall 2009) 389-427.
- Osgood, Kenneth A. "Hearts and Minds: The Unconventional Cold War" *Journal of Cold War Studies* #4 (Spring 2002) 85-107.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Form before Substance: Eisenhower's Commitment to Psychological Warfare and Negotiations with the Enemy" *Diplomatic History* 24 (2000) 405-433.
- Paul, David Mel. "Sending Back the Balts." *Scandinavian Review*. 64 #4, 1977 39-44.
- Petrov, Vladimir. "Radio Liberation" *Russian Review* 17 (April 1958) 104-114.
- Pollard, Robert A. "Economic Security and the Origins of the Cold War: Bretton Woods, the Marshall Plan, and American Rearmament, 1944-1950" *Diplomatic History* 9 (1985) 273-279.

- Priedkalns, Janis. "The Latvians in Australia: Comments on Demographic Studies" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #13 (Spring 1982) 128-133.
- Putnins, Aldis L. "Latvian Identification: Second Generation youth in Australia and North America" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #10 (Spring 1979) 60-63.
- Readman, Kristina Spohr. "Between Political Rhetoric and Realpolitik Calculations: Western Diplomacy and the Baltic Independence Struggle in the Cold War Endgame" *Cold War History* 6 (February 2006) 1-42.
- Ribuffo, Leo P. "Is Poland a Soviet Satellite? Gerald Ford, the Sonnenfeldt Doctrine, and the Election of 1976" *Diplomatic History* 14 (1990) 385-404
- Roberts, Geoffrey. "Stalin at the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam Conferences" *Journal of Cold War Studies* 9 (Fall 2007) 6-40.
- Rudgers, David F. "The Origin of Covert Action" *Journal of Contemporary History* 35 (April 2000) 249-262.
- Senn, Alfred Erich. "American Lithuanians and the Politics of Basketball in Lithuania, 1935-1939. *Journal of Baltic Studies* #19 (Summer 1988) 146-156.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lithuania in March 1941: An American Diplomat's Report" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #26 (Summer 1995) 151-158.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A US National Intelligence Estimate on the Baltic, 1958" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #26 (Summer 1995) 159-166.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lithuanian in America and the Lithuanian National Movement before 1914" *Journal of American Ethnic History* 6
- Shain, Yossi. "Ethnic Diasporas and U.S. Foreign Policy." *Political Science Quarterly* 109, no. 5 (1994-1995): 811-41.
- Shaw, Tony. "The Politics of Cold War Culture" *Journal of Cold War Studies* #3 (Fall 2001) 59-76.
- Silenieks, Juris. "Latvian Literature in Exile: The Recycling of Signs." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #2 Issue 3 (Autumn 1971) 13-17.
- Skerrett, Delaney Michael. "History and Memory in the "Return of the Descendants of Latvians and Estonian Refugees to the Baltic, A Survey" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #39. (March 2008) 39-56.
- Stanfield, Rochelle L. "Ethnic Politicking." *National Journal* 21, no. 52 (1989): 3096.
- Taagepera, Rein. "Soviet Documentation on the Estonian pro-independence Guerilla Movement, 1945-1952." (Summer 1979) 91-106.

- Taremae, Heino. "Baltic Materials Among the John C. Wiley Papers." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #9 (Autumn 1978) 203-211.
- Taylor, Melissa Jan. "Bureaucratic Response to Human Tragedy: American Consuls and the Jewish Plight in Vienna, 1938-1941" *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 21 (Fall 2007) 243-267.
- Trachtenberg, Marc. "The United States and Eastern Europe in 1945: A Reassessment" *Journal of Cold War Studies* #10 (Winter 2009) 124-149.
- Trapans, Jan Arved. "The Baltic States and Western Radio Broadcasts: The Role and Estimated Impact of Radio Free Europe" *Journal of Baltic Studies* #19 (Summer 1988) 93-100.
- Tudda, Christopher J. "Reenacting the Story of Tantalus": Eisenhower, Dulles, and the Failed Rhetoric of Liberation" *Journal of Cold War Studies* #7 (Fall 2005) 3-35.
- Tyas, Stephen. "Allied Intelligence Agencies and the Holocaust: Information Acquired from Germany Prisoners of War" *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 22 (Spring 2008) 1-24.
- Uustalu, Evald. "The National Committee of the Estonian Republic." *Journal of Baltic Studies* #7 (Autumn 1976) 209-219.
- Warner, Michael. "Origins of the Congress for Cultural Freedom" *Studies on Intelligence* 38 (Summer 1995). <http://odci.gov/csi/studies/95unclas/war.html>
- Vitas, Robert A. "The Recognition of Latvia: The Completion of the Legal Circle." *Journal of Baltic Studies*. #24 (Autumn 1993) 247-262.
- Yarrow, Andrew L. "Selling a New Vision of America to the World: Changing Messages in Early U.S. Cold War Print Propaganda" *Journal of Cold War Studies* #11 (Fall 2009) 3-45.
- Zake, Ieva. "'The Secret Nazi Network' and Post-World War II Latvian Émigrés in the United States" *Journal of Baltic Studies I* #41 (March 2010) 91-117.

