



Part of the automobile map of Baltic states (1930). National Library of Latvia, Riga, map collection, ref. no. KtB1-3/30.

**Inese Grumolte-Lerhe PhD**

Analytical Service of Saeima, Riga, Latvia

**Ainārs Lerhis PhD**

University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia



DOI: 10.48261/INRR230505

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE  
ON LATVIA'S  
DESTINY:  
**CHANGES IN THE COUNTRY'S  
INTERNATIONAL SITUATION  
AND THE MAIN LINES OF ACTIVITY  
OF LATVIAN FOREIGN SERVICE  
(1939–1945)**

**Abstract**

This article presents the main directions and features of foreign service of the Republic of Latvia together with an analysis of its operation during World War II (1939–1945) when Latvia was occupied, and its independence *de facto* destroyed, but the Republic of Latvia continued to exist *de iure*. The international context of developments regarding Latvia as a sovereign state is examined briefly. Between 1940 and 1991, the foreign service of Latvia was the only institution of the Latvian State which, to a limited extent, continued to carry out the foreign policy functions of the Republic of Latvia.

**Keywords:** foreign policy, foreign service, Latvia, Baltic states, occupation, non-recognition policy

## Introduction

Since the beginning of the international recognition of the Latvian State and the beginning of the new era of peacetime, the main issue to be solved in Latvia's foreign policy was the problem of the security guarantees. Despite the guarantees of general security achieved (Covenant of the League of Nations and guarantees for the territorial integrity and political independence of the State), Latvia, like many other European countries, still felt threatened (Feldmanis, Stranga, and Virsis 1993, 12). In the 1920s and early 1930s, Latvia failed to establish either multilateral alliances or agreements on guarantees of the Great Powers for Latvia's security. For the time being, this was assured by the relative balance of power between the USSR, Germany, and Poland (Bleiere, Butulis, Feldmanis, Stranga, and Zunda 2005, 163). In Europe, the international situation temporarily stabilized in the late 1920s. Latvia pursued a policy of balance and tried to avoid putting itself against the Great Powers, and not participating in alliances formed by the Great Powers.

The Munich Agreement (September 1938) marked a sharp escalation of international tension, which was particularly dangerous for small countries. In the autumn of 1938, following the example of the Scandinavian countries, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania declared neutrality, but they did not have a real chance to get other countries to respect and guarantee this (Bleiere, Butulis, Feldmanis, Stranga, and Zunda 2005, 166). On December 13, the Latvian government passed a law on neutrality rules, which marked the country's transition from relative to absolute neutrality with the aim of preventing Latvia from being pulled into a war.

In 1939, with increasing pressure from Nazi Germany and the USSR, the security situation in the Baltic States deteriorated. On August 23, 1939, the USSR and Nazi Germany signed a non-aggression pact. The secret additional protocol attached to it envisaged that Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Bessarabia would come under the influence of the USSR, and Lithuania – under the influence of Germany. After the conclusion of the German – USSR non-aggression pact, Latvia's security and independence were threatened.

On September 1, 1939, World War II broke out with the German invasion of Poland. On September 2, the Latvian government declared neutrality (entry "Ārpolitika," [Foreign Policy] in *Latvijas Enciklopēdija*, vol. 1, 2002, 324). Some of Latvia's missions abroad were the first to face the conditions of war. The first legation which Latvia lost was the

one in Warsaw (Latvian National Archives, Latvian State Historical Archive, hereinafter LNA LSHA, 2570. fonds [fonds/collection] [hereinafter – f.], 1. apraksts [description] [hereinafter – apr.], 472. lieta [file] [hereinafter – l.], pp. 32–53; Jēkabsons 1992, 2). The defeat of Poland made a deep impression on Latvia's foreign policy leadership. Later, Latvia was forced to close several consular representations in the territories conquered by Germany and the USSR in 1939–1940.

On September 21, 1939, Latvian foreign minister Vilhelms Munters informed the Polish envoy that the Latvian government was forced to suspend relations with Poland (Feldmanis, Stranga, and Virsis 1993, 361). Unfortunately, the real reason for the legation's closure was the fear of the USSR (Feldmanis, Stranga, and Virsis 1993, 362). Latvia did not recognize the Polish government-in-exile (Feldmanis, Stranga, and Virsis 1993, 354, 357). Later, the Polish government-in-exile moved to London. Due to Latvia's position in 1939, after 1940, it was difficult for the Latvian diplomats in the West to establish contacts with representatives of the Polish government-in-exile in London in an effort to gain Polish support in the struggle for the restoration of Latvia's independence.

The USSR immediately applied pressure on the Baltic states towards the implementation of the German – Soviet Treaty of friendship and borders (September 28, 1939). The USSR, with the help of the ultimate threat of immediate military invasion, forced the Baltic states to conclude similar pacts of mutual assistance (on September 28 – with Estonia, on October 10 – with Lithuania). On October 5, an agreement on mutual assistance between Latvia and the USSR was signed for 10 years. About 30,000 Red Army soldiers were brought into the territory of Latvia, and Latvia's sovereignty was restricted (entry “Ārpolitika,” *Latvijas Enciklopēdija*, vol. 1, 2002, 324).

Diplomats and politicians from several countries blamed Latvia for the drastic change in policy (Feldmanis, Stranga, and Virsis 1993, 49). Subsequently, none of the member-states of the Baltic Entente dared to declare that the mutual assistance agreements were not concluded



Vilhelms Munters (1898–1967), Latvian foreign minister (1936–1940), imprisoned in Soviet Union (1940–1958). Photo (1936–1939), National Digital Archives, Warsaw, Poland, collection Koncern Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny – Archiwum Ilustracji, ref. no. 3/1/0/17/9619

voluntarily, but were imposed under the threat of power (Feldmanis, Stranga, and Virsis 1993, 370–371). The agreement of October 5 practically no longer allowed Latvia to call things by their proper names (*20. gadsimta Latvijas vēsture* 2003, 693). Since the conclusion of the agreement in foreign policy, Latvia was forced to take into account the interests of the USSR at every step. In the autumn of 1939, the entry of a contingent of Soviet troops and establishment of the Soviet military bases in the territory of Latvia was considered by a significant proportion of Latvian society as the “beginning of the end” of Latvia’s independence.

On May 17, 1940, the Cabinet of Ministers of Latvia decided to grant the envoy to Great Britain, Kārlis Zariņš (also: *Charles Zarine*), extraordinary powers to defend the interests of Latvia in all countries except Estonia, Lithuania, Finland, Sweden, Germany and the Soviet Union; to issue binding orders to all diplomatic and consular missions of Latvia (except missions in the abovementioned countries); to manage all government funds, and movable and immovable property at the disposal of the aforementioned missions; to relieve envoys temporarily, as well as to dismiss and transfer all other officials at the Latvian missions abroad; to liquidate missions except the legation in the United States; to appoint delegates for conferences and various meetings and, in an emergency case he could not execute these powers himself, to transfer the powers to the Latvian envoy to the United States, Alfrēds Bilmanis (see LNA LSHA, 293. f., 1. apr., 4388. l., pp. 12, 16, 17, 28. Hoover Institution Library and Archives [hereinafter: HIA], Vilis Šumanis papers 1925–1948, box 1, folder “Increment April 1978”; document “Latvian Government Apprehensive. Extraordinary Emergency Powers of Latvian State Authority abroad granted to the Latvian Minister in London, K. Zarins and his substitute A. Bilmanis, Latvian Minister in Washington,” in *Baltic States* 1972, 433; *Latvijas Republikas oficiālā nostāja* 2015, 41–42).

These empowerments would also come into force if, due to the conditions of war, the Latvian government were unable to maintain contacts with Latvia’s diplomatic and consular missions in Western Europe (Andersons 1984, 413). The mandate was intended to continue to represent the interests of the Latvian State abroad in an emergency in the conditions of the Second World War. Although these powers had significant shortcomings and were limited (Andersons 1984, 414–415,) they proved to be important in the fight for the *de iure* continuation of the Latvian State, and for the future operation of the Latvian diplomatic and consular service.

The decision of the Latvian government to accept the USSR government's ultimatum of June 16, 1940, and not to resist the Soviet occupation (June 17, 1940) by diplomatic protests or military means (see LNA LSHA, 1307. f., 1. apr., 317. l., p. 172; Gore and Stranga 1992, 115–117), as well as not to send instructions for further political and diplomatic powers in the face of the threat of an attack by the military force, determined Latvia's future foreign policy changes and the fate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA).

The USSR began a gradual restriction of the activities of the MFA and foreign relations of Latvia. The foreign minister Vilhelms Munters was forced to resign on June 21 when the puppet government of Augusts Kirhenšteins, formed by the USSR came to power – from that moment the Latvian MFA and its activities started to be continuously reduced. The MFA of a formally still independent state (until August 5, 1940) was maintained, but as of the end of June, foreign policy activities effectively ceased.

## Latvian Foreign Service After the Annexation

In the middle of the summer 1940, the first and most important task of the diplomats of the Baltic states was to ensure that the Soviet occupation, annexation and incorporation in the Baltics were not legally recognized internationally. Latvian diplomats sought the most optimal support for not recognizing the changes taking place in the Baltic states among the Western powers, who – as the desired victors in the Second World War, sharing the understanding of democratic values – hoped for a fair solution to the Baltic situation after the war (see LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, file “Sarakste ar kolēģiem. Ienākušie. 1941. g. [Correspondence with Colleagues. Incoming Documents. 1941]”, Letter of Pēteris Oliņš to Nikolajs Ozoliņš, 23 July 1941). In mid-July 1940, two weeks before Latvia's incorporation into the USSR, diplomatic representatives accredited in several Western countries by the last independent government of the Republic of Latvia began a diplomatic struggle against the aggression, which was to destroy Latvia's independence. Latvian diplomats abroad assessed the situation as a fact of occupation (Feldmanis, Freimanis, Lerhis, and Ziemele 1999, 132; Lerhis 2000, 169), and several envoys strongly opposed the destruction of the Baltic states. They voiced protests to the Western governments against the occupation and sought to achieve non-recognition of Soviet occupation and the



Alfrēds Bīlmanis (1887–1948), Latvian envoy in USA (1935–1948). Photo (1927), National Digital Archives, Warsaw, Poland, collection Koncern Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny – Archiwum Ilustracji, ref. no. 3/1/0/17/9600

subsequent annexation, and incorporation. This in turn meant calling on Western countries to continue recognizing the Republic of Latvia *de iure*.

Latvian envoys abroad formulated their protests against the illegal actions of the USSR on the basis of the norms of the Constitution (*Satversme*) of Latvia, and thus the doctrine of the continuity of the Latvian State began to develop. After the loss of the country's independence, the diplomats immediately began to develop, defend and explain the doctrine of the continuity of the Latvian State. In July 1940, the envoys Kārlis Zariņš in London, and Alfrēds Bīlmanis in Washington, submitted protest notes to the British and American governments, respectively, in connection with the Soviet occupation, and called for its non-recognition (The National Archives [hereinafter: TNA], Foreign Office [hereinafter: FO], FO 371/24761; N6041/1224/59, pp. 193–195; *Latvian – Russian Relations* 1944, pp. 204–205; Note of K. Zarins, Latvian Envoy in London, protesting

against the incorporation of Latvia into the U. S. S. R. as being unconstitutional and illegal, in *Baltic States* 1972, 438–439; “Latvia – a victim of unprovoked aggression of the Soviet Russia. Statement of Dr. Alfred Bīlmanis, Latvian minister in Washington. Released to the Press on July 21, 1940,” in *Baltic States* 1972, 436–437; TNA, FO 371/24761; N6194/1224/59, p. 297; *Latvijas Republikas oficiālā nostāja* 2015, pp. 49–51). Several other Latvian envoys did the same. On July 15, the US administration froze all Latvian and other Baltic funds in the US (*Foreign Relations of the United States. Diplomatic Papers*. [hereinafter: FRUS] 1940. *General*. Vol. I, 1959, 391; Andersons 1984, p. 504; Bleiere, Butulis, Feldmanis, Stranga, and Zunda 2008, pp. 444, 551). On July 15, merchant ships from the Baltic States were interned in US ports (Hough 1985, 393; Balodis 1991, 291–292). At that time, on July 15, 1940, the Republic of Latvia held gold worth 17,890,422 Latvian lats in the United States. After the freezing of funds, regular sums were, nevertheless, allocated later to ensure the operation of Latvian legations and consulates (Andersons 1982, 504). Following the example of the United States, on July 20, the British government imposed an embargo on the property of the Baltic states in Great Britain (entry “Sūtniecība Londonā” [Legation in London] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 4, 1990, 506).

In July 1940, a new stage in the history of diplomacy of the Republic of Latvia began with new tasks. After the occupation, the Latvian Foreign Service was the only state institution of the *de iure* existing Republic of Latvia that continued to perform the functions of the state. This service retained the ability to exist and operate (without the support of an independent Latvian government and the MFA), as the diplomatic and consular representations were located outside the occupied territory of Latvia. The Service continued to operate without interruption throughout the period of occupation and annexation of Latvia until the restoration of independence in 1991, and represented the interests of the Republic of Latvia and its citizens abroad, if only to a very limited extent. This opportunity was created by the non-recognition of the occupation, annexation and incorporation of Latvia.

On August 8, 1940, the Cabinet of Ministers of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic adopted a decision on the termination of the activities of Latvia's diplomatic and consular missions (LNA LSHA, 2570. f., 4. apr., 64. l., p. 3). The Soviet authorities formally liquidated 16 Latvian legations and 194 consulates (entry "Sūtniecības un konsulāti" [Legations and Consulates] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 4, 1990, 502–503). The official liquidation process of the central apparatus of the MFA took place from August 1940 to the beginning of 1941 (LNA LSHA, 2570. f., 4. apr., 57. l., pp. 1–41).

Twelve out of sixteen legations were closed (except for Buenos Aires, London, Washington and Geneva). Three out of four career general-consulates (except for Bern) and four out of five career consulates (except for New York, for a short time) closed down. In August 1940, 128 consular representations actually closed down, so there were no more Latvian honorary consulates in seventeen European and three Asian countries, as well as in Cuba and Egypt (Križevica 2017). In the summer of 1940, the Latvian State lost the possession of legation buildings in Berlin, Paris, Tallinn and Helsinki, but retained the legation buildings in London and Geneva.

However, although most of Latvia's diplomatic and consular missions abroad were merged with USSR missions in the respective countries, several legations and a large number of consulates in the West refused to comply with the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Government's order on liquidation and continued to operate in Latvia's interests. The Soviet Union failed to restrict Latvia's foreign relations completely.

Immediately after the occupation of the Baltic States, a long-standing phenomenon in international diplomacy ensued – the policy of non-recognition of the occupation, annexation and incorporation of the



Baltic States. As the occupation and forcible annexation of Latvia were based on illegal grounds, the Latvian State continued to exist *de iure*, and many countries continued to recognize it. Latvia's national independence was *de facto* declared void. Maintaining the question of restoration of the independence of the three Baltic States, which lasted for more than 50 years, was unprecedented in international politics and law (Feldmanis, Freimanis, Lerhis, and Ziemele 1999, 127), and had some impact on the development of international law (McHugh and Pacy 2001, 112).

Since the Note issued in 1932 by the US Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, the principle that acts or other activities by which countries seize territories of other countries by force or by threat of use of force should not be recognised, was formulated in a number of international treaties and time-honoured in national practice. The principles formulated in that note entered the international law as the "Stimson's Doctrine". The doctrine was also based on those principles of international law that prohibited the use of force in relations between states. As early as March 11, 1932, the Assembly of the League of Nations adopted a resolution declaring that any violation of the territorial integrity of a member of the League of Nations and a change in its political independence contrary to the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations or the Briand-Kellogg Pact could not be declared valid (Hough 1985, 327–329). The principle of the prohibition of the use of force and threats in interstate relations was time-honoured in these two documents before the Second World War.

The Statement of July 23, 1940, by the US Acting Secretary of State, Sumner Welles (*Statement by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Welles, relating to the incorporation of the Baltic States. Released to the Press July 23, 1940*, in *Baltic States* 1972, 147; Andersons 1984, 504–505; *Latvijas okupācija* 1995, 553–554; TNA, FO 371/24241, A3686/131/45, p. 250; *Rietumvalstu nostāja* 2018, 66–67), laid out the US policy on the issue of independence of the Baltic states and thus ensured the continuation of the operation of the diplomatic missions of the Baltic states in the United States (entry "Sūtniecība Vašingtonā" [Legation in Washington] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 4, 1990: 510). The protests of Latvia's diplomatic representatives also contributed to the fact that in the summer of 1940 the leading Western countries extended the principle of non-recognition of forcible conquests also onto the Baltic States, and initiated the *de iure* non-recognition of the occupation and annexation of Latvia and the other Baltic states (Feldmanis, Freimanis, Lerhis, and Ziemele 1999, 134–135). The United States neither *de iure* nor *de facto* recognized the inclusion of the Baltic states in the USSR

(entry “Latvijas Diplomātija” [Latvian Diplomacy] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 3, 1987, 391). The United States never established official relations with the Soviet authorities in occupied Latvia (Lerhis 1997, 16). Many other countries followed the US position. The Polish government-in-exile did not recognize the occupation and annexation of the Baltic states as legitimate, either. The policy of the USA and Great Britain towards the Baltic states was also influenced to some extent by the position of the Polish government-in-exile which recognized the independence of the Baltic states (entry “Sūtniecība Londonā” [Legation in London] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 4, 1990, 507). The United States extended the principles of the Stimson doctrine to the Baltic states and the doctrine of non-recognition of conquests to the territorial acquisitions of the USSR, as it had previously applied



to the conquests of Japan, Germany, and Italy (Hough 1985, 391). The United States always considered diplomatic relations with Latvia and other Baltic states to be valid, although during 1940–1991 there were only incomplete diplomatic relations (Latvia had a legation in America, but in the Soviet-occupied Latvia there could be no American legation). The United States treated all three Baltic states equally, although Estonia did not have a legation. After the occupation of Estonia, the United States recognized the Estonian Consul-General in New York granting him the rights equal to an envoy.

Diplomatic and consular missions of the Republic of Latvia continued to operate in several countries: legations in Washington and London throughout the entire period of the occupation of Latvia, for a shorter time – legations in Buenos Aires (1940–1946), in Geneva (1940–1946), in Rio de Janeiro (1944–1961), diplomatic mission in Madrid (1953–1959), as well as many consulates in different periods (Lerhis 1997, 17). However, not all missions had the same status – only diplomats from the legation in Washington continued to enjoy full diplomatic privileges and immunities.

Vilhelms Munters, Latvian foreign minister (left) and Kārlis Zariņš (Latvian envoy in London) (right) at the entrance to Downing Street no. 10, 4 December 1938. National Digital Archives, Warsaw, Poland, collection Koncern Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny – Archiwum Ilustracji, ref. no. 3/1/0/17/9638

After the closure of the legation, Latvian envoy to Sweden, Voldemārs Salnais, continued to represent the interests of the Latvian State as much as possible. The Swedes retained their personal diplomatic status for the legation staff until the end of the war (entry “Latvijas Diplomātija” [Latvian Diplomacy] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 3, 1987, 394; entry “Sūtniecība Stokholmā” [Legation in Stockholm] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 4, 1990, 517).

Although Switzerland did not recognize the incorporation of the Baltic states, it ceased to recognize the status of the Baltic legations as of January 1, 1941, but still allowed Jūlijs Feldmanis and other Baltic diplomats to serve in their personal capacity until the end of 1946. On February 4, 1941, the Swiss government decided to suspend the official activities of the diplomatic representatives of the Baltic states in Switzerland, but allowed them to continue their work as official delegates of the Baltic states to the League of Nations. Switzerland no longer included Jūlijs Feldmanis in the Swiss Diplomatic Corps List, but continued to grant all previous privileges. Jūlijs Feldmanis continued to work in the building of the legation as a Permanent delegate to the League of Nations. On November 15, 1946, Switzerland recognized the annexation of the Baltic states to the USSR *de facto*, but not *de iure*, and the archives and property of the Baltic legations in Switzerland were put under the temporary administration of the Swiss Federal Government. Switzerland retained the building of the Latvian legation, but handed it over to the USSR diplomatic mission for use (entry “Sūtniecība Ženēvā” [Legation in Geneva] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 4, 1990, 514; entry “Latvijas Diplomātija” [Latvian Diplomacy] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 3, 1987, 394).

Throughout the war, the British government froze financial deposits and allowed the funds to be used only for the Latvian legation in London, but did not release them to help refugees. The United States was more liberal in releasing deposits to maintain Latvian legations in the Western Hemisphere and at the League of Nations in Geneva. The British and US governments accepted the right of Kārlis Zariņš to appoint consular representatives (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, file “Sarakste ar Latvian Senior Consul N. McLeod” [Correspondence with Latvian Senior Consul N. McLeod], Letter of Kārlis Zariņš to Norman McLeod, April 19, 1951).

Until 1942, the Baltic legations in Great Britain continued to operate without restrictions. On June 27, 1942, the British War Cabinet decided that in the future the envoys of the Baltic states and the employees of the legations would no longer be included in the Diplomatic Corps

List, but in a separate Annex (TNA, Foreign Office, War Cabinet Memoranda WP and CP series, CAB 66/25/49, WP (42) 269, 27 June 1942, “Representatives of the Baltic States” – Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; TNA, Foreign Office, War Cabinet and Cabinet: Minutes (WM and CM Series), CAB 65/26/44, WM (42) 83, Conclusion. The Baltic States – Status of Representatives in this Country, 29 June 1942; entry “Latvijas Diplomātija” [Latvian Diplomacy] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 3, 1987, 393). The envoys of the Baltic states in London were not considered to be official representatives of any country, but they retained all diplomatic privileges and immunities in their personal capacity, and were allowed consular functions (Zunda 2007 (1), 282, 286, 287).

While Latvia did not have an independent government and its occupation continued, between 1940 and 1991, the work of the Latvian missions abroad was managed by the heads of the Latvian diplomatic and consular service: Kārlis Zariņš (1940–1963), Arnolds Spekke (1963–1970, thus the service management center moved from the legation in London to the one in Washington), and Anatols Dinbergs (1971–1991). They set guidelines on foreign policy issues and appointed mission staff, consuls and personal representatives. The activities of the missions were further determined to a large extent by the head of the Latvian diplomatic and consular service, and the head of the respective mission.

The interests of the Latvian State and citizens continued to be defended and the official opinion of the State (on any international policy issues and events affecting the interests of the Latvian State and its citizens) was developed and expressed by the remaining Latvian diplomatic representatives in Western capitals, primarily by envoy to the Great Britain, Kārlis Zariņš, and envoy to the United States, Alfrēds Bilmanis (Lūsis 1990, 12). In the Latvian legations in London, Washington, Geneva and Buenos Aires, political work since 1940 was focused mainly on informational activities and the struggle for Latvia’s existence and rights. Work with Latvian citizens, ships, etc. focused on the consular sector and was considered very important (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, file “1940. D. 125.63/ Latvian Consulate-General, New York”, Letter of Alfrēds Bilmanis to Kārlis Zariņš, 7 September 1940).

In 1940 and 1941, the envoys of the Republic of Latvia protested to the governments of the countries of residence against the occupation of Latvia by both the USSR and Nazi Germany, respectively, describing the actions against the Latvian State as both criminal and illegal,

a violation of international law. In the summer of 1941, they pointed to the replacement of one occupation power in Latvia by another, and further followed the claims of occupation by both powers to Latvia (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, file “Miscellaneous (War time), mainly Washington”). The envoys believed that, from the point of view of the Latvian State, both belligerent Great Powers – the USSR and Nazi Germany – were occupiers. The diplomatic missions of the Republic of Latvia abroad were obliged to resist any foreign domination in Latvia.

The situation was very unfavourable: the legal status of the Baltic states, which had lost their independence, was not recognized by the two occupying powers in the Second World War – the USSR and Germany; diplomats had to cope with minimal resources, not always with sufficient moral or practical support from the government of the country of residence. The greatest support for diplomatic activity lay in international legal norms and moral principles. In the initial period there was insufficient information in Western societies about Latvia; diplomats were not able to replace their governments in any way; there was no government-in-exile. Reckless actions had to be avoided, as it could lead to the dismantling of legations and consulates (entry “Latvijas Diplomātija” [Latvian Diplomacy] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 3, 1987, 394). However, the diplomats were obliged to use the existing opportunities to represent independent Latvia, to speak not only on behalf of those who went abroad, but also on behalf of Latvians living under the Nazi and Soviet regimes (in Latvia, Siberia, etc.) (Lerhis 1997, 16–17). During the war, there were no influential Latvian exile organizations abroad. The employees of the Latvian Foreign Service developed cooperation with the representatives of the foreign services of the other two Baltic states – Estonia and Lithuania. Regular consultations took place, during which official foreign policy positions, decisions and actions were coordinated. A little later, cooperation was established with the Latvian resistance movement in the homeland, which opposed both foreign powers and advocated the restoration of Latvia’s national independence.

Latvian diplomats tried to draw the attention of the societies of their countries of residence, as well as to constantly remind of the international legal existence and situation of the Latvian State, conditions in Latvia and violations of international law, and crimes against the Latvian State and its inhabitants by Germany and the Soviet Union. Kārlis Zariņš and Alfrēds Bīlmanis had to reject and refute both Soviet and German propaganda statements. The August

1941 newsletter of the legation in Washington, D.C., was published in Latvian and English with a significant introductory article, “The Latvian people rise against the Bolsheviks. The Latvian people are also against German military occupation” (LNA LSHA, 293. f., 1. apr., 4370. l., pp. 51, 83). Envoy Jūlijs Feldmanis continued his activities in Geneva throughout the war. His contribution was to compile and publish legation newsletters of about 100 editions on the situation in Latvia under the two occupying powers and the international situation of Latvia.

In August 1941, the leaders of the United States and Great Britain signed an important foreign policy document against Nazi Germany and other “Axis” countries, the “Atlantic Charter”, and the USSR acceded to it in September, 1941. The “Declaration by United Nations” was signed in Washington on January 1, 1942, in which the commitment to the principles of the “Atlantic Charter” was reaffirmed (*FRUS 1942 1960*, 25–26; entry “Apvienotās Nācijas” [United Nations] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 1, 1983, 75; Feldmanis, Freimanis, Lerhis, and Ziemele 1999, 141). Official representatives of the Republic of Latvia also expressed a wish for Latvia to join the coalition of United Nations. On January 4, 1942, envoy Alfrēds Bilmanis announced on behalf of Latvia that the country also wanted to accede to the Charter and the Declaration, but did not receive a written response to the application (*FRUS 1942 1960*, 29–30). Latvia was not invited due to possible objections from the USSR. Therefore, the West denied the Baltic envoys the opportunity to sign the Charter and the Declaration, to participate in wartime conferences, and to participate in the founding of the United Nations Organization.

However, Latvian envoys supported the fact that several Latvian merchant ships remaining in the Western Hemisphere operated at the disposal of the United States and Great Britain, and carried military cargo (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, file “Miscellaneous (War time), mainly Washington”). This was Latvia’s military contribution and support to the Western countries of the United Nations coalition.

On June 26, 1941, during a meeting between the envoy of the Republic of Latvia to the United States, Alfrēds Bilmanis, and the ambassador of Poland to the United States, Jan Maria Ciechanowski, diplomatic contacts between Latvia and Poland (which were interrupted in the autumn of 1939, due to the compulsory liquidation of Polish legation in Riga) were re-established (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, file “Sarakste ar kolēģiem. Ienākušie. 1941. g.”

[Correspondence with Colleagues. Incoming Documents. 1941]; *Latvijas Republikas oficiālā nostāja* 2015, 90).

On February 24, 1942, Latvian envoy, Alfrēds Bilmanis, sent Aide-Mémoire to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Polish government-in-exile in London, Count Edward Bernard Raczyński, apologizing for the actions of Latvian foreign minister Vilhelms Munters on September 21, 1939, when the latter had declared termination of official relations with the Polish envoy to Latvia. Alfrēds Bilmanis asked the Polish foreign minister to convey this apology to the Polish President and Government, along with his deepest regret and apology for the Latvian foreign minister's action. The envoy also confirmed the sympathy to the Polish nation for its struggle for freedom (HIA, Alfrēds Bilmanis papers 1919–1968, box 2, folder 2.8). By resolving this unpleasant issue, Latvia managed to restore relations with Polish diplomats by establishing contacts with the Polish government-in-exile. Latvian envoy to the United Kingdom, Kārlis Zariņš, maintained regular contacts with the Polish government-in-exile in London.

Since the United States and Great Britain did not legally recognize the occupation of the Baltics by either the USSR or Germany during the war, the officials and peoples of the Baltic states had reasons to believe that the Atlantic Charter applied to them as well. However, neither during nor after the Second World War did any of the Great Powers of the West make an open declaration that the principles of the Atlantic Charter also applied to the Baltic states. The extension of the principles of the Charter to the Baltic states in Western diplomatic circles was not denied, but was not expressed officially in order not to aggravate relations with the USSR.

Latvian envoys tried to secretly send instructions to compatriots in their homeland not to give up in any way and to wait for the victory of Western democracies (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, box 430, file “Politiskie pārskati 1943. g.” [Political Surveys 1943]; Feldmanis, Freimanis, Lerhis, and Ziemele 1999, 141). However, due to the disrupted communications during the war and the propaganda of both Germany and the USSR, it was very difficult to reach the compatriots. Kārlis Zariņš and Alfrēds Bilmanis believed that the restoration of Latvia's full independence would be possible only on the basis of the former legal and democratic Constitution (*Satversme*), with a democratic system, a democratically elected parliament and a responsible government, and not by restoring an authoritarian regime of 1934–1940 period (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, box 430, file “1944. K. Zariņa vēstules un pārskati” [1944. Letters and Surveys of Kārlis Zariņš]).

In his note of June 11, 1943, envoy Kārlis Zariņš drew the attention of the British Government to the illegal mobilization carried out by the German occupation authorities in Latvia and protested against this violation of international law (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, box 460, file “Sarakste ar Foreign Office līdz 1945. g.” [Correspondence with Foreign Office until 1945]). In January and early April 1944, Kārlis Zariņš sent letters to the ambassadors of several countries in London on the situation in Latvia (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, box 456, file “1944. Correspondence with Ambassadors etc. in London re. position of Latvia”). On February 2, 1944, Kārlis Zariņš in London, and on February 14, Alfrēds Bilmanis in Washington, submitted a request to the envoys of the Western countries, calling on the governments of these countries to delegate observers in case the Soviet troops re-occupied the Baltics (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, file “1944. Sarakste ar kolēģiem” [Correspondence with Colleagues]). After the Soviet troops re-entered Latvia in July 1944, Alfrēds Bilmanis submitted a note to the US Department of State on August 5 on the second occupation of Latvia by the USSR (*FRUS 1944* 1966, 898–899). In order to inform the public and official circles of the Western countries, the importance of the informational work of Latvian legations increased considerably. Envoy Alfrēds Bilmanis was particularly active in countering Soviet and Nazi propaganda in the West and, during the war, he published several brochures on the situation in Latvia – the legal status of the country and policy of the German and USSR regimes in Latvia (Bilmanis 1943 (1); Bilmanis 1944; Bilmanis 1943 (2); Bilmanis 1945). The envoys understood the struggle of Latvians during the war against the two foreign totalitarian regimes, and that this struggle could be considered as controversial among the Great Powers of the United Nations coalition. The envoys also understood that Latvians had become hostages and victims of the military confrontation between the two foreign powers, but assessed positively the contribution of the Latvian resistance movement against both foreign powers.

At the end of the war, there were serious fears that the US government might accept USSR diplomatic pressure to close missions of three Baltic states, and diplomats from the Baltic missions became aware of this danger (Dinbergs 1954, 21). In such circumstances, Alfrēds Bilmanis published a collection of documents, titled *Latvian – Russian Relations* (1944), in which he compiled important documents on the policy of Russia (USSR) towards Latvia since the Treaty of Nystad in 1721.



Even before the end of the war, Latvian envoys called on the US and British governments not to hand over Latvian refugees to the USSR civilian or military (repatriation) institutions and not to consider them allies of the enemy (Germany) (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, box 456, file “1945. D. 124.63/ Dr. A. Bilmanis, Latvian Legation, Washington”). In a note dated March 16, 1945, envoy Kārlis Zariņš informed British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden about the Latvians in the labor camps in Germany and about the Latvian citizens who would fall into the hands of the Allied Armies on the Western Front, asking Britain not to consider them as enemies and to reject the claims of the Soviet authorities over their jurisdiction (LNA LSHA, Latvian Legation London fonds, file “Sarakste ar kolēģiem. Izejošie. 1945. g.” [Correspondence with Colleagues. Outcoming Documents. 1945]). Western powers did not consider the Baltic exiles as Soviet citizens and did not extradite them to the Soviet Union against their will. On May 12, 1945, the Western Allies decided not to forcibly send refugees and displaced persons from the Baltic states to Soviet-controlled territories (entry “Latvijas Diplomātija” [Latvian Diplomacy] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 3, 1987, 393–394).

On November 30, 1946, the Argentinian government abolished the Baltic legations in Buenos Aires, and on December 5, the Latvian Chargé d'affaires, Pēteris Oliņš, moved to Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), where the legation worked until March 11, 1961. After that, the Baltic diplomats were enclosed on the diplomatic list (*Diario Oficial*) in personal status (i.e., outside the legation) with the right for Pēteris Oliņš to manage the affairs of Latvian nationals (entry “Sūtniecības Buenosairesā un Riodežaneiro” [Legations in Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 4, 1990, 516, 517; entry “Sūtniecības un konsulāti” in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 4, 1990, 503–504).

With the onset of the Cold War, accredited diplomats from the Baltic states were able to continue their functions in the West more normally. In 1950, the US Treasury Department allowed the diplomatic missions of the Baltic states to use interest on their deposits in US banks to maintain these missions (Vares and Osipova 1992, 253). As of April 1964, the Latvian legation in London no longer received financial support from the British government, provided since 1948, and only the Latvian legation in Washington financially ensured the operation of all Latvian diplomatic missions in the Western countries (Zunda 2007 (3), 27; Zunda 2007 (2), 97–99).

Due to the favorable position of the Spanish government, Kārlis Zariņš established the Latvian diplomatic mission there in 1952. Roberts Kāmpuss was appointed the Latvian diplomatic representative in Spain, and worked there until his death in 1969 (entry “Sūtniecība Madridē” [Legation in Madrid] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 4, 1990, 519).

A group of Latvian diplomats, whose legations and consulates were closed in 1940, also continued to operate in a personal (individual) capacity outside diplomatic missions (with limited rights to perform diplomatic functions). In several Western countries, Latvia’s diplomatic and consular representatives acted unofficially, privately, with some support and encouragement from local governments: in France – Oļģerts Grosvalds, and since 1962 Chargé d’affaires Kārlis Bērends, in West Germany – Delegate of the head of the foreign service Roberts Liepiņš and Consul in Hamburg Pēteris Apmanis, in Belgium – Vice-Consul Herberts Rācenis in Antwerp, in Canada – Honorary Consul, later Acting Honorary Consul-General Ray Neil Bryson, in the Netherlands – Consul-General Bruno Pavasars, in Norway – Honorary Consul-General Arturs Vanags, in Switzerland – representative of interests of Latvian refugees and displaced persons in International Refugees Organisation, and representative at international organizations and institutions based in Switzerland and Geneva Arnolds Skrēbers, etc. (entry “Sūtniecības un konsulāti” [Legations and Consulates] in *Latvju Enciklopēdija*, vol. 4, 1990, 504). The government of the Federal Republic of Germany continued to recognize passports issued by consular representatives of the Baltic states and accepted semi-official diplomatic representatives of these countries (Hough 1985, 426). Envoys who resigned from their posts in 1940 (and those who were forced to cease their activities) could not resume their activities either during or after the war.

After the Second World War, the governments of the countries of residence allowed the appointment of new heads of Latvian legations as Chargés d’affaires (Jūlijs Feldmanis, Arnolds Spekke and Anatols Dinbergs in the USA, Teodots Visvaldis Ozoliņš in the Great Britain).

Although Latvia was no longer represented at the level of heads of state and government due to occupation and annexation, Latvian diplomats were sometimes received by the heads of several countries and other high-ranking officials, representatives of international organizations. Representatives of the Latvian legation in Washington were invited to receptions by senior US officials. Anatols Dinbergs, Head of the Latvian Foreign Service and Chargé d’affaires of the



Olgerts Grosvalds (1884–1962), Latvian envoy in Poland (1930–1934), envoy in France (1934–1940). Photo (1930–1934), National Digital Archives, Warsaw, Poland, collection Koncern Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny – Archiwum Ilustracji, ref. no. 3/1/0/4/1017

legation in US, started working in the service during the prewar period – from 1937, he worked as an attaché at the Consulate in New York and without interruption in various positions in legation in Washington from 1941 to 1993. During his long career as a diplomat, he had met ten US presidents, from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to George Herbert Walker Bush.

Olgerts Grosvalds was received at an audience by the President of France, Vincent Auriol, on January 9, 1948 (“Dr. O. Grosvalds pie Francijas prezidenta” 1948, 1). On September 25, 1950, envoy Kārlis Zariņš was received by Pope Pius XII at his summer residence in Palace of Castel Gandolfo (“Pāvesta svētība” 1950, 2; “Pāvesta svētība latviešiem” 1950, 1). In the second half of September 1953, Kārlis Zariņš was received by the US Vice President Richard Nixon (“Sūtnis K. Zariņš audiencē...” 1953, 1). On October 6, 1979, during the visit of Pope John Paul II to Washington, the Head of the Foreign Service of the Republic of Latvia and Chargé d'affaires of Latvia to the United States, Anatols Dinbergs, also met with him (“Dr. A. Dinberga...” 1979, 20; “Latvieši pasaulē” 1979, 2). On December 10, 1980, Pope John Paul II received in the audience Latvian honorary vice-consul in Melbourne, Emīls Dēliņš (“Par Latviju un Lietuvu...” 1981, 1; Brumanis 1989, 7). After 1975, Emīls Dēliņš was often received at audiences by Australian prime ministers and foreign ministers.

For fifty years, Latvian diplomats abroad tirelessly reminded the world of Latvia's existence and defended its rights, ensured the country's legal existence, and preserved most of Latvia's gold abroad. Significant work was done on consular issues by issuing Latvian foreign passports, etc. The missions carried out important external information work – published Western declarations, statements and other documents pertaining to Latvia, provided information on the situation in Latvia obtained from various sources. The legation in Washington issued the “Latvian Information Bulletin” four times a year. As far as possible, the Latvian mission cooperated with joint Latvian and Baltic organizations in the West (Lerhis 1998, 13).

## Conclusions

The main results of the activities of the Foreign Service of the Republic of Latvia during the war were the protection of the *de iure* status of the Republic of Latvia, elaboration of the official position of the State on the events, protection of interests of the State and its citizens (consular activities), information work, issuing regular reminders to the Western societies of damage and injustice caused by foreign powers to the Latvian State and nation, and of their right to the restoration of independence. The fate of the diplomats was closely intertwined with the fate of the State.

Maintaining the *de iure* status of Latvia and the other Baltic states, as well as the continuation of the foreign services of the three countries for 50 years, the long-term activities of diplomats and the belief in the restoration of national independence in the future, is an unprecedented fact in world diplomacy. Throughout all those years, Latvian diplomats contributed significantly to the restoration of Latvia's national independence, which took place in 1991.

The Latvian foreign service is the only state institution of the Republic of Latvia that has been operating without interruption since the proclamation of the State in 1918. The continuous existence of this service is a real example of the continuation of the State of Latvia and the continuity of its international *de iure* recognition.

## References

- Latvian National Archives, Latvian State Historical Archive in Riga: 2570. fonds, 1. apraksts, 472. lieta; 293. fonds, 1. apraksts, 4388. lieta; 1307. fonds, 1. apraksts, 317. lieta; Latvian Legation London collection; 2570. fonds, 4. apraksts, 64. lieta; 2570. fonds, 4. apraksts, 57. lieta; 293. fonds, 1. apraksts, 4370. lieta; Latvian Legation London collection, files: “1940. D. 125.63/ Latvian Consulate-General, New York”; “Sarakste ar kolēģiem. Ienākušie. 1941. g.”; “1944. Correspondence with Ambassadors etc. in London re. position of Latvia”, box 456; file “1944. K. Zariņa vēstules un pārskati”, box 430; file “1944. Sarakste ar kolēģiem”; file “Miscellaneous (War time), mainly Washington”; file “Politiskie pārskati 1943. g.”, box 430; file “Sarakste ar Foreign Office līdz 1945. g.”, box 460; file “Sarakste ar Latvian Senior Consul N. McLeod”; file “1945. D. 124.63/ Dr. A. Bilmanis, Latvian Legation, Washington”, box 456; file “Sarakste ar kolēģiem. Izejošie. 1945. g.”.
- Hoover Institution Library and Archives, Vilis Šumanis papers 1925–1948, box 1, folder “Increment April 1978”; Alfreds Bilmanis papers 1919–1968, box 2, folder 2.8.
- The National Archives, Kew (United Kingdom): Foreign Office, 371/24761, N6041/1224/59; 371/24241, A3686/131/45; War Cabinet Memoranda WP and CP series (CAB 66), CAB 66/25/49, WP (42) 269, June 27, 1942. “Representatives of the Baltic States” – Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; War Cabinet and Cabinet: Minutes (WM and CM Series) (CAB 65), CAB 65/26/44, WM (42) 83, Conclusion. The Baltic States – Status of Representatives in this Country. 29 June 1942.
20. *gadsimta Latvijas vēsture. II: Neatkarīgā valsts. 1918–1940*. Ed. Valdis Bērziņš. Riga: Latvijas vēstures institūts, 2003.
- Andersons, Edgars. *Latvijas vēsture. 1920–1940. Ārpolitika*. Vol. 2. Stockholm: Daugava, 1984.
- Balodis, Agnis. *Latvijas un latviešu tautas vēsture*. Riga: Neatkarīgā Teātra “Kabata” Grāmatu apgāds, 1991.
- Baltic States: A Study of Their Origin and National Development; Their Seizure and Incorporation into the U.S.S.R. Third Interim Report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House of Representatives, Eighty-Third Congress, Second Session, 1954, Under the Authority of H. Res. 346 and H. Res. 438; International Military Law & Reprint Series*, Vol. 4. Ed Igor I. Kavass, Adolph Sprudz. Buffalo, New York: W.S. Hein, 1972.
- Bilmanis, Alfreds. *Latvia Between the Anvil and the Hammer*. Washington D.C.: Latvian Legation, 1945.
- Bilmanis, Alfreds. *Latvia under German Occupation 1941–1943*. Vol. I. Washington D.C.: Press bureau of the Latvian legation, 1943.
- Bilmanis, Alfreds. *Latvia under German Occupation 1941–1943*. Vol. II. Washington D.C.: Press bureau of the Latvian legation, 1944.
- Bilmanis, Alfreds. *The Baltic States in Postwar Europe*. Washington D.C.: Latvian legation, 1943.
- Bleiere, Daina, Butulis, Ilgvars, Feldmanis, Inesis, Zunda, Antonijs, and Aivars Stranga. *Latvijas vēsture. 20. gadsimts*. Riga: Jumava, 2005.
- Bleiere, Daina, Butulis, Ilgvars, Feldmanis, Inesis, Stranga, Aivars, and Antonijs Zunda. *Latvija Otrajā pasaules karā (1939–1945)*. Riga: Jumava, 2008.
- Brumanis, Ārvaldis. “Žurnālists, diplomāts un džentlmenš.” *Austrālijas Latvietis* 19/26 may 1989.
- Dinbergs, Anatols. “Latvijas sūtniecības darbs ASV (Pēdējie 10 gadi).” *Latviešu trimdas desmit gadi: rakstu krājums*. Ed. Heronims Tichovskis. Toronto: Astras apgāds, 1954.

- “Dr. A. Dinberga tikšanās ar pāvestu. Iecelts Latvijas goda konsuls Melburnā.” *Latvija Amerikā* 13 Oktober 1979.
- “Dr. O. Grosvalds pie Francijas prezidenta.” *Latvju Vārds* 11 February 1948.
- Feldmanis, Inesis, Stranga, Aivars, and Mārtiņš Virsis. *Latvijas ārpolitika un starptautiskais stāvoklis (30. gadu otrā puse)*. Riga: Latvijas Ārpolitikas institūts, 1993.
- Feldmanis, Inesis, Freimanis, Astra Aleksandra, Lerhis, Ainārs, and Ineta Ziemele. “Latvijas valsts okupācijas gados (1940–1991).” *Dokumenti par Latvijas valsts starptautisko atzišanu, neatkarības atjaunošanu un diplomātiskajiem sakariem. 1918–1998*. Ed. Alberts Sarkanis Riga: Nordik, 1999.
- Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers. 1940. General*. Vol. I. Ed. Matilda F. Axton, Shirley L. Phillips. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1959. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1940v01>.
- Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers. 1942. General, the British Commonwealth, the Far East*. Vol. I. Ed. G. Bernard Noble, E.R. Perkins. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1960. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1942v01>.
- Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers. 1944. Europe*. Vol. IV. Ed. E. Ralph Perkins, S. Everett Gleason, Rogers P. Churchill, John G. Reid, N. O. Sappington, Douglas W. Houston, John Rison Jones, Warren H. Reynolds. Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1966. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1944v04>.
- Gore, Ilga, and Aivars Stranga. *Latvija: neatkarības mījkrēslis. Okupācija. 1939. gada septembris – 1940. gada jūlijs*. Riga: Izdevniecība Izglītība, 1992.
- Hough, William J.H. III. “The Annexation of the Baltic States and its Effect on the Development of Law Prohibiting Forcible Seizure of Territory.” *New York Law School Journal of International and Comparative Law* Vol. 6, No. 2, Winter 1985: 301–533. [https://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/journal\\_of\\_international\\_and\\_comparative\\_law/vol6/iss2/5](https://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/journal_of_international_and_comparative_law/vol6/iss2/5).
- Jēkabsons, Ēriks. “Latvijas sūtniecība Varšavā. 1939. gada septembris.” *Neatkarīgā Cīņa* 16 January 1992.
- Križevica, Silvija. *Latvijas goda konsulārās pārstāvniecības ārvalstīs (1918–1991)*. Republic of Latvia Ministry of Foreign Affairs website, 24 January 2017, <https://www.mfa.gov.lv/ministrija/arlietu-dienesta-vesture/latvijas-goda-konsularas-parstavniecibas-arvalstis-1918-ndash-1991> (accessed 1 April 2021).
- Latvian – Russian Relations, Documents*. Ed. Alfreds Bilmanis. Washington, D.C.: Latvian Legation, 1944.
- “Latvieši pasaulē.” *Austrālijas Latvietis* 9 November 1979.
- Latvijas Enciklopēdija*. Riga: Valērija Belokoņa izdevniecība, 2002.
- Latvijas okupācija un aneksija: 1939–1940: Dokumenti un materiāli*. Ed. Ilga Grava-Kreituse, Inesis Feldmanis, Juris Goldmanis, and Aivars Stranga. Riga: Preses nams, 1995.
- Latvijas Republikas oficiālā nostāja. Latvijas diplomātiskā dienesta dokumentos 1940.–1991. gadā. Dokumentu krājums*. Ed. Ainārs Lerhis. Riga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2015.
- Latvju Enciklopēdija*. Ed. Edgars Andersons. Vol. 1. Rockville, MD: Amerikas Latviešu Apvienības Latviešu Institūts, 1983.
- Latvju Enciklopēdija*. Ed. Edgars Andersons. Vol. 3. Rockville, MD: Amerikas Latviešu Apvienības Latviešu Institūts, 1987.

- Latvju Enciklopēdija*. Ed. Edgars Andersons. Vol. 4. Rockville, MD: Amerikas Latviešu Apvienības Latviešu Institūts, 1990.
- Lerhis, Ainārs. "Ieskats Latvijas Republikas ārlietu dienesta vēsturē (1917–1997)." *Latvijas ārlietu dienesta rokasgrāmata*. Rīga: Latvijas Republikas Ārlietu ministrija, 1997: 10–29.
- Lerhis, Ainārs. "Neatkarības idejas saglabāšana pēckara gados: Latvijas diplomātiskā dienesta ieguldījums mūsu valsts de iure statusa saglabāšanā (1940.–1988. g.)." *Diena* 13 February 1998.
- Lerhis, Ainārs. "Pārmaiņas Latvijas diplomātiskā dienesta darbībā (1940. g. jūnijs – 1942. g. augusts)." *Vēsturnieks profesors Dr. phil., LZA ārzemju loceklis Andrievs Ezergailis: Biobibliogrāfija, darbabiēdru vēltījumi 70 gadu jubilejā*. Ed. Jānis Bērziņš. Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūts, 2000.
- Lūsis, Jānis. "Latvijas diplomātu darbs." *Daugavas Vanagu Mēnešraksts* No. 3 (1990): 9–14.
- McHugh, James T., and Pacy, James S. *Diplomats Without a Country: Baltic Diplomacy, International Law, and the Cold War*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- "Par Latviju un Lietuvu es lūdzu Dievu katru dienu." *Austrālijas Latvietis* 14 January 1981.
- "Pāvesta svētība latviešiem." *Londonas Avīze*, 4 October 1950.
- "Pāvesta svētība." *Londonas Avīze* 27 September 1950.
- Rietumvalstu nostāja Baltijas valstu jautājumā 1940.–1991. gadā: Dokumentu krājums*. Ed. Ainārs Lerhis. Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2018.
- "Sūtis K. Zariņš audiencē pie Savienoto Valstu viceprezidenta." *Londonas Avīze*, 25 September 1953.
- Vares, Peeter, and Oļga Osinova. *Pokhishchenie Evropy, ili Baltiyskiy vopros v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh XX veka*. Tallin: Izdatel'stvo Estonskoy Entsiklopediī / Eesti Entsüklopediakirjastus, 1992.
- Zunda, Antonijs. "Baltijas jautājums un Rietumvalstis: 40. gadu otrā puse – 50. gadu sākums." *Latvijas vēsture 20. gadsimta 40.–90. gados: Latvijas Vēsturnieku komisijas 2006. gada pētījumi*. Ed. Andris Caune, Rudīte Viksne. Rīga: Latvijas Vēstures institūta apgāds, 2007.
- Zunda, Antonijs. "Baltijas jautājums 20. gadsimta 50. gadu starptautiskajās attiecībās." *Latvijas Vēsture. Jaunie un jaunākie laiki* No. 3(67) (2007).
- Zunda, Antonijs. "Baltijas jautājums 20. gadsimta 60. gadu starptautiskajās attiecībās." *Latvija un Austrumeiropa 20. gadsimta 60.–80. gados: Starptautiskās konferences referāti, 2006. gada 10. oktobris, Rīga*. Ed. Andris Caune, Daina Bleiere, and Valters Nollendorfs. Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2007.