

# LATVIA AS A PARTNER IN THE POLITICAL SECURITY SYSTEM OF WESTERN DEMOCRACIES IN THE EARLY 1920S: LATVIA'S RELATIONS WITH GREAT BRITAIN, THE UNITED STATES AND GERMANY

† *Uldis Krēsliņš*

Institute of Latvian History, University of Latvia

For the new states that emerged as a result of the First World War, ensuring the internal political security in the early 1920s was a fundamentally important issue. In the case of Latvia, potential security threats were exacerbated by the country's geopolitical position – a direct border with Soviet Russia – which made Latvia a protective barrier against the spread of the Communist movement. The aim of the study is to characterize Latvia's role in the political security system of Western democracies in the early 1920s based on the materials of the Latvian security service, focusing on Latvia's relations in the field of political security with three Western democracies – United Kingdom, the United States and Germany.

*Key words:* political security, Latvia's Political Guarding, British Left, Scotland Yard, US Intelligence Division in Riga.

## INTRODUCTION

One of the necessary conditions for the development of new states that separated from the Russian Empire as a result of the First World War was the need to ensure their internal political security from political forces that threatened the existing state structure. Hence, it was important for the new countries – including the Republic of Latvia, proclaimed on November 18, 1918 – to organize the country's internal political security service as soon as possible and fit into the overall political security system of Western democracies.

The aim of this study is to characterize the role of Latvia as a partner in the political security system of Western democracies in the early 1920s, based on the materials of the political security service of Latvia. This view is special and distinguished from the more widespread outlook, because, instead of approaching the problem of national security in terms of foreign policy relations, this problem is addressed in terms of identifying and preventing specific – existing and potential – security threats. The everyday concreteness and variety of different threats make this view of the security problem highly fragmented, but at the same time it accurately reveals the differences in the approach of various countries to threats to political security and the issue of their prevention. The emphasis, in this case, is on Latvia's relations in the field of political security with three Western democracies – United Kingdom, the United States and Germany. This choice is due to the significant, albeit different, roles of the above three countries in political security issues both in Latvia and in the Baltic region as a whole. The two main tasks, solved in this study, are to find out in what issues, from the point of view of Latvia, the interests of Latvia and those of the three above-mentioned countries overlapped in the field of political security, and what were the main differences in relations between Latvia and each of these countries in the field of political security. By solving these tasks, the study attempts to confirm the hypothesis that in relations with Latvia in the early 1920s, United Kingdom became a power that, earlier than others, tried to form a common system of political security, while Western democracies as a whole at that time did not have a unified definition, based on collective values, of what constituted a political threat.

The main source used in the study is the documents of the internal political security service of Latvia – the Political Guarding (*Politiskā apsardzība*) under the Ministry of Internal Affairs –, which are collected in the Latvian State Historical Archives (LVVA). The scientific significance of these documents is reduced by the fact that, according to the existing rules, the political security service was engaged only in inquest, while the further promotion of cases was carried out by investigators. As a consequence, the documents of the security service do not contain information regarding the final result of the initiated inquiry.

The list of scientific literature on issues of national and transnational security in the interwar period is extensive, but from the perspective of this study, it has two limitations. Most studies dedicated to the security issue of the Baltic region in the early 1920s consider it in terms of foreign

policy efforts, and the activities of the security services are mentioned only as an illustration or fragmentary actions. These sources include the works of Edgars Andersons, John Hiden and Olavi Hovi. In turn, those studies that are devoted to the response of special services to political threats usually discuss the menaces emanating from Soviet Russia, and later – from the Soviet Union. The list of such works includes the studies on the history of the Latvia's security services, as well as the studies exploring the fight against threats to internal political security in other Western countries. Because of both of the aforementioned limitations, the current article resorts to the previous studies predominantly to characterize general trends and as a means to verify the facts and data of persons contained in the documents of Political Guarding.

The main scientific method used in the study is content analysis, which allows generalizing and comparing information from various sources. The chronological framework of the study covers the period from November 1919 to 1923, when, with the entry into force of the Constitution of Latvia and the elections to the First *Saeima* (Parliament of the Republic of Latvia), Latvia completed the construction of the foundations of its statehood.

## UNITED KINGDOM

United Kingdom played a special role in the rise of the Latvian state: Britain was the first country to recognize Latvia *de facto* in 1918, while in November 1919, during the attack of the West Russian Volunteer Army, the intervention of the British (together with the French) Navy influenced the outcome of hostilities in favour of the Latvian Army. Against this background, relations between Latvia and UK in the sphere of political security developed.

Britain had a clear pragmatic explanation for cooperation with Latvia: the territory of Latvia was used as a transit point for the British left. This fact became known to the wider public in Latvia in June 1920. Unfortunately, this discovery was associated with a tragic episode. On 3 June 1920, the Social Democrat Faction of the Constitutional Assembly of Latvia submitted an interpellation to the Government for the shooting of five civilians deported to Soviet Russia – three women and two men – at the border crossing on 27 May. Three of these persons were born in Latvia,

but had lived in London for almost thirty years and were now on their way to Soviet Russia via Latvia. This incident became a reason to make public the information that, in addition to the official legitimate expulsion procedure, there was also an unofficial one: by order of the Commander-in-Chief of the Army, the Army's Internal Intelligence Units were given the right to expel to Soviet Russia persons who were considered dangerous and undesirable (Biedra... 1920).

For the first time, information about the possible movement of the British left through Latvia was received by the Political Guarding from the diplomatic mission of Britain in Riga in March 1921, and its sender, judging by the handwritten text in Russian, was a Russian who worked in the mission. In April 1921, Political Guarding received another notification, this time written in English, from the mission of Britain about the possible stay of several leftist persons in Riga (Britain... 1921). The list includes former employees of the Soviet regime of 1919 in Latvia and members of the left-wing movement in other countries, including Agnes Enbuske, born in Norway of Finnish parents (Elmgren 2015, 302), a Bolsheviks' courier travelling between Finland and Norway. But perhaps the most interesting persons mentioned in report were two sisters: Baroness Anna von Grothus, a former hospital nurse who, according to some reports, was "on excellent terms with high officers" of Red Army in 1919, and Princess Amilakhvari,<sup>1</sup> who in May 1919 arrived to Stockholm on a Soviet Russia's visa, and probably on a special mission. The inquest issued by Political Guarding did not find any data about the stay of these persons in Latvia.

An active flow of information about the traffic of representatives of left-wing organizations through Latvia began in the summer of 1921. At that time, almost simultaneously, two international congresses were planned in Moscow: on 22 June 1921, the Third Congress of the Third International (Comintern) was opened, and on 3 July, the founding congress of Red International of Labour Unions took place. Simultaneously, the source of incoming information had changed: reports to Political Guarding were now sent by the British Scotland Yard through the Latvian Consul General in London Eduards Bīriņš (1883–1971).

---

<sup>1</sup> Princess Amilakhvari was the daughter of Baron Karl Christopher Otto von Grotthus of Kurland, Swedish subject Cecilia Helen Regina Emmanuel von Grotthus (1872–1934), who was married to a Swede in her first marriage and in 1905 married Alexander (1880–1968), a descendant of an old Georgian noble family Amilakhvari (Dumin, Chikovani 1998).

The first Scotland Yard information reached the Political Guarding in early June, 1921. In a personal and confidential letter on 7 May, Sir Basil Thomson (1861–1939), the Head of the Directorate of Intelligence for the United Kingdom, expressing his compliments to the Latvian Consul General, informed that one Henry Bernard Offel of the International Socialist Club, “a dangerous extremist”, might travel to Latvia in the near future (Thomson 1921). This letter was accompanied by brief descriptions of four other prominent left-wing campaigners in the UK, including Robert Page Arnot (1890–1986), one of the staff members of the British Bureau of the Red Trade Union International, Mary Bamber (1874–1938), a member of the British Socialist Party, and Tom Mann (1856–1941), President of the Provisional International Council of Trade and Industrial Unions (British Bureau). According to British information, all these people might soon go to Moscow.

In 1922, new aspects appeared in the information transmitted by the British. In April, 1922, the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent a letter to the Minister of the Interior regarding the import of Bolsheviks’ illegal literature to Great Britain and Latvia’s counterfeit money into England (Ministry... 1922). As noted in the letter, in March the Latvian Consul General in London Biriņš had a conversation with the Assistant to the Chief of the British Secret Police. According to the Briton, Latvia was a centre for the distribution of Soviet propaganda literature for foreign countries, from where Latvian sailors took it abroad. Two versions of the origin of literature were expressed: according to one, it was brought to Latvia from Soviet Russia by Russian couriers, while another reported that it was printed in Latvia, because Russia did not have a paper of such quality. The Briton also remarked that there was a large amount of counterfeit Latvian money in London, which, in his opinion, was printed in England and intended for Soviet propaganda in Latvia.

On 2 January 1923, the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent a letter to the Minister of the Interior with a copy of the report of the Latvian Consulate General in London dated 12 December 1922, on the case of the arrested political criminal Jānis Jurģis (1882–1940). According to the Consul General, on 11 December 1922, he was visited by Captain Guy Liddell (1892–1958), Assistant to the Chief of the Political Secret Police of England. He expressed the wish to visit Latvia at the expense of the British Government for interrogating the arrested political criminal Jurģis (Biriņš 1922). According to him, the aforementioned Jurģis was the main employee

of the Bolshevik secret organization in England and the Soviet Russia's representation in London was very concerned about his arrest in Riga. Liddell would arrive in Latvia on 4 January 1923, and asked that Jurgis would not be released from detention and sent out to Russia until then.

Summing up all of the above, we can argue that in the early 1920s United Kingdom was the country with which Latvia established mutual cooperation and partnership in the sphere of political security.

## UNITED STATES

Latvia's relations with the United States in the early 1920s were more complicated. There could be several reasons for this. This can be partly explained by the return of the United States to a policy of isolationism. On the other hand, from the perspective of political security, a serious obstacle was the specific view of the US Government regarding the freedom of expression of leftist ideas in society, which, despite the deportation of left-wing radicals from the US (the so-called Soviet Ark) in December 1919, was still very liberal in the early 1920s. This liberal position of the United States resulted in the strong legal Latvian left movement in the US, as evidenced by a long list of the Latvian-language leftist periodicals in the US. In addition, it should be remembered that Latvians played a prominent role in the American leftist movement. This can be illustrated by referring to one of the founders of the Communist Party of America on 1 September 1919, Charles Johnson (Charles E. Scott) (1882–1939), a founder and leader of the Socialist Party of America Morris Hillquit (1869–1933), and prominent employee of the US left press Nicholas Dozenberg (1882–1954). In this situation, Latvia's political security service was forced to closely monitor all suspicious contacts and parcels between the United States and Latvia, and to supervise the locomotion of USA citizens through Latvia.

The United States was first mentioned in the documents of Latvian security service in December 1919, when an incomer was detained in Riga. The following inquest revealed that the detainee was a courier of Soviet Russia on his way to the United States; diamonds were found concealed in the heels of his boots, while documents and letters were hidden in the double walls of his travel bag. Information about these events also appeared in the US press, when "The New York Times" published a report by Walter Duranty (1884–1957) from Riga in December of 1919. True, the judgments

differed regarding the significance of the documents found on the courier. In report, prepared by Chief of Political Guarding Voldemārs Alps (1891–1964) in 1922, the emphasis was placed on a letter to “American comrades” signed by representatives of the Comintern Executive Committee; the letter contained instructions for founding of the Communist Party and the propaganda of its slogans (Alps 1922). Soviet Latvia’s historians accentuated Lenin’s letter to an American journalist also found on the person of the courier (whose real name was Andrei Fyodorov), admitting that it could have been Lenin’s article “Answers to American Journalist’s Questions”, published in newspaper “Pravda” on 25 July 25 1919 (Mende 1967). Meanwhile, in the US the documents found in possession of the courier were not considered particularly important, and Alps in his memoirs, published in 1956, criticised the work of the Subcommittee on the Investigation of Communist Activities of the 84<sup>th</sup> US Congress, the materials of which did not mention the instruction found in Riga on 1919 (Alps 1956).

In 1920, Political Guarding received a copy of report from the US intelligence service, which the US Intelligence Division in Riga had sent to the Chief of Staff of the Latvian Army on 25 August 1920. The report notified of the US workers’ plan to incite European workers against the United States (US Intelligence... 1920). The report contained an excerpt from the 6 May 1920 issue of the American weekly newspaper “Industrial Worker”: US Industrial Workers’ Union through William D. “Big Bill” Haywood (1869–1928) had planned to implement a comprehensive propaganda plan in Europe by sending several thousand letters to workers in European countries – England, France, Germany and Italy – using carefully prepared lists of workers. These letters contained several calls: to prevent workers from leaving for the United States, to strike all merchant ships unloading US goods at European ports, and to refrain from buying US-made goods.

At the end of the 1920, several private mail items from the United States attracted the attention of the Latvia’s Political Guarding. One of such was a letter from Tuozos Trilikauskas, a communist living in the United States, to his son, prisoner of war Joseph in Moscow; in the absence of direct postal service between the United States and Soviet Russia, Trilikauskas had sent the letter to his wife in Liepāja for transfer (Trilikauskas 1920). In a letter dated 15 October 1920, Trilikauskas expressed his regrets that his son had served in the Latvian Army and had even been forced to fight against Soviet Russia. Describing his left-wing activities in the United

States, the father mentioned the arrest and the three months he had spent in a US “democratic prison”, when an application for his deportation to Russia had already been submitted, but he was eventually released. At the end of the letter, the father urged his son to look for an opportunity to avoid returning to Latvia and to remain in Soviet Russia.

Another object of interest to Political Guarding was the left-wing press published in Latvian language in the United States. One of such periodicals was the American Latvian Workers’ newspaper “Rīts” (“Morning”) published in Boston. On 27 November 1920, on behalf of the editorial office of the newspaper “Rīts”, Rūdolfs Zālītis, a lawyer and Chairman of the Boston Latvian Workers Society, in response to a letter, sent the four latest issues of the newspaper to Latvia addressed to Kārlis Marga, a student at the University of Latvia. In the cover letter of the consignment, Zālītis informed that he had received a notification that the newspaper could not be admitted to Latvia due to its disposition. This news led him to speak critically about Latvia’s freedoms: “... it shows that your government in terms of the press and individual freedom lags behind us, that is, behind the American capitalist republic” (Zālītis 1920).

In 1921, information about the activities of A. Savins (elsewhere Saviņš), living in the United States, became the cause of the greatest concern of the Latvia’s Political Guarding. The aforementioned Savins, whose personality and origin remain unclear, had founded the company “Latvia” Lettish Bureau in New York (150 Nassau Str.) and advertised his services in Latvia, which consisted of searching for the relatives living in the US. However, another and not publicly highlighted aspect of Savins’ activities attracted the attention of Latvian security service. On 3 March 1921, Political Guarding received a report on financial benefits, for which it was necessary to fill out printed questionnaires in Russian (Police... 1921). The questionnaires, among others, contained questions about whether any of the respondent’s relatives were in Soviet Russia and what position he/she held, and whether any of the relatives had not lost their lives in Latvia, fighting in the ranks of the Red Army against the Latvian Army. All those who could present a proof for affirmative answers to these questions were immediately paid 300 Latvian roubles.<sup>2</sup> According to some sources, the commissioners’ rel-

---

<sup>2</sup> In June 1921, the exchange rate of the Latvian currency was about 1 900 Latvian roubles for British pound, but at the end of 1921 – about 1 100 Latvian roubles for British pound.



atives were paid a larger amount – a thousand Latvian roubles a month. Savins stood behind this campaign of financial payment, as the following inquest revealed. In total, according to the collected information, in 1920 Savins had transferred 156 thousand Latvian roubles for the purpose. It was not a surprise that this activity of Savins aroused suspicion, and the Ministry of the Interior of Latvia published a remark in newspapers, in which Savins was designated as an agent of the Bolsheviks campaigning against Latvia (Valdības darbs. Iekšlietu... 1920).

## GERMANY

In the context of Latvia's historical experience, the efforts of Weimar Germany's *Ostpolitik* in the early 1920s were seen as a potential threat to Latvia. Possible threats from Germany were exacerbated by the strong revanchist sentiments in German society. That is why the Latvian security service closely followed not only the political and economic, but also the ideological efforts of Germany. To illustrate the point, in February 1920 the head of the Criminal Police appealed to the Riga Post Office with a request to detain and submit for verification all letters and manuscripts addressed to the German newspaper "Memeler Dampfbot". In response, the head of the Post Office stated that, in accordance with the current legislation, the check of postal items should be carried out at the premises of the post office, so he could only inform about the receipt of such items. However, the main focus, of course, was on Germany's political endeavours.

The launch of the German security company "Wach- und Schließ-Gesellschaft" ("Guard and Lock Society") in Latvia was regarded as a certain threat from the very beginning of its activities on 15 August 1920. This company, which already operated in German cities and took over the protection of shops, warehouses, cargo and valuables, opened in Riga in 1920. According to the Prefect of Riga, in terms of technical responsibilities, the company performed excellently and the stern hand of the German lead was noticeable everywhere. However, concern of both the Latvian press and Latvian security authorities was caused by the German composition of the company, which gave reason to assume that this company could turn into a secret organization that could at some point surround Latvian state institutions and arrest their employees (Deputy... 1920). These concerns persisted later. As noted in the 1922 report, the capital of the company

was located in Germany, where the money from local branches was also transferred; since the Riga branch had more than three thousand clients, it issued an amount of 31 million Latvian roubles per year (German... 1922). However, the main focus of the author of the report was on the possible role of the company at a “crucial time”. In a letter to the Minister of Internal Affairs written in March 1922, the Headquarters of the Latvian Army also pointed out these possible threats: noting that company in Latvia had 237 employees, of which 50 were foreign nationals, the letter stated that the participation of foreigners in an armed organization was undesirable (Army... 1922). In the explanatory memorandum, the Prefect of Riga informed that the mentioned 50 foreigners (only one of whom was a German citizen) mostly were elderly persons and permanent residents of Riga, about whom there was no compromising information (Prefect... 1922).

In 1921, Political Guarding received several copies of reports on the Russian-German monarchist movement abroad from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Latvia, which were prepared, as far as could be ascertained, by British intelligence.<sup>3</sup> One of these reports concerned the organization in Reval, led by Hermann Kromel (1892–1944) (Kromel... 1921). As stated in the report, in early January 1921, a meeting was held in Kromel's apartment, which, in addition to Kromel himself, was attended by a certain K. Müller, Louis Krotler, a French agent, assistant to the French military attaché in Reval, and an employee of the diplomatic mission of Soviet Russia V. I. Rykatkin.<sup>4</sup>

Against the background of these complex relations, those cases especially stood out, where the interests of the security services of Germany and Latvia coincided, and in such a situation the security service of Latvia did not refuse its assistance. One such case received wider international coverage. On the way to the Third Congress of the Comintern, which opened on 22 June 1921 in Moscow, already at the beginning of June the representatives of the communist and left-wing parties of Western European

---

<sup>3</sup> The view that the reports were drawn up by the British intelligence service was supported by the fact that the copies of the reports were translations and that London was mentioned as the first addressee, and furthermore, that the author of the reports was some ST.28 from Helsinki.

<sup>4</sup> As mentioned in the report, Rykatkin was invited to the meeting to brief on its content Isidor Gukovsky (1871–1921), Soviet Russia's trade representative in Estonia; Rykatkin also acted as a mediator in Soviet Russia's financial support to the Kromel organization (Mejre 2002, 269).

countries began visiting Riga. Among them was Clara Zetkin (1857–1933), a leader of the German communists and a member of the Reichstag, who arrived in Riga on 7 June. Immediately after her arrival at the Riga railway station, she was detained and taken to Political Guarding; after several hours of conversation in the office of the Chief of Political Guarding, she was released on the same day with an apology. Latvian leftist press did not hide the indignation at these events. At that moment, Zetkin's detention looked at least as the evidence of unprofessionalism on behalf of the Latvia's security authorities. This incident is regarded from another perspective in the memoirs of the former Chief of Political Guarding Alps, where he reveals the situation behind the scenes concerning this event (Alps 1956). According to him, the legation of Germany had shown interest in the contents of Zetkin's luggage, and Alps had received an unofficial direction from the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs to help in this case. That is why this temporary detention of Zetkin had taken place, which had enabled satisfying the interest of the Germany's legation.

In January of 1923, the attention of Political Guarding was focused on events that gave reason to talk about the military cooperation between Soviet Russia and Germany. The specific reason for such attention was the fact that on 12 January 1923, a German "Junkers" type passenger plane, which was the property of the joint-stock company "Junkers", had made a forced landing near the Krāslava railway station (Nokritis... 1923). The plane, which had left Königsberg at 8:50 and whose destination was Moscow, was forced to land at Krāslava due to snowfall and fog, damaging the wheel chassis and propeller during the landing. Airplane pilot Kurt Bauerdein and fitter Alfred Kestner indicated the purpose of the flight as the Ukrainian exhibition in Moscow, during which they had to maintain air traffic between Moscow and Kiev. According to the aircraft fitter Kestner, the "Junkers" management had ordered him to stay in Moscow for one or two months and then return to Germany by train or another plane, which would travel from Moscow to Königsberg for repair. At the same time, according to the pilot of the plane, he had already previously flown from Königsberg to Moscow and returned to Germany by train, because the plane in Moscow had broken down and remained there. The coincidence that German-piloted aircrafts remained in Moscow but pilots returned to Germany by rail was noted by the new Chief of Political Guarding Pēteris Martinsons (1886–?). It prompted him to express an assumption in a report to the Minister of the Interior on 19 January 1923 that these could be

a means whereby Germany supplied Soviet Russia with planes that could be used in case of war (Martinsons 1923).

On the same day, Martinsons sent another report to the Minister of the Interior, informing him of the general indications about the military cooperation between Soviet Russia and Germany. One of the most important aspects noted in the report was the fact that at the time there were more than 600 German officers in Soviet Russia, about 50 of whom were generals, while the possibility of joint military action by Soviet Russia and Germany was being actively discussed in the local German community in Latvia. This joint military action, as mentioned in the report, was being prepared so that, if necessary, the Russian Army could launch a military campaign through Lithuania and Poland to Germany.

## CONCLUSIONS

Having won the country's independence in the struggle against the troops of the Red Army and the efforts of the German-Russian monarchists, Latvia from the very beginning of its existence was clearly aware of the importance of internal political security and the need to cooperate with other countries in the field of political security. However, for various reasons, Latvia's relations in the field of political security with other Western democracies evolved in different ways.

Of the three Western democracies examined in this study, United Kingdom was the only country with which Latvia established mutual cooperation and partnership in the early 1920s. It would be an exaggeration to think that this cooperation was based on the special sympathy of the British for the Latvian state. Britain's position was based on pragmatic political interests: rivalry for influence in the Baltic region and attempts to limit the spread of the Communist movement, which presented a threat to Britain.<sup>5</sup> This pragmatic position of UK was also confirmed by the waiver of any foreign policy guarantees in the event of a possible military threat to Latvia. At the same time, the British position on political security made it

---

<sup>5</sup> Andersons, a historian of Latvian origin from the United States, is quite severe in his judgments about Britain's position in relations with Latvia in the early 1920s, believing that valuation of British support and assistance to the Baltic states in these countries was exaggerated, since British support was actually selfish in its nature (Andersons 1982, 309).

clear that they saw political security as a common problem of different countries that transcended national borders, and that a common security system was needed to safeguard against common security threats. The clearest evidence of this British view was the fact that the reports prepared by British secret service agents operating in Europe, which affected Latvia's security interests, were addressed to Latvia at the same time as London. True, it is difficult to judge from Latvia's experience how comprehensive the British view of the common security system was. Against the background of Latvian-British relations, Latvia's relations with the United States in the field of political security in the early 1920s were reserved. In that relationship, it was not possible to speak of cooperation between the special services, but only of their contacts, and in addition those contacts were mediated, i.e., through diplomatic or military channels. The main limitation for the cooperation was that the interests of the US special services were limited to security threats directed at the US. Interestingly, there was some contradiction in this US position, suggested by the fact that in the early 1920s the US conducted an extensive humanitarian aid mission (mediated by the American Relief Administration) in Eastern Europe, including Latvia. It is difficult for the author of this study to propose the reason for such a derogation in approach by the US: was it caused by different goals or different decision makers? However, the most restrained relationship in the field of political security Latvia had with Germany. There was no cooperation of both countries and no contacts between the Latvian and German special services. Even more – the Latvian security authorities saw German activities as a threat to Latvia's internal security, and these threats were exacerbated by Germany's unofficial contacts and military cooperation with Soviet Russia.

Returning to the hypothesis of this study that in the early 1920s United Kingdom became a power that, earlier than others, tried to form a political security system, we can argue that the documents of the Political Guarding generally confirm this.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The article was carried out within the framework of the research project “Interaction between the individual, the society and the state in process of the history of Latvia: Conflicting values and formation of shared values during historical turning points” (VPP-IZM-2018/1-0018).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY / BIBLIOGRĀFIJA

## Primary sources / Avoti

- Alps' overview of the work of the Riga Branch, 1922. *LVVA*, 3235-1/2-895, p. 189.
- Army Headquarters letter to the Minister of the Interior, 28.03.1922. *LVVA*, 3235-1/2-896, p. 114.
- Biriņš report, 12.12.1922. *LVVA*, 3235-1/2-894, p. 2.
- Britain diplomatic mission report, 04.1921. *LVVA*, 3235-1/6-69, pp. 303-304.
- Deputy of the Chief of Army Internal Intelligence report on the political situation, 09.1920. *LVVA*, 3235-1/2-895, p. 121.
- German Policy in Latvia, 1922. *LVVA*, 3235-1/2-896, p. 266.
- Kromel's organization, 17.01.1921. *LVVA*, 3235-1/6-78, p. 18.
- Martinsons' report to the Minister of the Interior, 19.01.1923. *LVVA*, 3235-1/2-894, p. 26.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs letter to the Minister of the Interior, 26.04.1922. *LVVA*, 3235-1/2-896, pp. 134-135.
- Police officer report, 02.1921. *LVVA*, 3235-1/6-69, p. 404.
- Prefect explanatory memorandum to the Minister of the Interior, 08.04.1922. *LVVA*, 3235-1/2-896, p. 115.
- Thomson's letter to Biriņš, 07.05.1921. *LVVA*, 3235-1/6-69, p. 217.
- Trilikauskas' letter to his son, 15.10.1920. *LVVA*, 3235-1/8-26, pp. 79-84.
- US Intelligence Division in Riga report to the Chief of Staff of the Latvian Army, 25.08.1920. *LVVA*, 3235-1/13-93, p. 242.
- Zālītis' letter to Marga, 27.11.1920. *LVVA*, 3235-1/6-68, pp. 134-135, 142.

## Secondary sources / Literatūra

- Alps, Voldemārs (1956). Briljanti papēdī, instrukcijas Amerikas komunistiem somas dubultsiēnā [Diamonds in the heel, instructions for the American Communists in bag's double wall]. *Laiks*, 04.08., p. 6.
- Andersons, Edgars (1982). *Latvijas vēsture 1920-1940: Ārpolitika, I* [History of Latvia 1920-1940: Foreign Policy, I]. Stockholm: Daugava.
- Biedra Holcmaņa runa Satversmes Sapulcē ķilnieku nogalināšanas lietā [Speech by Comrade Holcmanis at the Constitutional Assembly on the Case of Shooting Hostages] (1920). *Strādnieku Avīze*, 06.06., p. 2.
- Bušs, Dzintars (2012). Eduards Biriņš – viens no pirmajiem Latvijas diplomātiem [Eduards Biriņš – one of the first Latvian diplomats]. *Latvijas Vēstures Institūta Žurnāls*, 3, pp. 124-150.
- Dumin, Stanislav, Chikovani, Yuri (1998). *Dvoryanskie rody Rossijskoj Imperii. Tom 4: Knyaz'ya Carstva Gruzinskogo* [Noble families of the Russian Empire. Vol. 4: Princes of the Kingdom of Georgia]. Moscow: Likominvest, pp. 112-113.

- Elmgren, Ainur (2015). The Socialist Soviet Republic of Scandinavia. *Ajalooline Ajakiri*, 3, pp. 287–326.
- Hidden, John (1988). From War to Peace: Britain, Germany and the Baltic states 1918–1921. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, Vol. 19, 4, pp. 371–382.
- Hovi, Olavi (1980). *The Baltic Area in British Policy, 1918–1921*. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society.
- Valdības darbs. Iekšlietu ministrijas aizrādījums [Remark by the Ministry of the Interior] (1920). *Latvijas Sargs*, 22.12., p. 2.
- Mejmre, Aurika (2002). Za veru, carya i Otechestvo: Epizod iz deyatel'nosti russkih monarhistov v Estonii [For Faith, Tsar and Fatherland: An Episode from the Activities of Russian Monarchists in Estonia]. In: Oleg Korostelev (ed.). *Diaspora: Novye materialy*. Vyp. 3. Saint Petersburg: Phoenix, pp. 267–292.
- Mende, Jānis (1967). Vai nezināms V. I. Ļeņina dokuments? [Is it a V. I. Lenin's unknown document?]. *Cīņa*, 26.04., p. 2.
- Nokritis Vācijas aeroplāns [A German airplane has fallen] (1923). *Jaunākās Ziņas*, 13.01., p. 5.
- Zālite, Elga (2014). Exploring the Library of Latvian socialists in San Francisco, California: Activities of the Early Latvian Political Emigration, 1905–1917. *Latvijas Vēstures Institūta Žurnāls*, 2, pp. 9–62.

## LATVIJA KĀ PARTNERE RIETUMU DEMOKRĀTIJU POLITISKĀS DROŠĪBAS SISTĒMĀ 20. GADSIMTA 20. GADU SĀKUMĀ: LATVIJAS ATTIECĪBAS AR APVIENOTO KARALISTI, ASV UN VĀCIJU

† Uldis Krēsliņš

Jaunajām valstīm, kas bija parādījušās kā Pirmā pasaules kara rezultāts, iekšējā politiskā drošība bija valsts pastāvēšanas primārs priekšnoteikums. Latvijas gadījumā potenciālos drošības draudus pastiprināja valsts ģeopolitiskais stāvoklis – tiešā robeža ar Padomju Krieviju –, kas Latviju padarīja par Rietumu demokrātiju priekšposteni pret komunisma izplatību. Pētījuma mērķis ir raksturot Latvijas lomu Rietumu demokrātiju politiskās drošības sistēmā 20. gadsimta 20. gadu sākumā, balstoties uz Latvijas politiskās drošības dienesta materiāliem un fokusējot uzmanību uz trim Rietumu demokrātijām – Apvienoto Karalisti, ASV un Vāciju.

*Atslēgas vārdi:* politiskā drošība, Latvijas politiskā apsardzība, britu kreisie, Skotlendjards, ASV izlūkošanas nodaļa Rīgā.

## Kopsavilkums

Izcīnījušai valsts neatkarību Brīvības kara cīņās pret Sarkanās armijas un vācu-krievu monarhistu centieniem, Latvijā jau no valsts pastāvēšanas pirmajām dienām pašsaprotama bija iekšējās politiskās drošības nozīme un nepieciešamība sadarboties ar citām valstīm politiskās drošības jomā. Tomēr dažādu iemeslu dēļ Latvijas attiecības ar citām Rietumu demokrātijām politiskās drošības jomā veidojās un attīstījās atšķirīgi. Par to liecināja arī Latvijas attiecības ar Apvienoto Karalisti, ASV un Vāciju, kas ir analizētas šajā pētījumā.

Visciešākā sadarbība politiskās drošības jomā Latvijai izveidojās ar Apvienoto Karalisti. Būtu pārspilējums skaidrot to ar kādām īpašām Apvienotās Karalistes simpātijām pret Latviju: tā motīvi bija britu pragmatiskas politiskas intereses nostiprināt savu ietekmi Baltijas reģionā un ierobežot komunistisko kustību. Tomēr tieši Apvienotā Karaliste savās attiecībās ar Latviju apliecināja, ka tā skatās uz politiskās drošības apdraudējumiem kā uz pārnacionālu problēmu, kas šo draudu ierobežošanai prasa kopēju drošības sistēmu. Britu piesūtītā informācija – sākotnēji ar savas diplomātiskās misijas Latvijā starpniecību, vēlāk no Lielbritānijas Skotlendjarda – laika gaitā paplašinājās, un ziņojumus par britu kreisi noskaņoto personu pārvietošanos papildināja informācija par viltotās Latvijas naudas izplatīšanu un latviešu komunistu darbību Apvienotajā Karalistē. Taču spilgtākā liecība šai Apvienotās Karalistes nostājai bija fakts, ka britu aģentu sagatavotos ziņojumos, kas skāra Latvijas drošības intereses, briti piesūtīja arī Latvijas drošības iestādēm. Tieši Latvijas un Apvienotā Karalistes drošības dienestu attiecībās mēs varam runāt par sadarbību un abpusēju partnerību. Uz Latvijas un Apvienotās Karalistes attiecību fona Latvijas attiecības ar ASV politiskās drošības jomā 20. gadsimta 20. gadu sākumā bija vairāk distancētas. Šajās attiecībās bija atzīmējamas atsevišķas specdienestu kontaktu epizodes, taču šie kontakti bija pastarpināti, t. i., izmantojot diplomātiskos vai kara resoru kanālus. Būtiskākais sadarbības ierobežojums bija tas, ka ASV specdienestu interese aprobežojās tikai ar apdraudējumiem ASV drošībai. Šajā ziņā, vismaz no Latvijas skatupunkta, ir pamats apgalvot, ka ASV nostāja politiskās drošības jautājumos bija turpinājums ASV izolacionisma kursam ārpolitikā. Interesanti, ka šī ASV nostāja drošības jautājumos bija zināmā pretrunā ar ASV izvērsto humanitāro palīdzību Austrumeiropas valstīm. No minētajām trim Rietumu demokrātijām visrezervētākās attiecības politiskās drošības jomā Latvijai bija ar Vāciju. Šajās attiecībās mēs nevaram runāt ne par sadarbību, ne par jebkādiem kontaktiem starp abu valstu drošības dienestiem. Taču Latvijas nostājas raksturojumam zīmīgs bija fakts, ka, atbildot uz Vācijas ārlietu resora lūgumu palīdzēt, Latvijas Politiskā apsardzība neatteicās palīdzēt.

Apkopojot minēto, var izcelt divus secinājumus. Pirmkārt, vairākas norādes liecināja, ka Latvija pagājušā gadsimta 20. gadu sākumā centās būt uzticams



sabiedrotais Eiropas un ASV politiskās drošības sistēmā un bija gatava sadarbībai ar Rietumu demokrātijām. Otrkārt, Latvijas Politiskās apsardzības dokumenti ļauj apgalvot, ka Apvienotā Karaliste agrāk nekā citas Rietumu demokrātijas jau 20. gadu sākumā attiecībās ar Latviju izrādīja centienus radīt kopēju politiskās drošības sistēmu.

Saņemts / Submitted 09.01.2022.

© 2022 Uldis Krēsliņš. Latvijas Universitāte

Raksts publicēts brīvpieejā saskaņā ar Creative Commons Attiecinājuma-Nekomerciāls 4.0 Starptautisko licenci (CC BY-NC 4.0).

This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).