

The debate on the Latvian SS Volunteer Legion

By Bjarke W. Bøtcher, post graduate student of East European Studies at the University of Copenhagen

In March 1998, Latvia was on the front page of a number of international newspapers. The headlines said that fascism was redeveloping in Latvia. The reason was that a group of veterans from the Latvian Legion held a march in central Riga to commemorate their fallen comrades. The march had taken place on the 16th of March every year since Latvia's independence, but especially this year the foreign, and not least Russian, reactions were harsh.

The veterans of the Latvian SS Volunteer Legion claim they fought in German ranks to hold back a greater evil, the Soviet Union. They consider themselves as freedom fighters. Russia, Jewish organisations and even some Latvians believe that

the veteran link with the Nazi SS-organisation is a national disgrace. They consider the veterans as Nazi sympathisers. Other Latvians claim that the veterans are to be considered as victims, who were hoodwinked or forced to spill their blood for the Third Reich.

This article will examine the fundamental features of the debate on the Latvian Legion, as it turned out in the spring of 1998 and, partly, the following two years. The examination is not thorough, but includes a selected number of the most characteristic Russian, Latvian, Israeli/Jewish and Danish newspaper articles and official statements. First, a brief introduction is necessary.

The debate before 1998

Since the end of the World War II (WWII) it has been a topic of much discussion, whether the Latvian SS Volunteer Legion in fact consisted of Latvian volunteers fighting for Hitler, and whether the Legion was an integrated part of the German SS-formation. It is important to determine, whether the legionaries were Nazis sympathising with the ideas of Hitler, national heroes fighting for an independent Latvia or simply victims forced to fight for the occupational power.

The questions were obviously relevant to the Latvian Legionaries with the status

of Prisoners of War (POW) in the allied camps in Germany after the war. A “de-nazification” would allow them to get out of the POW-camps to the more comfortable Displaced Persons-camps (DP) and give them the right to immigrate to the Allied countries.

The American-Latvian historian Andrew Ezergailis has in a selected collection of documents proved, that “in the campaign to clear the Latvian soldiers of the Nazi tag the refugee spokesmen, under the leadership of the Latvian Red Cross prevailed: At all critical junctures they were able to disassociate the Latvian Legion from the labels of SS and of having enlisted themselves as «voluntary»”¹.

The Latvian side in particular had to argue for the fact, that the major killings of Jews in Latvia had already taken place at the time of the formation of the Legion in the winter of 1943 and that the soldiers of the Legion in reality mainly were draftees, not volunteers, who in some cases had to choose between forced labour in the German camps or to “volunteer” for service in the Legion.

The last major killing of Jews in Latvia was carried out in March 1942, almost a year prior to the founding of the Legion². Thus, the Legion as such could not have taken part in the killings. The Latvian argumentation was complicated by the transfer of a number of the Latvian Sonder Dienst (SD) forces, who were war criminals for their contribution to the killings of Jews, in late 1944 to the Legion. For the vast majority of drafted soldiers of the Legion this transfer was a disaster as it smeared their involuntary participation in the activities of the Legion.

After some dispute the former legionaries received refugee status and in September 1950, they were – according to a common Latvian point of view – finally de-nazified by the US Displaced Persons Commissioner Harry N. Rosenfield, who stated that;

“..the Baltic Waffen SS Units (Baltic Legions) are to be considered as separate and distinct in purpose, ideology, activities and qualifications for membership from the German SS, and therefore the Commission holds them not to

be a movement hostile to the Government of the United States...³”

This Latvian victory did not, however, mean that the debate on the claimed association of the Latvian Legionaries with the SS ceased.

A major problem for the former legionaries has been that the Germans as well as the Soviets could benefit from tying the Latvians to the war crimes that in fact did take place in Latvia during the German occupation. Whereas the Germans could minimise their own role in the atrocities, the Soviets could claim that they liberated Latvia from fascist criminals, as they introduced a pro-soviet government and at the same time smear Latvian émigrés living abroad, who were critical towards the Soviet regime in Latvia.

Since then, there has been an ongoing debate between the Soviets and veterans from the Legion, residing outside Latvia.

From time to time the Soviets published materials like the pamphlets “Daugavas Vanagi – Who are they?” which accused the Latvian people in general and

Latvian émigrés in particular for war crimes. Sometimes Western Nazi hunters used these materials in their search for war criminals. Today we know that the KGB was behind these materials, and that only some 10% of the contents can be considered correct⁴.

The veterans, on the other hand, refused all the Soviet accusations – even the true part of them, and denied or simply did not mention the Latvian participation in the holocaust.

In this way the debate continued, in some periods more actively than in others, until it bloomed again in 1998.

***What happened in Riga
on March 16th 1998?***

Estimations from a number of sources concur, that approximately 500 demonstrators, of this the majority war veterans dressed in uniforms from the Latvian Legion, participated in a commemoration in the Cathedral of Riga and afterwards marched to the Monument of Freedom, where flowers were laid. The ceremony

went off in an orderly manner, and a large force of police controlled it. A handful of Russian speaking counter demonstrators shouted at the gathering, calling them murderers and Nazis. A large number of local and foreign media covered the incident, including two Russian TV-stations.

However, this is as far as the concurrence goes. There is no agreement about whether the Latvian Government sanctioned the incident, if it only was a symbol of commemoration of the fallen soldiers or rather an insult to those, who fought fascism.

Russian criticism

The by far harshest criticism came from the Russian side. On the day of the event, the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a statement, that “reports that on the 15 and 16 March veterans of the Latvian Voluntary Legion celebrated in Riga – with approval of the official authorities – the 55th anniversary of the establishment of this formation, whose history had been marked by blood and sufferings of thou-

sands of people, have provoked indignation in Moscow”. The statement continues, that “the Latvian divisions, which had sworn an oath to Hitler, had participated in punitive actions, and in 1944 the Latvian police battalions, the notorious “Arâjs-team” and other units were incorporated in it and murdered tens of thousands of Jews, Russians and Belorussians.”

Further, the statement accuses the Latvian authorities of granting the “fascists” a number of benefits, not given to those who fought fascism, and that it is hypocritically to excuse the conduct by stating, that Latvia did not participate in the war as a state. Finally, the statement criticises that the Commander of the Armed Forces participated in the march, and that this proves “that despite official statements the Latvian ruling circles actually play into the hands of, and join the forces that whip up nationalism and russophobia in the society”⁵.

In a letter to the OSCE member-states of March 20 1998 the Russian Duma writes, that “it is indicative that the march of members of the Latvian SS legion took

place on the background of continuing violations of the rights of the Russian-speaking population of Latvia..." Finally, the OSCE member states are urged to condemn the policy of the Latvian authorities⁶.

In the Russian press, the tone is further sharpened. In connection with a demonstration in front of the Latvian embassy in Moscow, Moscow-mayor Lushkov said, that "I do not know of any other countries where human rights are breached so openly" whereupon he compared Latvia to the Pol Pot-regime in Cambodia and demanded sanctions against Latvia⁷.

In an article in the St. Petersburg Gazette march 18th 1998 1st deputy chairman of the Duma Vladimir Ryshkov states, that "Latvia has once more demonstrated, that for its government and pro-government circles former SS-members are far more important than the human rights⁸", after which he demanded sanctions against Latvia.

The following article from Voice of Russia's internet site shows that the Russian side was aware, that the criticism was

not without consequences for Latvia: "the march had its consequences: Latvia failed to be included in the first group of countries wishing to join the European Union, which could be considered as reflecting its unsatisfactory human rights record"⁹.

Generally, the same topics are criticised as well by the official Russia as the Russian press. The criminal character of the Latvian Legion, that Latvia affirms it never took part in the war as a state; that the legionaries get social benefits, while those, who fought fascism cannot get a decent pension; that there is a tendency toward connecting the march with the status of the Russian speaking minority in Latvia, and finally, that Russia is aware, that the criticism has its political consequences for Latvia. The Russian newspapers and individual politicians go further, accusing Latvia of being fascistic and demand political end economical sanctions.

Danish reactions

The Danish newspapers were quite more referring, than the Russian, although

they also to a certain degree came to a decision as to the moral and political aspects of the case.

The newspaper Information wrote in a leading article, that the marking of the "55-anniversary of the foundation of the Legion...by itself is a provocation in a country, where 65.000 Jews were killed during the three years of Nazi-German occupation. Although a provocation, it could have been accepted in the name of freedom of expression and assembly, had the march not received the semi-official approval of the Latvian authorities. It is true, that...Latvian men were forced to join the Legion by the Nazi-German occupying power...But it is also true, that...Latvian members of the SS-unit actively and enthusiastically took part in the extermination of Jews. After this, the article tells about the international responses to the march that made the Latvian President dismiss the Commander of the Armed Forces, and continues linking the march of the veterans to the Russian speaking minority in Russia¹⁰.

The newspaper Jyllandsposten did not only carry foreign criticism of Latvia, but gave an impression of the Latvian reaction too. "The Latvians once again feel let down by the West after the Russian cannonade of accusations of human rights violations... What happened to the moral support from the EU and USA after the cannonade of more or less strange allegations and threats from Moscow? Should we once again be the victims of a great political game? It looks suspiciously like a new Molotov-Ribbentrop-pact", says Atis Lejins, director of the Latvian Institute of International Affairs. He continues that "nobody protests, when Russia threatens to introduce economical sanctions¹¹".

As regards accounts of events and statements in the Danish press, there seems to be a tendency to let Russian statements take precedence over Latvian statements. Despite the article in Jyllandsposten about the Latvian reaction, official Russian statements and reactions are referred much more often than Latvian is. This could be explained – although not justified – by the fact, that most Danish newspapers have

a correspondent based in Russia, while Latvia in the best case is covered from Russia or Sweden. In addition, the international news agencies cover Russia more diligent than Latvia. Besides, as a regional great power, Russia has possibilities for distribution of information, which Latvia cannot match.

However, as regards the attitude of the Danish presses towards the march on March 16th, a pro-Russian attitude cannot be found.

The newspaper Information compares the Russian and the Latvian sides, and thinks, that the march should have been tolerated for the sake of the freedom of expression, but deviate from this perception as the newspaper fasten on the "semi official approval of the Latvian authorities". Finally, one can see a tendency toward connecting the acceptability of the march of the legionaries with the Latvian political debate on the status of the Russian speaking minority.

The article in the newspaper Jyllandsposten set out the Latvian astonishment that the Western countries does

not support Latvia against the Russian criticism, and thereby hits the very important point; that in the Western world it is politically totally unacceptable to defend anything, that anyhow can be linked to the Third Reich and the Holocaust.

Israeli/Jewish reactions

The Jewish debate about the march on March 16th 1998 started already in connection with a visit by the then Latvian president Guntis Ulmanis to Israel in February the same year. During the visit Ulmanis recognised, that Latvia is aware that some of its citizens persecuted Latvian Jews during World War II¹²

The Israeli newspaper Ha aretz welcomed the statements of the president, but foresaw that they could be tested already at the yearly march in March¹³.

On the 20th of March the Latvian daily Diena writes, that the embassy of Israel to Latvia condemns the arrangement of the legionaries, but considers the Latvian Government's desist from participation in the march as a positive reaction.

According to Diena, the criticism from the Jewish Simon Wiesenthal Centre's Riga-department became so intense just in 1998, because Latvia was then trying to enter the Western organisations EU and NATO, and that for an applicant country nazi manifestations were incompatible with membership aspirations. The article also establishes, that the Jewish criticism of the march was not linked to the alleged human rights violations, claimed by Russia. Furthermore, it made no difference whether high ranking Latvian officials participates in the march while on duty or as private citizens. Thus, the Government' refrain from participation can only be considered as a gesture for the international community, but not as a real condemnation of the bloom of fascism in Latvia¹⁴.

The Simon Wiesenthal centre in Jerusalem condemned in a press release the march of the legionaries in 1999 with the words: "although these units were not involved in crimes against humanity, many of their soldiers had previously served in the Latvian security police and had ac-

tively participated in the mass murder of civilians, primarily Jews...The stubborn insistence of Latvia's SS Legion veterans to conduct a public march to glorify their role as combatants on behalf of the Third Reich is a clear indication that many Latvians have still not internalised the lessons of WWII". Thereupon is mentioned, that the situation would be different, if the Latvian Government had charged war-criminals residing in Latvia, but in a country, in which "not one of the numerous Latvian killers who collaborated with the Nazis has been brought to justice since Latvia obtained its independence, far too many Latvians feel free to identify with those who fought alongside the perpetrators of the Holocaust rather than with its victims"¹⁵.

The Israeli/Jewish criticism is generally not as harsh as the Russian, and is issued differently. The Israeli/Jewish criticism distinguishes between the Latvian Legion and units, which are convicted for crimes against humanity, by not mentioning the Legion as a criminal organisation. Although the legionaries are not considered

criminals, the Jewish side does not think, there is any need to commemorate the Legion that was forced to fight for the Nazis, as anything positive. They also attach importance to the fact, that members of the special force (SD), who had previously committed crimes, were transferred to the Legion in the last years of the war. Another subject touched by especially the Wiesenthal Centre is the will of the Latvian Government to institute legal proceedings against war criminals in Latvia.

***The Latvian debate:
a response to the criticism***

The debate in Latvia started – like the Jewish debate – before the march itself on March 16th. The approaching march of the legionaries was thus the subject of a letter to the Latvian newspaper Diena, written by Uldin Neiburgs, the leader of the department for WWII in the Latvian Museum of War. In the letter it is established, that it is not correct to connect the march with the anniversary for the

founding of the Legion. On the 16th of March 1944, the two divisions that constituted the Legion for the first and only time during the war fought together in a four-day battle near the river Velikaya. In the letter it is also stated, that the Nuremberg judgement in its final phase distinguished between soldiers, who voluntarily joined the ranks of the SS organisation, and soldiers, who were forced in service. The letter emphasises that the Republic of Latvia never supported or sanctioned the founding of the Legion, and that the Republic of Latvia in every possible way lost the war, in which it did not participate. It is also mentioned, that Latvia as the only country in Europe had nearly 50% of its population replaced during the war. Sympathy is expressed for the Israeli wish that war criminals should be held responsible for their crimes. Finally, the letter states that the official opinion of the Latvian Government is, that as well the German as the Soviet mobilisation of Latvian forces was unlawful according to the Hague Convention and, that the US Government in 1950 recognised,

that the Legion is to be considered as separate and distinct from the German SS¹⁶.

Also well before the planned march, the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs on March 12th puts out a statement, in which Latvia unambiguously condemns the Nazi ideology and crimes against humanity during WWII executed by totalitarian regimes. About the planned march in Riga the statement says, "the Government of Latvia will not participate in the commemoration activities¹⁷". The following day Diena published a part of this statement¹⁸.

The Latvian reactions to the Russian criticism came already on March 17th in an official protest issued by the foreign ministry. Herein Latvia expresses indignation concerning the inactivity of the Russian authorities in connection with threats and demonstrations directed against the diplomatic representations of Latvia in Russia – not least the burning of the Latvian flag at the building of the Latvian Consulate in Pskov and acts of hooliganism at the building of the Latvian Embassy in Moscow on March 17th¹⁹.

On April 1st the spokesman of the Latvian foreign ministry declares with an ill-concealed reference to the Simon Wiesenthal Centre, that certain organisations have "politicised, distorted and inadequately interpreted the official statement of the Latvian Government of March 13th"²⁰.

On May 27th, a majority in the Latvian parliament votes for a dismissal of National Armed Forces Commander Juris Dalbins, for participation in the march, dressed in uniform, in defiance of a governmental instruction not to participate formally in uniform, and preferably not participate at all.

In the Latvian press appeared furthermore a number of articles like the one, already given an example of, from the Danish newspaper Jyllandsposten.

The debate in Latvia has to a high degree taken on a character of defence against foreign, primarily Russian, accusations. The differences, despite of everything that can be heard in the academic debate in Latvia, has not found expression. But, in return the general public in

Latvia for the first time became acquainted with a disputed period of the history of their country.

Whereas foreign observers and journalists have stated, that March 16th is the day of the founding of the Legion or the day, Hitler ordered it established all Latvian writers agree that the day marks the only time, the two Divisions of the Legion were fighting together. The Latvian side in the debate also agrees that the Latvian Legion as such was not convicted at the Nuremberg-tribunal but that it was the acts and crimes of the SS organisation, including the founding of the Latvian Legion that was sentenced. It is often emphasised that Latvia never has supported any fascist regimes, and that Latvia did not take part in the war as an independent state. The Israeli calls for proceedings against war criminals are supported, but the majority of observers seem to believe, that there is a bigger need for proceedings against criminals from the period of communist occupation.

Importance is attached to the fact, that the Legionaries – according to a common Latvian point of view – was finally

de-nazified already in 1950 by the decision taken by the US Government, but also that the Latvian Government already before the march banned official participation. It is considered unjust, that certain organisations seem to be able to change those two important facts in the eyes of the public. Further, the harsh Russian criticism is protested against.

Analysis of the debate

While the debate, as mentioned above, started already before the march in both the Latvian and the Jewish press, it is beyond any doubt, that it was the harsh Russian criticism that caused the subject to become a popular subject for the international press in the spring of 1998.

As we have seen, there are a number of questions that differentiates the parties. Among the most important questions are:

- Whether the Latvian Legion should be considered a criminal organisation, and its position at the Nuremberg tribunal?
- Whether or not the Latvian Government sanctioned the march?

- What the does the date of the march commemorate?

- Why the reactions on the march became so extensive especially in 1998?

- Granting of pensions to respectively legionaries, veterans from the Red Army and victims of the Holocaust.

Besides, it is relevant to raise a number of additional questions, like why Russia wants to link the march to the status of the Russian speaking minority in Latvia, and the question of possible sanctions against Latvia.

Several Russian statements and articles mention, that the Latvian Legion was criminal and at the Nuremberg tribunal was branded as a felonious organisation. It is remarkable, that not even one of the Russian contributions mentions that the main part of the Legion soldiers were draftees, who were forced to serve. This missing acknowledgement of the use of forced labour reminds of the traditional Soviet perception of the Legion. A Danish newspaper is at first close to the Russian perception, by writing that Latvian SS-members took active part in the kill-

ing of Jews, but admits then, that joining the Legion was not always carried out on a voluntarily basis. The Jewish perception is differently detailed, as it states that the Legion did not commit crimes, but that there among its soldiers were people, who under other units committed crimes against Jews and others. From that one could deduce, that the Jewish perception distinguishes between criminal and political guilt: Whereas the Legion is cleaned for the first, it does not mean that it is politically legitimate to mark it in public. The Latvian side argues that so far it has not been proved that the Legion as such committed crimes. The relatively few soldiers with crimes on their conscience should not be allowed to smear the memory of the majority of the drafted legionaries.

Several of the Russian statements criticise the Latvian Government for having sanctioned the march and for the fact that some high-ranking officials and members of the Parliament participated. A Danish newspaper thinks that the Latvian authorities semiofficially approved the march. The Jewish criticism is more diverse, as the

Israeli Government praises the Latvian Governments refrain from participation, whereas the Riga-department of the Wiesenthal Centre believes, that the government's decision not to participate only is a blind for not condemning fascism. The Latvians answer the criticism by stating that the government already before the march informed the public, that it refrained from participation, and continues, that in a democracy peaceful demonstrations hardly can be forbidden. Concerning the uniformed participation of the Commander of the National Armed Forces, the government admits that it was incorrect, and therefore he was subsequently dismissed.

It is characteristic for especially Russian and Western contributions that they at first thought, that the date of the march marked either the anniversary of the founding of the legion or even the day, when Hitler ordered it established. The Latvian reaction was that the day marks the first and only time the Legion fought united against the approaching Soviet Army. By choosing this day as the legion-

aries' commemorative day, they most probably tried to draw attention to the fact that the Legion according to the veterans fought against the Soviets for Latvian independence. That the purpose of the date could be doubted could tell us either about a Russian attempt to politicise the incident or about the short historical memory of the media.

An interesting question is why the reactions on the march were so harsh and persistent especially in 1998. What separates this year from the former, where similar marches took place? It is worth a note, that the subject is not touched from the Russian side. The Wiesenthal Centre in Riga offers however a suggestion: The Latvian aspirations for membership of Western security organisations had become important in 1998. There are, however, a number of factors, that could have played a role; a) in 1997 Latvia almost succeeded in becoming a member of the group of countries that could start membership negotiations with the EU. b) The Latvian president visited Israel a few weeks before the march. c) On March 3rd the

Latvian police broke up an unannounced and therefore illegal demonstration of mainly, but not exclusively, Russian speaking pensioners, who demanded pensions raised. The TV-pictures of the Russian speaking pensioners shouting at the Latvian policemen caused several Russian protests. Thus, already before the march, a conflict was approaching. Once again, it is necessary to notice, that the Russian criticism often concerns other subjects than the march itself, whereas the Jewish criticism primarily concerns subjects connected with the march itself.

From the official Russian side it is questioned, whether it is fair, that veterans from the Legion receive a special pension, which veterans who fought fascism are not entitled to. The Simon Wiesenthal Centre raises the same question, although not in favour of Red Army veterans, but Latvian surviving victims of the Holocaust and their next of kin. It is worth stating, that this question does not concern Latvian pensions, but German pensions, which, according to German law, is payable to veterans and widows of those

who were in German WWII service. Such persons living in Latvia could only after Latvia regained its independence use this possibility, and today a number of Latvian veterans and their widows receive pensions from Germany. From the Latvian side it has been stated, that Latvia as a free country could hardly influence, which pensions its citizens, receive from abroad. Jewish organisations have tried to stop this arrangement or at least enlarge it to include the victims of the Holocaust.

Only the Russian side has demanded the introduction of sanctions against Latvia. The Jewish side does not mention the subject, whereas several Western sources refer to the Russian demands. It is worth a note, that Western observers do not encourage Russia to react in a more adequate manner, whereas the Latvian side is calling for moral support from the West.

Conclusion

There is no doubt that the harshest criticism of Latvia in connection with the march came from Russia. A certain part

of the criticism was however, as explained above, unjust. It especially concerns the Russian claims that the Latvian Government had sanctioned the march, but also the statements, that the Legion was a felonious organisation. The examination of the debate has shown that as well Russian as Western contributions have made very basic errors by e.g. not being acquainted with, what the day of the march really commemorates.

The examination of the Russian contributions to the debate has shown that unfortunately there is every reason to believe that the old Soviet perception of history still has not been changed in favour of a new and more modern perception.

Most fair and competent seems the Jewish/Israeli reactions to be, as it is evident, that this side has a detailed knowledge of the case, and does not mix it up with subjects not related to it.

Despite relatively many repeats of the Russian argumentation, the Western criticism has not been useless. Although much seems to show that the Legion did not commit crimes, exemption from crimi-

nal guilt is not synonymous with exemption from political guilt.

The newest research points in the direction that the Legion did not commit crimes, and that it thus is not correct to mention the Legion, without explaining that it neither was voluntary nor an ordinary part of the German SS.

Important subjects like reconciliation and forgiveness lie in wait under the surface of the debate, although it is not expressed explicitly. The Latvian president made an attempt to start a process of reconciliation by his statements. There are no indications of anything similar with Russia, perhaps because the Russian atrocities committed both before and after the German occupation of Latvia are still remembered only too well. The question of guilt is, however, not the subject of this article.

The criticism after the march on March 16th made the Latvian authorities realise the difference between criminal guilt and political- or moral guilt, and that it is limited, what an government can afford not to dissociate itself from – even in the name of the newly regained freedom of

expression. The question of political or moral guilt is important, not least because it opens for a discussion of reconciliation and forgiveness.

The debate on the Latvian Legion has been cyclic. In 1950, the Latvian Red Cross succeeded in convincing the US Government, that the Latvian Legion essentially must be considered as separate and distinct in purpose, ideology and activities from the German SS. In 1998, it once again became necessary for Latvia to inform a sceptical world about these differences.

The debate on the Legion has not just repeated itself it has also been unequal. It was the Russian point of view that went around the world the first time. Russia has, only by virtue of its size, better possibilities than Latvia for influencing the world opinion. To attack is easier than to defend. Not least when the case concerns a subject as politically and morally sensitive as collaboration with the Third Reich, and when the explanations on this necessarily are complicated.

A fundamental feature of the debate is that the Latvians have had to carry a re-

versed onus of proof. After WWII as well as in 1998 exterior circumstances meant, that it was the Latvian people, which had to convince its innocence to a mistrustful world. After WWII Latvia had lost its statehood and Latvia was accused of war crimes by the Allies and the Soviet Union. In 1998, Latvia had regained its independence but was still weak, and vulnerable to harsh, primarily Russian attacks.

Since the end of WWII, it has been a topic of much discussion, whether the soldiers of the Latvian Legion were in fact heroes, Nazis or victims. To this date, there is still no general agreement about the question.

Notes

¹ Ezergailis, Andrew: The Latvian Legion. Heroes, Nazis or Victims? A collection of documents from OSS War-Crimes investigation files, 1945-1950. The Historical Institute of Latvia, Riga 1997.

² Ezergailis, A.: The Holocaust of Latvia 1941-1944. The Missing Centre. The Historical Institute of Latvia, Riga, published in association with the U.S. Holocaust Memorial

Museum, Washington DC, 1996. pp. 222-225, 239-270.

³ US Displaced Persons Commissioner Harry N. Rosenfield's letter of September 12th 1950 to Chargé d'Affaires of Latvia in Washington, J. Feldmanis. Reprinted in Ezergailis, A.: The Latvian Legion.

⁴ Ezergailis, A.: The Holocaust of Latvia. P. 324f, p. 15, p. 5f.

⁵ О реакции России на события в связи с 55-ой годовщиной создания Латышского добровольческого легиона СС. Заявление МИД России от 16.03.98. (And: Statement of the MFA of Russia, 19. March 1998).

⁶ Appeal by the State Duma to the heads of State or Government and the Parliaments of the Member States of the OSCE in connection with a march organised by SS veterans in Riga, 20.03.1998.

⁷ Lushkov attacks Latvia (By Jansson, Eric), The Baltic Times 2-8.04.1998

⁸ Бывшие члены СС для Латвии важнее, чем права человека? Санкт-Петербургские Ведомости но. 50, 18. марта 1998.

⁹ It's high time to use authority, Voice of Russia 1999: www.space.ru/english/voice/Exclusive/excl_next148_eng.html

¹⁰ Nyeng, Ole: "Lettisk strækmarch", dagbladet Information, April 7th, 1998, p. 12.

¹¹ Heine, Thomas: "Sat i skammekrogen" Jyllandsposten, April 12th, 1998. 1. section, p. 11.

¹² Krichevsky, Lev: Latvian head repeats apology for country's WWII role. Jewish telegraphic agency, 27.02.1998.

¹³ Ha aretz 25.02.1998 as referred in Tihonovs, Juris: Baltieðu leiions atðiiras no citâm Waffen SS vienîbâm, Diena 06.03.1998.

¹⁴ Lase, Inta: "Ulmanis aicinâs politiski izvçrtçt leiiona atceri. Diena 01.04.1998.

¹⁵ Newsbreak - Press information, Simon Wiesenthal Centre (Israel Office), 16.03.1999.

¹⁶ Neiburgs, Uldis: SS, Waffen SS, Latvieðu Leiions un Latvijas valsts politika. Diena 06.03.1998

¹⁷ Official notice by the Minister of Foreign of the Republic of Latvia, Dr. V. Birkavs, March 12th, 1998.

¹⁸ Tihonovs, Juris: Valdîba nepiedalîsies leiionârû pasâkumâ, Diena 13.03.1998

¹⁹ Statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia, 17.03.1998

²⁰ Lase, Inta: Ulmanis aicinâs politiski izvçrtçt leiiona atceri. Diena 01.04.1998.