

SECRET

8 December 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Present Status of Freds Z. LAUNAGS' Repatriation to Latvia

REFERENCE: Memorandum for the Record, dated 3 December 1964, Subject: Freds Z. LAUNAGS' Possible Repatriation to Latvia

1. The referenced memorandum was forwarded to Chief, SR, who assigned [] to look into the matter and the undersigned briefed [] on the background of the case in the afternoon of 4 December 1964. [] stated that subject's repatriation would be damaging to the Agency and therefore it would be preferable if he could be dissuaded from returning to his native country or if his repatriation could be delayed for a few years in order to dim his memory.

2. Various possible ways of achieving the desired results were discussed and the following plan adopted:

a. [] would attempt to reach subject by phone in order to determine if he has taken any concrete steps toward the implementation of his repatriation.

b. [] would be prepared to send subject up to \$100.00 in order to brighten the hopelessness of the situation somewhat. The exact amount of the dole would be left for [] to decide, depending on the urgency of the situation.

c. If need be, [] would invite subject to come to visit him at home in order to discuss the situation in greater detail.

SECRET

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3828
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2008

SECRET

d. [] would not indicate Agency interest and -- in the event that he would have to give subject any of the money -- he would not tell him that the money came from the Agency, but would imply that the money was his.

e. If at all possible [] would attempt to handle the entire matter through a cut-out. Subject and [] have at least one mutual friend in New York City and -- if [] would be unable to reach subject through his wife in Lancaster -- he would ask the mutual friend to contact subject and ask subject to telephone him. Should this attempt fail, [] would send a telegram to subject; and if he would not be successful in establishing contact that way, [] could drive to New York and contact him in person.

f. Should subject come to the Washington area, [] would again attempt to dissuade him from returning to Latvia, and if he should fail, a decision would have to be made whether the Agency would re-enter the case directly.

3. [] obtain approval for this plan in general from [] of SR and [] of the CI Staff. The undersigned was given \$100.00 which was drawn from Finance by SR in [] name.

4. The above-outlined plan was discussed with [] in the evening of 4 December 1964 and he telephoned subject's wife in Lancaster. She told [] that she does not believe that subject is serious about returning to Latvia. She thinks that he is threatening such action only in order to gain willing and sympathetic listeners. In her opinion he is scared to return to his homeland and she is convinced nothing will come of his threats. She also told [] that -- since his return from Texas -- she had spoken with subject on the telephone; that he was sending her a letter; that he had visited their son at the mental hospital; and that the son's condition had improved and that he was permitted to spend the weekend 4-6 December 1964 at home with her, away from the hospital. In general, the tone of her voice when speaking with [] indicated that she would prefer not to hear from her husband or about him ever again. She did, however, understand [] concern as a Latvian and promised to telephone him should she hear anything further concerning the possibility of subject's return to Latvia.

SECRET

SECRET

5. On Saturday morning, 5 December 1964, -- after several unsuccessful attempts during the previous evening -- [] was able to reach Bruno SMITS on the telephone. SMITS, a close friend of [] resides in New York City, is an engineer with the Norelko organization, and is -- according to subject's own statements during his last visit at [] home -- the only remaining friend in New York City in whom subject feels he still can confide. SMITS views subject's threats to leave for Latvia as a real possibility. He thinks that subject feels that he has been driven against the wall and that he is not too far from the point of taking such drastic action as repatriating. Although he feels that he has not really been able to penetrate subject's personality, SMITS thinks that he is probably closer to him than anyone. SMITS also supplied the following information concerning subject:

a. He has received a number of parking tickets in New York, but has not paid any of them.

b. Not too long ago, when he found subject financially hard pressed, he offered him money, but subject refused to accept it.

c. Since losing his job with the RISBERGS organization, subject has obtained a job with the Fuel Engineering Co., 125 E. 27th Street, New York City, telephone MU 4-2676. Apparently this job consists of weighing coal dust and subject is not pleased with this employment.

6. SMITS was in agreement with [] concern about the damage that subject's repatriation, would have among the Latvian people. He was prepared to aid [] in trying to dissuade subject from leaving and promised to go to his residence immediately. He said that, if subject would not be at home, he would leave a note asking him to come to SMITS home for a visit. SMITS promised to keep [] advised about the progress of his attempts and about future developments. At [] suggestion, they agreed that, in an emergency, SMITS would try to persuade subject to come to see [] and would offer subject \$10 - \$20 for travel expenses. [] promised to reimburse SMITS for any such outlay.

7. In order to obtain any possible further, independent information about subject, [] telephoned Vilis HAZNERS in the New York metropolitan area. As chief of NCFE's Council for a Free Latvia, HAZNERS is in a central position to receive information concerning Latvians and is considered as a good source of information. He is also quite popular among the emigres and many Latvians turn to him for

SECRET

SECRET

advice. [] was unable, however, to reach HAZNERS over the weekend because he had gone out of town. He will try to reach him during the week.

8. Having failed to hear from SMITS by Monday evening, 7 December 1964, [] telephoned him at his home. SMITS related that he had gone to subject's residence on Sunday 6 December 1964, but had not found him at home. Inasmuch as he saw no place where he could leave or affix a note for subject, he wrote a postcard asking him to come and visit him. He mailed the postcard on that same day. He promised to notify [] as soon as he has something to report.

9. On Tuesday, 8 December 1964, [] telephoned another one of his friends in New York, Ivars BERZINS, the assistant treasurer of RISBERGS' construction organization. [] has known him for many years when he was a student in the Washington, D. C. area where he worked for the highway department. BERZINS is married, was born in ca 1937, is a lawyer, and does RISBERGS' legal work, although his title is Assistant Treasurer. Concerning subject, BERZINS said: "He's nuts!" He related that subject had worked as a clerk-expediter in the company's supply warehouse and that he had made disparaging statements about the company to many outsiders, to Latvian emigres as well as to others, some whom had business dealings with the company. Subject reportedly has been saying that RISBERGS usurps his employees: that he treats them no better than slaves, paying them low wages and demanding long hours of work from them. According to BERZINS, RISBERGS tolerated this attitude for a long period of time, but finally he felt that the situation had become damaging to his organization and he dismissed subject. BERZINS said that he had heard nothing about subject's threats to repatriate, but he understood [] concern from the Latvian point of view. He also expressed concern about unsavory lies which, if subject repatriated and began spreading them in Latvia, would surely be broadcast by Soviet propaganda mechanisms.

10. BERZINS also informed [] that he knows a Voldemars CERBULS, a distant relative of subject's (possibly an uncle), who will be in New York City during the coming weekend (12-13 December 1964). CERBULS was born in about 1894; he is a retired pharmacist and resides at New Rochelle, New York. He is the comptroller of the American Latvian Association (ALA) and will be in New York City in connection with the regular monthly meeting of ALA's executive group. BERZINS promised to telephone CERBULS at home and ask him if he has heard about subject's threatened repatriation. BERZINS also said the he would

SECRET

SECRET

ask CERBULS to speak with subject when he comes to New York City and to attempt to dissuade him from taking rash action. Finally, he also promised to determine who among the construction company's workers was friendly with subject; if he should find such person, he said that he would try to persuade him to speak with subject in order to obtain additional facts and to try and dissuade him from returning to Latvia. BERZINS promised to keep [] advised of any developments of consequence.

Q

SECRET