

ROMANIA

RESTRICTION AND HARASSMENT OF THE LEGATION IN ROMANIA¹

511.66/3-250 : Telegram

The Minister in Romania (Schoenfeld) to the Secretary of State

RESTRICTED

BUCHAREST, March 2, 1950—9 p. m.

134. [Grigore] Preoteasa, Deputy Minister Foreign Affairs sent me word this morning inviting me to call at 5:30 this afternoon.

When I did so, he told me he desired to inform me Rumanian Government asked the discontinuance US Information Office. It did not consider its activities normal diplomatic function.

I inquired whether Rumanian Government intended to send me a written communication. He indicated it did not. It considered his action as official notification.

I inquired whether he wished to make any further reservations. He indicated this was all. Rumanian Government asked that office cease its activities as of time of notification.

I said I should advise my government Rumanian Government desired cessation of USIS activities (he corrected use of word "desired" and said "demanded") and I added I assumed I might convey to him any response my government might desire to make.

Preoteasa who was nervous and ill at ease made no reference to any improper activities on the part of any one personally and notwithstanding my effort to draw him out, confined himself strictly to his general statement.

British Minister Roberts,² who saw Preoteasa at six o'clock tells me similar notification was made to him re British press office.³

SCHOENFELD

¹ Previous documentation on this problem is presented in *Foreign Relations*, 1949, vol. v, pp. 521 ff.

² Walter St. C. H. Roberts, British Minister in Romania.

³ Telegram 137, March 3, from Bucharest, not printed, reported that the United States Information Service had that day suspended library facilities, film showings, and musical programs for the Romanian public in order to avoid possible incidents. The British press office had taken similar action. It was feared that Romanian secret policemen stationed outside these facilities would arrest any Romanian citizens who might enter (511.66/3-350).

511.66/3-450: Telegram

The Secretary of State to the Legation in Romania

RESTRICTED PRIORITY

WASHINGTON, March 4, 1950—3 p. m.

68. Urtel 134, Mar 2.¹ You are authorized communicate FonMin re RumGov't demand discontinuance USIS Office as follows:

Begin. I refer my conversation with Deputy Min FonAff in which he informed me of RumGov's demand that Info Office of US Leg at Bucharest be discontinued forthwith. In this regard, my Govt has instructed me communicate to you the following:

Gov of US has taken note RumGov's oral demand for cessation USIS activities in Rum on grounds RumGov does not consider activities that Office normal dipl function. US Govt also notes that Rum FonOff declined at time further explain its position as regards this demand.

It is observed that summary character of RumGov's informal *dé-marche* was lacking all elements of customary dipl practice and courtesy. Moreover, refusal of Deputy FonMin to clarify his Govt's view that the USIS activities in Rum do not constitute a normal dipl function leaves in doubt exact nature of RumGov's demand and its position as regards the informational and cultural activities of dipl Missions.

RumGov is requested set forth precisely in written communication its views with respect such activities and exact extent of its demand. In particular, RumGov is asked state whether it considers inappropriate to a dipl Mission activities of accredited Public Affairs, Press or Cultural Officers directed toward exchange of information and promotion of cultural relations between the peoples of the countries concerned. US Govt wld be interested to know whether RumGov objects to maintenance by a dipl Mission of a reading and circulating library, its distribution of a news bulletin, its showing of educational films or exhibits, and its arrangement of musical programs.

The progressively severe restrictions imposed over last three years upon the informational and cultural activities of US Leg as a result attitude and actions of RumGov have brought about a situation in which these activities were already reduced to the barest minimum and virtually confined to premises of USIS Office. This in itself was a serious impediment to free flow of information and to maintenance cultural relations between the peoples of US and of Rum. Is it intention of RumGov's present demand entirely to block all such channels of communication and thereby further to circumscribe the free and frank exchange of information among the peoples of world which is so essential to internatl understanding and peace? Does RumGovt consider it necessary to achievement its objectives that Rum people's

¹ *Supra.*

knowledge of world affairs be limited exclusively to official version set forth in Govt controlled press?

US Govt is astonished at this action on part of RumGovt especially in view fact that latter in recent years has maintained on staff its diplo Mission at Wash Press and Cultural Counselors, that its Leg has conducted various informational and cultural activities in US and that its Leg is publishing and distributing a weekly news bulletin. This bulletin is accorded the facilities of US mails and its publication is certified to US Dept of Justice as legitimate activity of Rum diplo representation in US. These activities have been sanctioned by US Govt as an evidence of its adherence to principles of freedom of press and publication and of established practice. Is US Govt given to understand by RumGovts action against USIS in Rum that it intends cease these activities on part its diplo representatives in US?

Without recognizing right of RumGovt to demand cessation of the informational and cultural services of US Leg at Bucharest, US Govt is suspending public activities of its dipl Mission in this field pending resolution of issue through further negots, and awaits Rum-Govt's reply to this communication. *End.*²

ACHESON

² The text of the note as delivered to the Romanian Foreign Ministry by Minister Schoenfeld on March 6 was released to the press by the Department of State on March 7; see Department of State *Bulletin*, March 20, 1950, pp. 443-444.

511.66/3-950: Telegram

The Minister in Romania (Schoenfeld) to the Secretary of State

SECRET PRIORITY

BUCHAREST, March 9, 1950—5 p. m.

167. Urtel 72, March 7, 3 p. m.¹ We are most mindful of publicity angle of USIS affair and urge for present publicity be kept on plane established by our note regarding free flow information and cultural interchange and Soviet-Communist obstruction. We believe sharp and detailed comparison between activities of cultural and information nature carried on in Washington by Rumanian Legation and those of USIS in Bucharest showing Rumanians have objected to what they themselves are doing is most profitable approach at this time.

Reference publicity on disappearances, arrests and intimidation of local staff, we urge greatest restraint on this phase. Such publicity may

¹ Telegram 144, March 4, from Bucharest, not printed, reported that three Romanian employees of the USIS office in Bucharest had disappeared on March 3 and were presumed to be under arrest (511.66/3-450). Telegram 72, to Bucharest, under reference here, not printed, stated that the Department of State desired to publicize the disappearances, arrests, and intimidation of the local staff of the Legation in Bucharest as an example of the terroristic measures and extremes of the anti-American program of a Communist state, and also as a measure for vitiating any fabricated evidence which might be adduced in likely forthcoming efforts to compromise the Legation (511.66/3-650).

be premature in view of bare possibility one or other of employees who have disappeared may be detained only briefly, questioned and released. Even excluding this possibility, we believe such publicity would worsen situation of employees directly involved, imperil safety of their families and adversely affect situation of remaining employees. We are convinced it would have no deterrent effect with regard to Rumanian maltreatment of local staff. On contrary, any action which reveals persons themselves or relatives have turned to us, merely brings down upon them added reprisals. Hostage system is one of favorite devices here and is unhesitatingly used and with dire effect.

Some Rumanian staff members have in fact asked that no publicity be given to arrests for sake of treatment accorded those in prison and their families and their own security. They have pointed out only harm can come to them since we cannot follow through on our protests.

Majority of our employees are still free and revelation of any information that we have received from them regarding their experiences with police can only destroy relations of confidence. While we shall, of course, continue to report fully on all such developments it is believed that for present there is more to lose than to gain by such publicity.²

SCHOENFELD

² In his telegram 219, March 27, from Bucharest, not printed, Minister Schoenfeld reported that during a call upon Romanian Foreign Minister Ana Pauker he had taken up the question of the disappearance of the three Romanian employees of the USIS office. Schoenfeld assured the Foreign Minister that the activities of the three employees had been entirely innocent and above-board. The Foreign Minister indicated a disposition to look into the matter but made no definite commitment (511.66/3-2750).

124.66/3-1850

*The Minister in Romania (Schoenfeld) to the Romanian Minister for Foreign Affairs (Pauker)*¹

No. 889

The American Minister presents his compliments to Her Excellency the Rumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs and has the honor to state that the Department of State in Washington has studied the suggestion made orally to Mr. Schoenfeld by Madame Pauker on January 28 for an exchange of four visas for official staff of the Missions of the respective countries and desires him to make the following observations:

1. The United States Government reaffirms its non-acceptance of the arbitrary determination by the Rumanian Government through

¹ The source text was transmitted to the Department of State as an enclosure to despatch 200, March 18, from Bucharest, not printed.

control of visas of the size and character of the American Legation whose responsibilities with respect to American interests are only assessable by the United States Government. The acknowledged effort by the Rumanian Government to reduce the staff of the American Legation in this way contravenes the generally accepted principles of comity which are practiced by the United States Government with respect to Rumania and all other diplomatic representations in the United States.

2. The uncooperative attitude of the Rumanian Government and the progressive restrictions over a wide area imposed upon the American Legation have indicated clearly that the Rumanian Government is not interested in open and friendly contact between the Rumanian and American peoples but, on the contrary, that it wishes narrowly to confine relations between the two countries and to restrict diplomatic representation to a minimum.

The organization and maintenance even of a reduced staff is administratively impracticable if the capricious handling of official visa applications persists. The United States Government therefore desires an understanding that will obviate continual discussion of individual applications or groups of applications. The Rumanian Government as long ago as April 1948 gave informal assurances, which were subsequently several times repeated, of willingness to grant visas for replacements. In practice however these assurances were not observed.

3. The Rumanian Government has at different times referred to the disparity in size of the Rumanian Legation in Washington and the American Legation in Bucharest but has professed recognition of the principle that each Government should fix its own complement. Although the duties devolving upon the American Legation in Bucharest call for an overall American complement of more than 50 persons, the United States Government contemplates reducing the American personnel of the Legation to the neighborhood of 30, including the persons in the offices of the Service Attachés. In conformity with this reduction, the American Legation desires at this time 15 visas for such personnel in lieu of the 30 pending applications. It is prepared to withdraw the existing applications and to furnish a revised list of those currently requested.

4. As to the office of the Service Attachés, the United States Government requests the Rumanian authorities to fulfill their earlier assurances that replacements for the recognized Attachés would be acceptable. The above list envisaging 15 visa applicants includes new Army and Air Attachés replacing those accredited to Bucharest who have been or will be transferred when visas for replacements are granted.

5. If the suggested numbers are acceptable and visas are granted, the American Legation will be immediately authorized to act on the visa applications for Rumanian personnel now pending.

6. The United States Government also asks assurances that it may maintain the level and balance of its Legation membership through future replacements and that the Rumanian Government will issue visas promptly, unless a particular assignment is not agreeable to it on personal grounds. It believes that a period of 15 days should suffice for a decision on individual applications and the Rumanian Government may be assured of no less prompt action on visa applications for its official personnel than that which it accords the requests for visas for American official personnel.

7. Since these questions have been pending for a long time, it will be appreciated if a reply to these proposals may be given within the coming fortnight.

BUCHAREST, March 14, 1950.

124.66/3-1550 : Telegram

The Minister in Romania (Schoenfeld) to the Secretary of State

CONFIDENTIAL

BUCHAREST, March 15, 1950—5 p. m.

185. I fully concur in inference expressed in last paragraph urtel 86, March 14, 6 p. m., namely, voluntary depletion complement Rumanian Legation Washington during visa impasse suggests Rumanians do not regard maintenance their mission of comparable importance to restriction or exclusion our representation in Rumania.¹

Whole attitude here is one of rigid intransigence and active hostilities and I am still of opinion as stated in mytel 824, December 11, 8 p. m.² Kremlin would like to see us out.

While varied restrictions, chicanery and pressure designed to prevent effective operation of this mission and to hamper and breakdown individual staff members have long been common practice here, these measures have been greatly intensified in recent months and it is manifest increasing efforts are being made to force our hand.

As regards staff I believe as stated in mytel 62, January 30² that we can look for no relaxation in foreseeable future; that we are unlikely to receive even a reply to our recent note re staff (mytel 176, March 14³), and that after expiration of fortnight suggested for reply

¹The other portion of the telegram summarized here reported that Vlad Mardarescu, Counselor of the Romanian Legation in Washington, was being reassigned, leaving only two officers in the Romanian Legation: Minister Mihail Magheru and Third Secretary Ion Nitescu (601.6611/3-1450).

²Not printed.

³Not printed; it reported the delivery of the note of March 14 to the Romanian Foreign Minister, *supra* (124.66/3-1450).

we shall at best have to move toward skeleton status envisaged in urtel 54, February 24.⁴

⁴ Not printed.

SCHOENFELD

124.663/4-1550 : Telegram

The Secretary of State to the Legation in Romania

CONFIDENTIAL

PRIORITY

WASHINGTON, April 19, 1950—4 p. m.

NIACT

130. Urtel 176, Mar 14.¹ We observe one month has passed without reply our *note verbale* Rum FonOff re official visas and staff despite request for reply within fortnight, ur subsequent informal representations to FonMin this regard (urtel 217 Mar 27²) with particular ref ur request Mar 10 re Gantenbein (urtel 182, Mar 15³) and FonMin's assurance forthcoming answer.

Rums' evidently calculated delay may be prolonged indefinitely as you suggest (urtel 257, Apr 15⁴) with increasingly serious consequences for leg, detriment our prestige and encouragement their further harassments if we appear resigned Rum discourtesy in failing even reply our inquiries re their unfriendly behavior.

Moreover, re stoppage USIS activities and nature Rum response our inquiries this regard (urtels 134, Mar 2; 153, Mar 6; 208, Mar 23; 218, Mar 27; 258, Apr 15⁵) which will be subj separate Tel,⁶ since retaliation against Rum info activities in US might have disadvantage appearing run counter our consistent support principle freedom of info and cultural exchange, it is considered preferable at this time take alternative action which we have long contemplated, i.e., closing Rum NY commercial office.

In light above considerations it seems questionable whether possible disadvantage leg's situation re visas, staff etc., resulting such action outweighs disadvantages our inaction while Rums compound indignities with impunity (urtel 132, Mar 1).

¹ Not printed; see footnote 3, *supra*.

² Not printed; it reported that during a conversation with Romanian Foreign Minister Pauker that day, Minister Schoenfeld had sought her views on his note of March 14. The Foreign Minister stated that a reply was in preparation, but she would not give even an approximate date when it could be expected (866.181/3-2750).

³ Not printed. It reported that on March 10 Minister Schoenfeld took up the visa question with Madame Ana Toma, Secretary General of the Romanian Foreign Ministry whom he found grumbling and unresponsive. Schoenfeld concluded that there was no mistaking the generally hardening attitude by Romanian authorities on the problem of the Legation staff (866.181/3-1550).

⁴ Not printed.

⁵ For telegram 134, March 2, from Bucharest, see p. 1052; the other telegrams under reference here are not printed.

⁶ Regarding the exchange of notes with the Romanian Government over the closing of the USIS office in Bucharest, see the editorial note, *infra*.

Accordingly subj ur views, we propose notify Rum leg here soonest as fol: US Govt regards activities Rum NY office (Deptel 54, Feb 24 and urtel 132⁷) unauthorized extension leg consular functions; no agreement asked or given for a Rum consulate NY; US Govt maintains no office Rum other than at Bucharest, and Rum Govt stated it will permit exercise consular functions by US officers only within leg (urdes 205, Mar 18⁸). We wld request immed cessation public business NY office and final closing office within two weeks from date our note. Wld further inform Rum leg we have under review, in light Consular Convention and reciprocity re our consular rights in Rum, their continuing exercise any activities in US of consular nature in absence presentation consular comms by Rum officers performing such functions and receipt exequatur.

For urinfo it appears since Rum Mission reestab in 1946 no Rum officers have performed consular functions with benefit exequatur. Re Crivilescu who has subsequently departed US, Rum Leg notified us May 1948 he performing consular functions and invested with title Vice Consul as well as Attaché; view then contemplated appt Consul replace Stanescu we accorded Crivilescu provisional recognition. Apparently third Sec Ion Nitescu only Rum officer currently performing such services extensively.

Effort to find appropriate basis for completely preventing gift parcel collections by Rum leg (urtel 132) being explored with Treasury and others. Grounds under considerations this end are (1) propriety collection Rum customs duties in US in dollar exchange, (2) reciprocity such fin transactions in Rum and US, (3) consular activity not confined protection Rum interests US. Threat of stopping these remunerative collections implied by proposed note, on grounds consular reciprocity, might provide leverage obtain Rum compliance Consular Agreement extent recognizing our officers. Also proposed *démarche* wld appear leave us freedom action re extent to which we might subsequently desire limit Rum leg activities pending reciprocal compliance Consular Convention light Rum restrictions our consular rights.

Dept desires urgently ur views re above proposal. Possible alternative wld be simultaneously with notification Rums re closing NY office inform them we not agreeable continuation henceforth any consular activities US without presentation consular comms by Rum leg personnel and receipt exequatur. Wld state we prepared grant exequatur accordance Convention if Rum Govt willing honor Convention with full and gen reciprocity by issuance exequatur US consular personnel presenting comms in Rum. Ur views also desired whether such approach (which more consistent with appeal to Consular Convention)

⁷ Neither printed.

⁸ Not printed.

more likely bring Rums to terms or result further restriction our consular opportunities to material detriment US interests.⁹

ACHESON

⁹ In his telegram 274, April 22, from Bucharest, not printed. Minister Schoenfeld concurred in the action proposed by the Department (124.663/4-2250).

In a note delivered on April 25 to the Romanian Legation in Washington, the Department of State requested the Romanian Government to close its establishment in New York City operating under the name of Office of the Romanian Commercial Attaché and its affiliated Office of Packages for Romania. The note expressed the view that the activities of the office in question was an unauthorized extension of the consular functions of the Romanian Legation. For the text of the note, released to the press on April 26, see Department of State *Bulletin*, May 8, 1950, p. 735.

Editorial Note

In a note of April 14 to the Legation in Romania, the Romanian Foreign Ministry replied to the Legation's note of March 6 regarding the Romanian Government's demand for the closing of the United States Information Service office in Bucharest (see telegram 68, March 4, to Bucharest, page 1053). The lengthy Romanian reply claimed that the United States Information Service was devoted to espionage, subversion, and propaganda. In a note transmitted to the Romanian Foreign Ministry on April 26, the Legation in Romania replied to the Romanian note of April 14. The Legation note, sent in pursuance of instructions contained in telegram 138, April 24, to Bucharest, not printed (124.665/4-1550), took the view that it was unnecessary to refute in detail the contentions of the Foreign Ministry note, and that it "would be ludicrous if they were not so serious in their implications for that understanding between peoples which is essential for peace". The note categorically denied charges of improper conduct by employees of the United States Information Service, and reaffirmed the view that information and cultural exchange constituted a normal and proper function of a diplomatic mission and could contribute to understanding between peoples. At the time of the release to the press on April 26 of the Romanian note of April 14 and the American reply of April 26, the Department of State also issued a lengthy summary reviewing Romanian Government actions against the United States Information Service in Bucharest and refuting allegations made in the Romanian note of April 14. For the texts of the Romanian Foreign Ministry note of April 14, the Legation's reply of April 26, and the Department of State summary issued to the press on April 26, see Department of State *Bulletin*, May 8, 1950, pages 732-735. The Legation note of April 26 is also printed in *American Foreign Policy, 1950-1955: Basic Documents*, volume II, pages 2147-2148.

766.00/4-2850 : Telegram

The Minister in Romania (Schoenfeld) to the Secretary of State

CONFIDENTIAL PRIORITY BUCHAREST, April 28, 1950—2 p. m.

312. Mytel 307, April 27.¹ As current USIS and BIO trial moves to its predetermined close, one conclusion clearly emerges: Recent political trial practically completes cycle begun with Maniu trial of October–November 1947² and carried forward by Pop-Bujoiu trial November 1948³ designed to seal off US and UK from local contact and local influence.

Object of Maniu trial was to destroy Rumanian historical parties (National Peasants and Liberals) and their chief leaders, to discredit them by identifying them with US and British opposition to Kremlin-controlled government, and thus convict them of treason and in process, to remove representatives of those parties from machinery of government and to substitute for them trusted and obedient Kremlin agents. It will be recalled Ana Pauker, Vasile Luca⁴ and Emil Bodnaras⁵ took office following that affair.

Pop-Bujoiu trial carried process a step further by eliminating and terrorizing potentially dangerous opposition elements among former industrial and business leaders particularly those with Western ties or affiliations. Method used was largely same as in Maniu trial, namely accusations of conspiracy, espionage and sabotage in service of Anglo-American imperialists. Trial served to intimidate local circles further from contact with Western representatives and action was in some respects more direct as Rumanian Government insisted on expulsion of certain US and UK diplomatic officials.

¹ Not printed. In April 1950, Nora Samueli, a Romanian employee of the United States Information Service in Bucharest, Liviu Popescu-Nasta, the Romanian correspondent for the *New York Times*, and three Romanian employees of the British Information Office in Bucharest, were tried and convicted by a Romanian military court of charges of having conducted espionage for the American and British missions in Romania. The five defendants were sentenced to various periods of imprisonment ranging from 15 years to life. Legation reports to the Department of State on the course of the trial, including the telegram under reference here, are included in file 766.00.

² In November 1947, Iuliu Maniu and other leaders of the Romanian National Peasant Party were convicted by a Bucharest military court of conspiring with American and British agents to overthrow the Communist regime in Romania. Maniu was sentenced to life imprisonment. For documentation on the attitude of the United States toward the arrest and trial of Maniu and the National Peasant Party leadership, see *Foreign Relations*, 1947, vol. iv, pp. 471 ff.

³ From October 27 to November 2, 1948, twelve Romanian citizens were tried by a Bucharest military court for participation in an alleged conspiracy to overthrow the Romanian Government and to set up an espionage system for the United States and the United Kingdom. All of the accused were convicted and sentenced to various terms in prison.

⁴ Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance, and member of the Politburo of the Romanian Communist Party.

⁵ Romanian Minister of War and member of the Politburo of the Romanian Communist Party.

Present trial, which seeks on similar charges to justify closure of USIS and BIO offices after the event, largely closes out remaining contact between US and UK missions and local Rumanian life and seems calculated to separate them from their native employees. Trial directed as it has been against local employees of USIS and BIO and against local revisions [*representatives?*] of foreign press (mytel 308, April 28⁶) reinforces already—strong sense of fear among those elements and impedes operation, not to speak of effective work.

US and UK missions are thus to be left, not only reduced in size, but virtually suspended in a vacuum and not to be permitted to see, hear, or discuss what goes on in this country. With present trial cycle is practically complete.⁷

SCHOENFELD

⁶ Not printed.

⁷ In a statement issued to the press on May 3, the Department of State denounced the recently concluded Bucharest trial of Romanian employees of the American and British information offices. The statement categorically denied that Nora Samuelli's functions with the American Legation could in any way be considered espionage or conspiracy. It was also observed that the *New York Times* local correspondent had only been performing routine newsgathering activities. The statement concluded that the trial had been designed principally to discredit the American and British diplomatic missions in Romania, to intimidate Romanian citizens from employment or contact with the missions, and generally to sever the lines of communications between the peoples of Romania and the free world. For the text of the statement, see Department of State Bulletin, May 15, 1950, p. 755.

602.6611/5-1550 : Telegram

The Minister in Romania (Schoenfeld) to the Secretary of State

PRIORITY PLAIN

BUCHAREST, May 15, 1950.

352. Following is translation Rumanian Foreign Office note May 13 received 5:35 p. m. May 15 re official visas.

"Ministry of Foreign Affairs of RPR presents compliments to Legation USA Bucharest and in reply note No. 889, March 15 [14], 1950¹ in which Government of USA poses problem of granting visas to new diplomatic personnel of US Legation Bucharest and fixing size of personnel of that Legation has honor on behalf of Government of RPR to communicate following:

"Re problem of visas for personnel of US Legation Bucharest, Government of RPR reminds Government of US present size of personnel at Legation is many times greater than size of personnel of Legation before war. In years 1936-37 diplomatic personnel of US Legation Bucharest comprised six members including MA who was at same time accredited to Athens and Belgrade where he maintained his permanent residence. In post war period total size of personnel US Legation Bucharest including large number employees of former American element of ACC in Rumania who normally would have been

¹ Ante, p. 1055.

required to leave country on termination of work of that commission numbered as many as 53.

"This increase in personnel does not correspond at all to relations created by unfriendly policy carried out by US Government towards RPR.

"The great number of members of Legation cannot be considered separately from hostile policy carried out by Government of US against RPR and manifested in espionage activity carried out by some members of Legation of USA in Bucharest as proved in treason trials of leaders of former National Peasant Party, Auschnitt-Popp-Bujoiu, band of conspirators and group of spies of American and British Information Offices² in repeated attempts to mix in internal affairs of RPR, slanderous attacks against RPR, hostile attitude toward RPR interests displayed by delegates of USA in UNO and official support accorded all the traitors who have fled from RPR.

"The reference of Government of USA to principles of courtesy and reciprocity is entirely out of place when US Government has refused steadily to accord visas for personnel to replace members of RPR Legation Washington who in last two years have stopped working at that Legation though Government of RPR even in year 1949 has granted visas for several replacements for members US Legation Bucharest until intention of American Government to obstruct activity of RPR Legation Washington became apparent.

"For all these reasons Government RPR requests US Legation Bucharest to reduce number of its personnel to 10, it being understood that parity with respect to number of members of RPR Legation Washington is put forth by RPR Government as a condition for this solution of problem of number of members of American Legation Bucharest.

"Bucharest May 13, 1950."

SCHOENFELD

² Regarding the trials under reference here, see telegram 312, April 28, from Bucharest, *supra*.

124.663/5-1850 : Telegram

*The Acting Secretary of State to the Legation in Romania*¹

CONFIDENTIAL

PRIORITY

WASHINGTON, May 19, 1950—8 p. m.

NIACT

164. Urtel 352, May 15.² Dept considers that prolonged delay in replying Rum demand of May 13 for reduction Leg staff suggested

¹ This telegram instruction was drafted by the Office of Eastern European Affairs and was cleared by other appropriate offices of the Department of State and by Acting Secretary Webb.

On May 19, Acting Secretary Webb discussed the Romanian demand for reduction of the Legation staff in Bucharest with Senator Tom Connally of Texas, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin, ranking active Republican member of the Committee, and Francis O. Wilcox, Chief of Staff of the Committee. The Senators understood and approved the action the Department of State was undertaking. (Memorandum by Acting Secretary of State Webb, May 19: 611.66/5-1950)

² *Supra*.

urtel 356, May 18,³ runs too great hazard further Rum move in near future in nature ultimatum similar recent Czech demand.⁴

Accordingly, it is desired that you address FonMin fol note to be delivered prior ur departure (Legtel 354, May 16⁵) :

"I have honor refer note MinFonAff of RPR under date May 13 in response a note of Mar 15 from AmLeg.

I am directed by my Govt to state that it cannot admit as conforming generally accepted principles and practices internatl comity that a receiving state shld attempt arbitrarily and unilaterally to determine composition dipl Mission of a state with which it maintains relations. Moreover, my Govt wholly rejects pretexts which RumGovt puts forward as basis its demand for reduction US representation Rum.

In line with evidences of RumGovt's attitude and actions toward US and AmLeg over past several years, Ministry's note makes clear that RumGovt is not disposed further interests of two countries in maintenance normal dipl relations.

Accordingly, US Govt, while reserving its rights and customary privileges, intends reduce official personnel its leg Bucharest to conform situation created by arbitrary attitude of RumGovt, as indicated in Min's note of May 13, 1950. This reduction is premised on understanding that RumGovt will in future take prompt action upon visa applications for replacement members of leg staff."

View mounting harassments by RumGovt against leg, Dept has decided institute travel restrictions on Rumleg personnel in US (Deptcirgam Aug 19, 1949, 8:10 AM, Deptel 145, May 1; Legtel 330, May 3⁶). With this in mind, Dept desires you make strong effort on basis ur imminent deparature schedule appt with FonMin or at least with Preoteasa or Toma and connection delivery above note orally

³ Not printed. In it Minister Schoenfeld suggested that the United States reject the Romanian demand for the reduction of the Legation staff and reiterate the American desire to facilitate the mutual issuance of visas for personnel needed by the American Legation in Bucharest and the Romanian Legation in Washington. Schoenfeld believed that the underlying question in the matter was whether or not the Romanian regime was determined to force the withdrawal of the American mission. He thought that an attempt should be made to keep the situation open in an effort to ascertain the real motivation of Romanian authorities (124.663/5-1850).

⁴ For documentation on Czechoslovak demands for a reduction of the personnel of the American Embassy in Praha, see pp. 526 ff.

⁵ The return of Minister Schoenfeld to Washington for consultation had been under consideration for some months but had been delayed pending favorable action by the Romanian Government on the visa application of James W. Gantenbein, Counselor-Designate to the Legation in Bucharest. Telegram 150, May 4, to Bucharest, not printed, authorized Minister Schoenfeld to inform the Romanian Foreign Ministry that the Department of State urgently wished him to return to Washington for consultation for an indefinite period. In the absence of a favorable action on Gantenbein's visa application, Minister Schoenfeld was obliged to leave the Legation in the charge of a junior officer. Schoenfeld was to inform the Romanian Foreign Ministry that the Department of State recognized the misinterpretation which public opinion might place upon the fact that the Legation was left in the charge of a junior officer, but the Romanian Government's "inexcusable tactics" left no alternative (123 Schoenfeld, Rudolf E.). In the telegram under reference here, not printed, Schoenfeld stated that he planned to depart about May 24 (123 Schoenfeld, Rudolf E.).

⁶ None printed.

inform FonOff along lines suggested Deptel 150, May 4⁷ and in addition make fol points:

Because of restrictions to which Leg has been subjected increasingly over past three years by Rum auths, US Govt is reviewing situation of RumLeg Wash.

Since, in general contravention internatl comity and in particular contravention existing Consular Agreement between US and Rum, RumGovt has seen fit impose severe travel restrictions upon US dipl and consular reps in Rum, US Govt has decided apply comparable restrictions on movements official Rum personnel within US. RumLeg Wash and MinFonAff will presently be informed precise nature such restrictions and terms of obtaining permission to travel within US. In acting upon requests by Rum officers for travel US Govt will have in view current extent of courtesy accorded by Rum auths to Amer officials in Rum.

Dept strongly hopes you will be able make above presentation in person. If it proves impossible obtain appt with high FonOff official before ur departure you may transmit note and have Williams⁸ make informal statement soonest thereafter. Pls report whether FonOff fails schedule appt for you even in knowledge ur intended departure.

Dept contemplates, on receipt Leg's notification delivery note and oral communication, immed informing RumLeg here terms travel restrictions.⁹

Our views on restaffing will be tele soonest.

WEBB

⁷ See footnote 5, above.

⁸ Murat W. Williams, Third Secretary of the Legation in Bucharest.

⁹ Regarding Acting Secretary of State Webb's note of May 25 to the Romanian Minister restricting the travel of Romanian Legation staff members, see the editorial note, p. 1067.

124.663/5-2250: Telegram

The Minister in Romania (Schoenfeld) to the Secretary of State

CONFIDENTIAL PRIORITY BUCHAREST, May 22, 1950—6 p. m.

375. Urtel 164, May 19.¹ Mme. Pauker received me at 1 p. m. today. I was accompanied by Williams. At that time I handed her note embodying our position on official visas. I explained very briefly we did not accept principle but we accepted fact. She read over note and after pause said: good.

I told her there were couple of points I desired to clarify. Did Rumania proposal of staff of 10 include Chief of Commission or was he in addition. She indicated he was additional. I then said: Total of 11 including him. She confirmed this.

¹ *Supra.*

I said my second point related to pace of reduction. We had two buildings. One housed consular section and service attachés. Other housed chancery. We proposed to consolidate into one building and release other. This involved considerable work. I hoped we might be allowed some leeway in pace of reductions so as to accomplish this work in orderly fashion. We expected to effect it during course of June. She indicated favorable disposition toward this suggestion.

Mme. Pauker referred to final paragraph our note re prompt granting visas for replacements. She said it did not specifically state this should be reciprocal. I said I could reassure her on that point. We would act on their visas without delay. (We plan to go ahead on pending cases if Department concurs. Please advise.)

I then said I hoped there might be some over-lapping. I trusted it would not be necessary to wait until persons had actually left before visas for replacements could be granted. On this point I asked whether Gantenbein visa² could be issued at this time. Mme. Pauker said she could not give answer at the moment. She would consult government and communicate result.

I then passed to question of travel restrictions. I said as I saw it she was advocate of reciprocity. She agreed. Continuing I told her my government desired me to say that because of progressive restrictions imposed on American Legation, Bucharest, Washington was reviewing situation Rumanian Legation there. (Mme. Pauker gave me a quizzical glance.) I added that since Rumanian Government had imposed severe travel restrictions on us in contravention international comity and US-Rumanian Consular Convention, Washington had decided apply similar restrictions on Rumanian official personnel in US. Mme. Pauker said Rumanian restrictions were non-discriminatory. They applied to all. (I suggest Department frame its system with eye to this point.) I pointed out there was no doubt of difference of treatment Rumanian officials in US and American officials here. I added Washington intended inform her Ministry and Rumanian Legation Washington shortly precise nature of such restrictions. I added US Government would be guided in application by current treatment here.

I expressed hope restrictions here would be eased. I said I could not see value of all harassments. I regretted to tell her that due to them no single member of my staff had left without resentment. She said she realized these things affected a person's attitude.

I went on to say there was one other question that gave me concern. This was question of housing. I cited certain cases of direct action by Rumanian authorities. She agreed they were undesirable. (I shall report details in separate telegram.) I suggested these questions should be discussed between Legation and Foreign Office. I was sure if they

² Regarding the visa case of Legation Counselor-Designate Gantenbein, see footnote 5, *supra*.

were taken up with Williams Foreign Office would find him entirely reasonable.

I then recapitulated main points staff of 11 with Chief of Mission, reasonable time to consolidate into one building, prompt issue of visas, intended travel restrictions and Gantenbein visa and commended Williams to her as Chargé d'Affaires.³

Mme. Pauker asked about my plans. I told her I was reporting to Washington for consultation. I had hoped to leave in February. Due to developments here I had been obliged to postpone my departure. Early in May Washington had ordered me to report for consultation without delay. My future movements would depend on result of my consultation.⁴

SCHOENFELD

³ From June 1950 the Legation in Romania adhered to the limitation of its American staff to 10 members, exclusive of the Minister. Delays and obstructions by the Romanian Government in the processing of visa applications for replacements for American staff members continued throughout the remainder of the year and was the subject of continuous negotiation between the Legation and the Romanian Foreign Ministry. Documentation on these problems is basically included in the file 124.66.

⁴ Minister Schoenfeld departed from Bucharest on May 24 and Third Secretary Williams assumed charge of the Legation. Schoenfeld did not again resume his post in Bucharest. In January 1951 he was named Ambassador to Guatemala. Counselor of Legation James Gantenbein was finally granted a visa by the Romanian Government, and upon his arrival in Bucharest in August, he assumed charge of the Legation.

Editorial Note

In a note delivered to the Romanian Legation in Washington on May 25 and released to the press the following day, Acting Secretary of State Webb informed the Romanian Minister that, effective immediately, members of the Romanian Legation in the United States and their dependents would no longer be permitted to travel, except by special permission, outside a designated area extending 35 miles from the District of Columbia. At the time of the issuance to the press of the note of May 25, Acting Secretary of State Webb also issued a statement briefly reviewing the contents of the note delivered to Romanian Foreign Minister Pauker by Minister Schoenfeld on May 22 and Schoenfeld's oral advisement of the imminent institution of travel restrictions on Romanian Legation personnel in the United States (see telegram 375, May 22, from Bucharest, *supra*). For the texts of the Acting Secretary's note of May 25 and his statement of May 26, see Department of State *Bulletin*, June 5, 1950, page 92 or *American Foreign Policy, 1950-1955: Basic Documents*, volume II, pages 2148-2150.

On June 19 the Romanian Minister delivered a note to the Secretary of State protesting against the regulations instituted on May 25 with

respect to travel by Romanian Legation personnel. Secretary of State Acheson took public cognizance of the protest in a statement issued to the press on June 23. The Secretary reviewed the progressively more severe restrictions, impediments, and discourtesies imposed upon members of the American Legation in Bucharest over a 3-year period. He observed that the restrictions and harassments to which the American Legation had been subjected by the Romanian Government were more comprehensively severe than those of any other country. The Secretary insisted that the institution of travel restrictions on Romanian Legation personnel involved reciprocity of diplomatic comity and would be carried out with a view to the current treatment of American representatives in Romania. The Secretary formally rejected the substance of the Romanian protest of June 19 in a note delivered to the Romanian Legation on July 3. The reply stated that the restrictions upon travel by Romanian Legation personnel would not be altered until the Romanian Government removed those restrictions it had placed upon travel within Romania by American Legation personnel. For the texts of the Secretary of State's statement of June 23 and his note of July 3 to the Romanian Minister, see Department of State *Bulletin*, July 3, 1950, page 30 and *ibid.*, July 17, 1950, page 117, or *American Foreign Policy, 1950-1955: Basic Documents*, volume II, pages 2151-2153.

Throughout the remainder of 1950, discussions continued between the Legation in Bucharest and the Romanian Foreign Ministry in an effort to find a mutually satisfactory adjustment of travel restrictions on American diplomatic personnel in Romania and Romanian diplomatic personnel in the United States. Documentation on these discussions is included in files 124.66 and 601.6611.

Editorial Note

In early June 1950 the Romanian press launched a propaganda campaign against the alleged subversive activity of the American Legation in Bucharest based upon an incident in which military personnel assigned to the Legation disposed of a small quantity of obsolete small arms ammunition in a suburban Bucharest lake near the residence of Assistant Army Attaché Capt. Herschel Hutsinpillier. The two American enlisted men directly involved in the incident left Romania on June 10. On June 14 the Romanian Government demanded the withdrawal of Captain Hutsinpillier. Acting on instructions contained in telegram 215, June 17, to Bucharest, not printed, Chargé Williams orally and in an *aide-mémoire* of June 20 refuted the substance of the accusations against Captain Hutsinpillier but agreed to his withdrawal in conformity with customary diplomatic practice.

Captain Hutsinpillier left Romania on June 25. For the text of the Legation *aide-mémoire* of June 20, released to the press in Washington on June 21, see Department of State *Bulletin*, July 3, 1950, pages 29-30, or *American Foreign Policy, 1950-1955: Basic Documents*, volume II, page 2150. For a statement issued to the press by the Department of State on June 21 explaining some of the details of the "ammunition dumping" incident, see Department of State *Bulletin*, July 3, 1950, page 30.

124.663/6-2050 : Telegram

The Chargé in Romania (Williams) to the Secretary of State

CONFIDENTIAL NIACT

BUCHAREST, June 20, 1950—5 p. m.

464. Deptel 215, June 17. I communicated Department's statement and delivered *aide-mémoire* re Hutsinpillier Mme. Toma at two p. m. today.¹ She received it angrily and insisted facts were inexact (a) because quantity was not negligible and (b) because Rumanian Government had waited from June 9 to 14 for reply re Hutsinpillier. I reminded her five days were barely enough exchange cables across ocean.

At same time I delivered protest directed by Deptel 214, June 17, re couriers² and left informal *aide-mémoire* to make sure Mme. Toma (who misses details in French) understood all my oral statement. This protest made her even more angry and she retorted we would have a reply. She said last part protest sounded as if we wanted strict reciprocity of treatment in which case we might have couriers only once in six weeks. (See Legtel 459, June 17³) I replied emphasizing I had said "at whatever intervals." She then turned in anger from question of reciprocity to charge we were guilty of discrimination against Rumania's Washington [Legation] because of travel restrictions. I of course said Rumanians alone were restricted in US because Rumanians alone restricted our diplomats. With rising temperature she reverted

¹ Regarding the statement, *aide-mémoire*, and telegram under reference here, see the editorial note, *supra*. Ana Toma was Secretary General of the Romanian Foreign Ministry.

² On June 16-17, the Romanian Foreign Ministry acknowledged to the Legation in Bucharest that the prior practice of automatic visas to American couriers had been discontinued. Romanian officials indicated that courier trips to Bucharest were too frequent and that no visas would be immediately forthcoming. In the telegram under reference here, the Department of State authorized Chargé Williams to informally and strongly protest the Romanian action in seeking to determine the Legation's courier service by means of visa controls. The telegram authorized Williams to indicate the intention of the United States Government to take into account the Romanian action when acting upon visa applications for Romanian couriers (124.663/6-1750).

³ Not printed.

to threat of limiting our courier service and with that interview ended. She was attended by Dobroiu ⁴ and I was accompanied by Mason.⁵

WILLIAMS

⁴ Acting Director of the Western Affairs Section of the Romanian Foreign Ministry.

⁵ Gordon B. Mason, Assistant Attaché, Legation in Romania.

124.663/6-2350 : Telegram

The Chargé in Romania (Williams) to the Secretary of State

SECRET

BUCHAREST, June 23, 1950—11 a. m.

471. Legtel 464 June 20.¹ With courier visa impasse gravely threatening Legation's communications and minimum effectiveness we assume Department is again reviewing over-all question maintaining relations with Rumania.

In absence information Department's current intentions Legation submits following observations:

It is vital to whole question to determine whether Rumanian Government has actually decided force break with US (see Legtel 356 May 18²). If Rumanian Government is determined to break it will prefer do so by slow humiliating attrition piling isolation upon insult until we are forced to leave Rumania with our prestige badly smattered. This process may be long, drawn out to give Rumanians maximum opportunity to drag down US reputation.

With this in view we may put question to test by taking initiative and seizing opportunity (unless situation unexpectedly mends) to warn Rumanians implicitly we must suspend relations unless we promptly get visas for couriers and replacements including Military Attaché personnel. Rumanians could be expected to make concessions of whatever value only if they desire maintain relations. If concessions are made, our effectiveness will be at least temporarily reinforced. If refused, as is quite likely, we may save ourselves from compounded humiliation by thwarting Rumanian design to submit us to slow strangulation. In this case, onus of break would be on Rumanians because of their refusal of courier visas, a minimum requirement for diplomatic relations.

In submitting above considerations we recognize basic desirability maintaining relations in those countries to which it will be hard to return once we leave but Legation also feels it likely Rumanians are determined to break and will do so on their own slow death terms unless we take initiative.

WILLIAMS

¹ *Supra.*

² Not printed, but see footnote 3, p. 1064.

124.66/6-2350 : Telegram

The Secretary of State to the Legation in Romania

CONFIDENTIAL

WASHINGTON, June 24, 1950—2 p. m.

228. Urtel 471, Jun 23¹ and previous. Rum Min² summoned by Dept for appt today with Asst Sec Perkins³ re courier impasse in context complex of restrictions imposed by Rums on Leg. Perkins characterized Rum Govt's refusal visas to couriers and its indicated intention limit our service six week intervals as incomprehensible in conduct dipl relations. He stated that US Govt takes very serious view this latest Rum action, and indicated that these and other Rum measures oblige US to review whole question of its relations with Rumania.

Magheru professed ignorance details courier issue. When informed he gave as his personal view that Rum action fitted framework reciprocity for "various restrictions imposed in recent times" on Rum Leg here.

Perkins replied that it was certainly not we who had begun this business, to which Magheru retorted that there was disagreement on that point as in his conversation last November (Deptel 397, Nov 21, 1949⁴). Perkins dismissed further discussion this regard as useless. He raised also matter of Rum procrastination on issuance requested visas for replacements Leg's staff and emphasized that he wished Rum Min convey to his Govt gravity with which this Govt views trend of developments affecting Leg for which Rum Govt is responsible.

Conversation concluded with Magheru's agreement communicate Dept's views to FonOff.⁵

Serious consideration will be given comments unreftef in shaping future course our action.

ACHESON

¹ *Supra.*² Mihail Magheru.³ Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs George W. Perkins.⁴ *Foreign Relations*, 1949, vol. v, p. 543.⁵ On July 28 the Department of State sent a *note verbale* to the Romanian Legation reminding it of the serious view which the United States Government took of the various harassments and restrictions imposed upon the American Legation in Bucharest, particularly the indicated intention of Romanian authorities drastically to limit courier service to that Legation. The Department of State stated that it was still awaiting a response to its protest and a clarification of the Romanian Government's intentions (124.66/7-3150). There appear to have been no responses by the Romanian Legation to these protests and demands for clarification.

124.66/7-1950 : Telegram

The Chargé in Romania (Williams) to the Secretary of State

CONFIDENTIAL

BUCHAREST, July 19, 1950—9 p. m.

64. Legtel 58, July 18.¹ At Foreign Office today Bogdan² told me Rumanian Government proposed give our couriers visas for trips at unspecified and irregular intervals but not for resumption previous weekly schedule.

I protested against Rumanians trying fix frequency our courier trips which was matter for US Government alone regulate. Although he denied such intention he reiterated his former statement "we think your couriers come too often" and pointedly referring to "revelations" in recent spy trials added "because of past activities of certain members your Legation we asked you to reduce Legation staff and similarly we think you should reduce courier schedules." After rejecting implied accusation re past activities as untrue and irrelevant I asked what could be relation between size Legation and its couriers since regardless of staff Legation still represents USA, its citizens and interests and thus needs pouch service. Bogdan denied he meant any mathematical relation and resorted again over protest to general charges about Legation's activities which he thought had given rise new framework of American-Rumanian relations to which frequency couriers should be adjusted. He refused give opinion as to what Rumanians thought fit interval between couriers.

Although prospects for future are dim Bogdan assured me visas are authorized for couriers now waiting Vienna but he could not guarantee authorization would arrive in time for this week's trip.³

[WILLIAMS]

¹ During late June and early July promised visas for American couriers continued to be withheld by Romanian authorities despite frequent Legation inquiries and protests. In the telegram under reference, not printed, Chargé Williams asked to be authorized to deliver a still stronger protest to the Romanian Foreign Ministry emphasizing the specific falsehood of Romanian officials and stating plainly in writing that it was difficult to do business with a government which indulged in falsehoods and which by deliberate evasions and delays sought to obstruct communications between the Legation and the Department of State (124.66/7-1850). The Department did not reply to the suggestion.

² Chief of the Western Affairs Section, Romanian Foreign Ministry.

³ Subsequent reports from the Legation in Romania indicated that the Romanian authorities had resumed the issuance of visas to American couriers on a strictly restricted and controlled basis.

Editorial Note

In the course of a short automobile trip on September 4, 1950, Lieutenant Colonel Franklin G. Rothwell, Army Attaché in Romania, and Gordon Mason, Attaché of the Legation in Romania, were de-

tained by the Romanian militia at the small town of Urziceni, 50 kilometers from Bucharest but not in an area prohibited for travel by American diplomatic personnel. Rothwell and Mason were held under guard for six hours, were questioned, and were not allowed to communicate with the Legation. The detention was the subject of a series of protests by the Legation to the Romanian Foreign Ministry. In a statement issued to the press on October 19, the Department of State reviewed the incident and the subsequent American protests. The statement concluded: "The present incident is one of many which illustrate the deliberate policy of the existing Rumanian regime to insult and harass American official representatives in that country." For the text of the statement, see Department of State *Bulletin*, October 30, 1950, page 695.