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NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION, TRANSLATION AND CITATION

Recognising that this volume is addressed primarily to readers with little or no knowledge of Russian, the editors have chosen to deal as simply as possible with the notoriously complex problem of transliteration. The system used by the Slavonic and East European Review has been employed throughout, with the customary exception of Russian surnames ending in -sky (not -skiy) and the usual deference to accepted English usage in the case of geographical names (Baikal, not Baykal) and the names of Russian sovereigns (Alexander, not Aleksandr). A further exception has been made for the names and surnames of Russian travellers and migrants in Australia, which are given in the anglicised or australianised form preferred by their owners (Simonoff, not Simonov, Miklouho-Maclay, not Miklukho-Maklay).

Where it has been felt that such information would be of assistance to the non-Russian-speaking reader, the titles of Russian publications appearing in the text and in the notes have been translated by the editors; everywhere, however, Russian sources have been cited first in transliteration.

In conformity with Soviet academic usage, pre-revolutionary Russian sources are identified by place and date of publication only.
The original impetus for this volume of essays on the Russian-Australian connection was the Australian Bicentenary in 1988 - a year which, coincidentally, marked the millennium of Christianity in Russia. Mindful of this lesson in historical perspective, the editors were nevertheless convinced that the time was right to take stock of almost two centuries of contacts between the two countries by inviting appropriate contributions from Soviet and Australian specialists. Since then, the volume has grown in scope to include many aspects historical, cultural and economic - of this diverse and surprising relationship, and to take note of recent changes in the Soviet Union itself. This is not to say that the editors labour under any illusion about the comprehensiveness of the coverage or about their success in keeping abreast of rapidly changing events.

Whatever its omissions and deficiencies, however, this book remains the first attempt to examine in its wider context - and from both Australian and Soviet points of view - a relationship which has occupied a unique place in the Russian consciousness and contributed significantly to the Australian sense of national identity.

A volume such as this is inevitably characterised by differences in perspective and style. The editors have welcomed both, striving only for general consistency as regards transliteration, punctuation and presentation. Accommodating such a diversity of material and interpretation, they have sought to arrange the individual contributions in such a way as to emphasise unifying themes and enhance the underlying sense of cohesion. The short essay by the late Manning Clark which stands as a foreword to the collection sets the keynote by defining in Australian terms the significance of that great watershed in modern Russian history, the October Revolution. Completed not long before his death, the piece is a fitting tribute to Australia’s greatest historian and to his life-long interest in Australian-Russian relations. The introductory chapter by
John McNair offers a broad survey of contacts between Russia and the "Fifth Continent" and of the changing perspectives which have characterised their development. Two Soviet contributions then examine in greater detail the historical background to the relationship, Kim Malakhovsky focussing on Russian naval visits in the nineteenth century and N.A. Butinov on the "Australian years" of the Russian anthropologist Nikolay Miklouho-Maclay. Next come four complementary views of the impact of Russian immigration in Australia: Charles Price presents a pioneering demographic analysis, while Boris Christa assesses the social and cultural legacy of successive "waves" of visitors and migrants; and Eric Fried and Ray Evans illumine the role played by Russians in Australian radical politics in the early twentieth century. Tom Poole's contribution examines a later phase in relations between the two countries with an account of the first Australian diplomatic mission to the USSR, while two further Soviet articles are devoted to other significant areas of contact: A.S. Petrikovskaya reviews the reception of Australian literature in Russia, and A. Chuyko analyses the changing patterns in trade between the two countries. The collection concludes with two complementary surveys of Australian Studies in the USSR and Russian and Soviet Studies in Australia by authors who have played a conspicuous part in the development of their respective disciplines in their respective countries: Kim Malakhovsky and T.H. Rigby.

The editors acknowledge with gratitude the assistance of all those who have helped in the preparation and publication of this volume. First among these is Boris Christa, whose brainchild it originally was, and to whose work in the early stages it owes so much. The assistance of Kim Malakhovsky in establishing and maintaining contact with Soviet colleagues also deserves particular mention. All the contributors are to be thanked for the goodwill and forbearance with which they have endured inevitable but frustrating delays and postponements. Sue Abbey and Nicola Evans of the University of Queensland Press have been patient and generous with technical advice, as has Alan Cockerill; Heidi Poole and Lyndall Morgan McNair have been diligent proof-readers. Special thanks are due to Helena Popov, who typed and re-typed successive drafts and prepared the final copy.
POSTSCRIPT: AUGUST 1991

This volume goes to press as the world assesses its response to the extraordinary events which have brought to the surface as never before those processes of change and reform at work in the Soviet Union since the end of Brezhnev 'years of stagnation'. In the new situation created by the abortive coup d' état these processes seem irreversible, with profound and inevitable consequences for all the constituent republics of the USSR and their relations with the rest of the world. Any further attempt to trace the development of Australian-Russian contacts in the Gorbachev era and beyond will certainly see the events of August 1991 as a turning point; for the present, we can only point to Australian reactions to those events as evidence, not only of continued goodwill towards the Soviet peoples in general, but perhaps too of a new realisation that further developments in that country are no longer a matter for its citizens alone, but most concern the world community as a whole — Australia included.
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In Place of a Foreword:
Australia and the Russian Revolution

Manning Clark

In the nineteenth century the serious-minded in Australia were divided in their attitude to Russia. Some feared Russia would invade Australia. There were scares during the Crimean War of 1854-56 and again during the Russian Turkish War of 1878. Russia was the last citadel of autocracy in Europe, the antithesis of the British ideal of a free democratic society. By contrast, a few people in Australia who were familiar with Russian literature of the second half of the nineteenth century looked to Russia to rescue Western Europe and America from decadence, corruption and materialism.

The outbreak of revolution in February 1917 led to a different division of opinion in Australia. This time the division was on class lines. The capitalist class was alarmed. They feared that the middle-class liberal revolution in Russia might be followed by a working-class revolution. This might encourage the radicals within the labour movement to start a revolution in Australia; they might try to bring the war to an end. By contrast, a few radicals in the labour movement hailed the February Revolution as a promise of better things, not only for Russia but also for the working classes of the world. One Labor Party member of the New South Wales Parliament said the red flag was “the only flag I’ll spill my blood for”.

On 25 October [7 November] 1917 in the Smolny Institute in Petrograd Lenin announced the birth of a new era in the history of humanity. Once again the capitalist class in Australia was alarmed. On 28 October the Bolshevik Government in Petrograd proclaimed that the soldiers of Russia were “for peace, for bread, for land and power of the people”. The conservative government of Australia, led by W.H. Hughes, took fright. Hughes told the Australian people that any government asking for peace was breaking down the barrier between liberty and anarchy. The Russians, he argued, had let down their allies. The Soviets of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies were like the Sinn
Feiners in Ireland, the socialists in Australia, Dr Mannix, the Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne (also an Irishman) and the Industrial Workers of the World. They were the enemies of liberty, of a White Australia and of the British Empire. They were the enemies of all that Australian conservatives believed to be the essentials of civilisation. The Bolsheviks, Hughes said, were “Dreamers, theorists, Anarchists, pro-Germans” and “enemies of the Empire”. Loyal Australians must treat them like the plague.

The conservative press in Australia was just as scathing in its comments on the Revolution in Russia. The Melbourne Argus warned its readers to beware of those revolutionaries in Russia who were promising to regenerate the world. These revolutionaries, the Argus said, were “quacks” who knew as little about the business of governing human beings as the physicians of the Middle Ages knew about the ailments of the human body. The physicians of the Middle Ages prescribed such remedies as “newts’ hearts, lizards’ legs and dried spiders, to be swallowed facing the sun and followed with a blood-letting”. The Bolsheviks, the Argus said, were just as stupid and ignorant in their opinions on government. They claimed they stood for liberty and equality. The truth was, they believed in what the Argus called a “fanatical fraternity”. The Bolsheviks were not peacemakers. They were “the instruments of wholesale murder”, persecutors of all true religion and virtue. The foundations of civilisation were private ownership of property, the family, and belief in God. The Bolsheviks rejected all three. They believed in the common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, and in dialectical materialism. As such they were the enemies of both Man and God. Or so the conservatives maintained.

The Australian Worker, the paper published by the Australian Workers Union in Sydney, put a quite different point of view. They told their readers that the Bolshevik was not the barbarian, as portrayed in the conservative papers of Australia. Lenin was not a lunatic as the capitalistic press had reported, but “one of the most enlightened and educated men of Russia”. The working classes of Australia and the world would in time have cause to bless the communist revolution in Russia. From October 1917 on there would be two conflicting forces in the world - the communists and the capitalists. There could not be and there would not be any reconciliation between them.

The conservatives continued to argue that Australia's main aim should be to win the war in Europe. The radicals in the labour movement replied that the big question for humanity from now on was “the irreconcilable class struggle".
So in the immediate aftermath of the Russian Revolution, the conservatives warned Australians of a possible bloody revolution in Australia. The radicals in the labour movement took up Lenin's theme of the dawn of a new era in the history of humanity. But by 1919 the members of this movement, both political and industrial, were deeply divided on the Russian Revolution. Moscow was already appealing to workers to hasten the victory of the communist revolution throughout the world. The capitalist crisis, they insisted, could be resolved only by a revolution which established the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat divided the labour movement in Australia. All those who had learned their politics from the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin accepted the dictatorship of the proletariat as the essential instrument for the creation of a socialist society. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat conservative forces would destroy the revolution and restore the old order. The dictatorship of the proletariat was the saviour of the revolution.

Other members of the labour movement had learned their politics from the utopian socialists like Edward Bellamy, John Ruskin, the English Fabians and the social teachings of the Catholic Church. They believed that democratic elections were the sources of political power, that the ballot-box was the British way of deciding political differences. Labor must first win a majority in Parliament and then use its political power to create a new society.

In 1920 R.S. Ross, the editor of the Socialist, returned to Melbourne after a visit to Moscow. He had gone there to collect impressions of the Russian Revolution. That year he published a pamphlet: Revolution in Russia and Australia. Ross was a socialist ideologue, an agnostic who did not accept Marx's materialist interpretation of history. He was steeped in the mythology of British institutions: he believed that British political institutions were the best setting for liberty, equality and material progress. Ross argued that Australians would not accept the Russian method of “creating the Kingdom of Heaven by violence”. That was not the Australian way. The Australian political tradition was the use of the ballot-box, freedom of expression, freedom of thought and freedom of association. The Bolsheviks had a one-party State and had suppressed all other political parties. The Bolsheviks did not permit liberty of the press, liberty of conscience or liberty of association. The Bolsheviks, Ross declared, were the spiritual bullies of the post-war world. They dismissed liberty of conscience as a “bourgeois self-indulgence”.

On 30 October 1920 delegates representing the Industrial Workers of the World, the Australian Socialist Labor Party and other militant groups
met in Sydney and agreed to form the Communist Party of Australia. They accepted the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. As they saw it, capitalist society stood "shamed, dishonoured, wading in blood and dripping with filth". They repudiated the doctrine held by the Australian Labor Party that Parliament could be used by the working class "for positive advancement of its class interests". They announced their intention to work for the complete overthrow of the capitalist system and the destruction of the last vestige of the tyrannical bureaucracy by which capitalist society was buttressed in Australia. They were proud to call themselves the party of Marx and Lenin.

From October 1920 to the present day the labour movement in Australia has remained deeply divided between the supporters and the opponents of the teachings of Marx and Engels and Lenin, between the believers in the dictatorship of the proletariat and its critics. This has probably had at least one adverse effect on political thinking in Australia. Both the supporters and the opponents of the Russian Revolution were borrowing their ideas from abroad. Radical political movements went on shouting slogans from overseas: the critics of the dictatorship of the proletariat went on chanting the slogans about the virtues of British institutions. Australians went on drawing their political ideologies from "foreign harvests". Through the many decades of political arguments the American, the French and the Russian revolutions retained their standing as an inspiration for all those who accepted the teaching of the Enlightenment on the capacity of human beings for better things. The debate continues on how these "better things" are to be achieved.
Introduction:
Russia and the "Fifth Continent"

John McNair

It is now more than two hundred years since Australia made its first impact on the Russian consciousness as "The Fifth Continent". While it may have little resonance for Australians themselves, the sobriquet has become a commonplace in Russian accounts of Australia, and the image it evokes of a distant and alluring terra australis incognita seems to have retained some hold over the Russian imagination even to the present day. The novelist Daniil Granin, writing in 1966 of his own visit to the "fifth continent", wryly observes the potency of such vestigial romanticism even in the prosaic world of Soviet officialdom:

In Aeroflot, the girls behind the counter, world-weary and with mirror-like eyes that saw no one, at the mention of the word “Australia” nevertheless raised their heads, and something ethereal enlivened their faces.

Still more recently, it was perhaps similarly ethereal visions of a faraway land of promise and plenty which in 1990 inspired widespread rumours in Moscow and elsewhere of an impending campaign by the Australian authorities to recruit Soviet citizens for immigration and resettlement.

Over the past two centuries, however, an impressive corpus of Russian Australiana bears witness to Russia’s gradual discovery of the reality behind the myth, and to the achievement of Russian mariners, scientists, journalists and travellers in creating the basis for a more objective and factual view of the "fifth continent". The comprehensive bibliography published in 1985 by the Soviet scholar Elena Govor lists a total of 5,925 items relating to Australia published in Russia and the Soviet Union between 1710 and 1983; while many of these are either translations from other European languages or brief notices and book reviews, the number of original Russian works remains very considerable.
and attests to the steady development of a modest but noteworthy tradition of *avstralovedenie* (Australian studies) dating back to the nineteenth century.

Already familiar with translated accounts of the voyages of Cook, Prévost d’Exiles, Laperouse, Tasman, Dumont-Durville and other explorers, Russians were able as early as 1820 to read the first first-hand description of Australia by one of their compatriots. This was only one in a series of reports and memoirs chronicling the sixteen or so Russian naval expeditions which visited Australia between 1814 and 1888. Taking place at irregular intervals, disrupted by the Crimean War and occasionally overshadowed by outbreaks of Russophobia, these voyages nevertheless mark the beginnings of direct contact between the two countries; the accounts, both official and personal, which commemorate them display a lively and informed interest in all aspects of Australian reality - the terrain, the flora and fauna, the life of the Aborigines and settlers - and constitute a unique perspective on the development of the Australian colonies up until the late 1880s.

By then there is ample evidence of an increasingly empirical approach to the “fifth continent” in the form of articles and monographs written to acquaint the Russian reader with contemporary research into various aspects of Australian life. Predictably, perhaps, much of this attention was initially focused on the exotica of the unknown continent - kangaroos, koalas and boomerangs - and on the culture of the Aborigines, the subject of both academic and popular studies, as well as of two Russian reworkings of Carl Lumholz’s *Among Cannibals*. The original investigations conducted from his base in Sydney by the great Russian ethnographer and anthropologist Nikolay Miklouho-Maclay in the 1880s were well publicised in the Russian press and did much to stimulate popular interest in the indigenous population of Australia, their environment and customs. At the same time, Russian readers had had access since the early 1850s to a steady stream of information on life on the Australian goldfields, and from this there developed the more comprehensive concern with the general economic, social and political conditions in the colonies evident in such works as A.F. Fortunatov’s *Population and Economy of Australia* (1898), N.A. Kryukov’s substantial study of Australian agriculture (1906) and the published reports of the Russian consul in Melbourne. In the years following Federation, there was a marked increase in Russian writing on Australia, most notably perhaps in the works of liberal and radical journalists seeking to contrast, however obliquely, the “progressive” achievements of the young Commonwealth with the political and social situation in their homeland. Thus I.V. Shklovsky (writing from London under the
pseudonym "Dioneo") acquainted the readers of the monthly *Russian Wealth* [*Russkoe bogatstvo*] with the constitution of the new "Australian republic [sic]" and with the plans for social reforms (old age pensions, female suffrage) being canvassed in the local press; Australia, he wrote, was "the colony of the future, heir perhaps to more than one culture which will burst forth like lava during the eruption of societies that have outlived their time".\(^\text{12}\) Some years later, P.G. Mizhvev published his *Lucky Australia* (1907) devoted to "social welfare legislation and its consequences",\(^\text{13}\) while L.P. Kupryanova in her *Australia and New Zealand* (1901) devoted particular attention to the political parties and the labour movement.\(^\text{14}\) It was the subsequent development of this movement in general, and the fate of the Labor Party in particular, which brought Australia to the notice of the Russian Marxist press: in June 1913, the Bolshevik newspaper *Pravda* carried an article entitled "In Australia", occasioned by the electoral defeat of the Australian Labor Party. Far from controverting Marxist theories of the class struggle, this event (it was argued) served merely to illustrate how Australia was the exception that proved the rule, and that the Australian Labor Party was in fact "a liberal-bourgeois party", which had come into being "only for a limited period, as the result of certain conditions which are not normal for capitalism in general". The article was signed simply "W", but the author was none other than V.I. Lenin.\(^\text{15}\)

Since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the volume of writing on Australia in Russian and the other languages of the Soviet Union has increased exponentially to embrace virtually all areas of political, economic, social and cultural life. Australian literature, for example, which before the Revolution was represented by a mere handful of translations and critical studies has (at least since the Second World War) found a remarkably wide readership in the USSR and attracted the attention of a considerable number of literary scholars.\(^\text{16}\) All the major issues in Australian domestic policies and foreign affairs have been surveyed and analysed from a Soviet perspective,\(^\text{17}\) while the established Russian tradition of research into Aboriginal society and culture has been continued, most notably by Vladimir Kabo.\(^\text{18}\) Australian studies as an academic discipline has developed rapidly since the 1960s, with major centres of research in three institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences.\(^\text{19}\) Less scholarly but perhaps more significant in their influence on general perceptions of the "fifth continent" are the accounts of the Soviet travellers who have sought to share their impressions of life "down under" with a reading public avid for any information about the outside world.

Informing this profusion and diversity of Russian Australiana are
those ideological preoccupations and priorities which have defined “official” Soviet attitudes to Australia and determined the not always smooth course of relations between the two countries in the twentieth century. If the dominant motifs during the era of the Communist International are solidarity with the Australian workers’ movement and denunciations of Australian capitalism, the emphasis during the Second World War is on the friendship and co-operation between the two allies. The atmosphere of the cold war years, the “Petrov affair” of 1954 and the subsequent suspension of all official contacts found their reflection in expressions of Soviet outrage at Australia’s “provocation”. During the 1960s, Australia’s involvement in the Vietnam conflict was routinely criticised in the Soviet press. From détente to Afghanistan to the “new world order” of the Gorbachev era, the ups and downs of Soviet-Australian relations have been chronicled in Kremlin communiqués, Pravda articles and the other channels of official information which seek to control popular opinion in the USSR.

Whatever the popular “image” of Australia in the Soviet Union, however, it is not to be judged from such pronouncements alone. The personal warmth which shines through even the most ideologically orthodox travel accounts, the genuine enthusiasm for writers like Henry Lawson and Allan Marshall, the apparent popularity of the annual television tribute to Australia Day - all these point to an interest and a sympathy which have endured political tensions and differences. Reports from Australian-based correspondents are no longer the rare events they were in the Soviet media; and if it is true, as has been suggested in this context, that “[a] journalist’s attempts to fit the nation under observation into the conventional perceptions of his audience is often more revealing of the latter than the former”, it is nevertheless the fact that in the age of glasnost’ the Soviet population at large is less disposed to accept conventional stereotypes than it was in the past. One recent Soviet writer has suggested that:

on the level of day-to-day awareness, the fifth continent is still perceived as something exotic, associated mostly with kangaroos, koalas, emus and intricately-painted aborigines.

Yet he also sees in the growing awareness of the Soviet role in the Pacific region generally signs of a new perception of the reality of Australia and of the importance of the Soviet-Australian relationship for the future of both countries.
In the history of contacts between Russia and the "fifth continent", a major chapter rightly belongs to those Russians who in various "waves" of migration have made new lives for themselves in Australia. Their distinctive contribution to the life of their adopted land has received only comparatively recent recognition, and is described in several of the contributions which follow. No less worthy of attention, however, is another aspect of this complex relationship that remains unexplored in any systematic way: the larger question of Australian perceptions of Russia itself. For, as even a cursory survey will suggest, the impact of these perceptions has left its mark on the national consciousness and indeed on the formation of Australia's intellectual and political culture as a whole.

In the nineteenth century, as might be expected, Australian attitudes to Russia reflected British perceptions of the country and her role in international affairs. The warm reception accorded the first Russian visitors to Port Jackson in 1807, in the years of the Anglo-Russian alliance against Napoleon, contrasts sharply with the Russophobia which followed the outbreak of hostilities in the Crimea and the panic which greeted subsequent Russian naval expeditions. While it might be argued from the evidence presented elsewhere in this volume that the colonists' inherited suspicion of Russia and her imperial designs was offset on the personal level by genuine cordiality and respect, it is nevertheless true that antipathy to the Tsarist system and its repressive institutions - itself a legacy from the British liberal and radical traditions - remained long after apprehensions of the Russian "threat" had subsided. The political refugees and disaffected émigrés who began arriving in Australia from Siberia in the last decade of the century encountered the ready sympathy of the Australian radical movement in which so many of them were to play so prominent a part.

It is of course the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 which forms the watershed in the development of Australian perceptions of Russia in the twentieth century, and marks the beginning of that great divide which has traditionally separated the views of "official" Australia from the attitudes of those on the political Left. In the former case, the determining factor has been Australia's alignment with "the West" and in particular, since the Second World War, with the United States. Australia's policy towards the Soviet Union has in general been that of her Allies, and official relations have followed the pattern set elsewhere. It was the decision of the British Government in 1924 to recognise the Soviet state which first established diplomatic contacts between Australia and the USSR, and the formalisation of these relations in 1942 reflected the general rapprochement between the Soviet Union and the other Allied powers.
In the post-war world, Australian-Soviet relations, like American-Soviet relations, soon became embroiled in the politics of the “red scare” and the Cold War; the campaign of the Menzies Government against the Communist Party of Australia, the “Petrov affair” and the rupture of diplomatic relations mark the lowest ebb in the history of the Russian-Australian connection. Restored in 1959, relations grew cordial only after the election of the Whitlam Labor Government in 1972, but again became strained during the years of the Fraser administration, with new fears of the “Soviet threat”; the invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 brought the suspension of all official and cultural exchanges - although Australia did not boycott the Moscow Olympic Games, and the by now significant trade between the two countries was not disrupted. In general, Australian-Soviet relations continue to reflect changes in the international climate and in the political agenda of the Australian Government; and with the election of the Hawke Government and the accession of Gorbachev might be said to have entered a new phase of co-operation and understanding.

As for perceptions of the Soviet Union characteristic of the Australian Left, it is here that we find some echo of that romanticism which has coloured Russian views of the “fifth continent”. Many Australian intellectuals and activists greeted the October Revolution of 1917 with enthusiasm, seeing in it the triumph and vindication of their ideals and hopes for human progress; even those who, like Robert Ross, took issue with the Bolsheviks, looked forward with renewed confidence to an Australian Revolution. The Communist Party of Australia, through organisations like the Society of Co-operation with the USSR (1928) and the Friends of the Soviet Union (1930) sought to mobilise support for the Soviet State after dreams of a universal revolution had faded; committed sympathisers like T. Wright in his Russia To-day, Katharine Susannah Prichard in her The Real Russia and Jessie Street in her public lectures sought - ingenuously or disingenuously - to present to ordinary Australians the “truth” about Soviet achievements. During the Second World War, the Congress for Friendship and Aid to the Soviet Union was formed to rally solidarity with the socialist motherland in its struggle against the fascist invader.

Not all the faith and enthusiasm of those years survived the revelations of Khrushchev’s “thaw” and the trauma of de-Stalinisation. Writing of his 1951 visit to the USSR, the Australian novelist Frank Hardy could still declare, with Lincoln Steffens, “I have seen the future and it works;” nine years later Manning Clark was to strike a somewhat different note in his own travel account, Meeting Soviet Man:
By 1958 most people in Australia except the members of the Communist Party and a rapidly dwindling band of fellow travellers had stopped taking Soviet Man seriously; that is to say, they no longer bothered to study his solution to the problem of equality, his contributions to culture, or his solutions to the problems of the life of man without God.37

By the beginning of the 1970s, the number of the faithful had dwindled even more, and while the new Socialist Party of Australia still bore allegiance to Moscow, the Communist Party now took its lead from Peking. By the late 1980s, the political, economic and ideological crisis in the Soviet Union itself had created new perplexities for those who continued to see in that country “a beacon light to the workers of the whole world”.38

Government policies and the ideologies of the Left aside, however, perceptions in the Australian community as a whole are less easily identified and characterised. The evidence of the mass-circulation press and other mainstream media - arguably mirroring as well as moulding public opinion - would suggest that Russia and the Soviet Union (the terms are seldom differentiated) have only intermittently loomed large in the collective consciousness, and that attitudes have in general reflected the “official” position. If the wartime alliance can be seen as an expression of national sympathy for the beleaguered Russian people, the hostility of the cold war years might equally seem to be the embodiment of apprehensions and suspicions widespread in the population at large. From a survey of Gallup polls conducted in Australia between 1941 and 1970, one historian has concluded:

From the end of the war till the early sixties at least, a considerable if variable proportion of Australians feared the Russians as aggressors and were deeply sceptical about their commitment to peace.39

While anti-Soviet sentiment reached its peak in public and press responses to the Petrov affair - the newsreel shot of Mrs Petrov harassed by her escort at Darwin airport remains for many Australians an emotive image of the cold war period40 - the reaction to more recent incidents like the occupation of Afghanistan in 1979 or the shooting down of the ill-fated Korean airliner and the “Ivanov affair”41 in 1983 point to an abiding distrust of the Soviet Government and its policies. By the same token, on the other hand, the journalistic enthusiasm for Mikhail Gorbachev and his reformist policies characteristic of the late ‘eighties was perhaps an
indication of an equally enduring goodwill towards a nation seen to be breaking free from an oppressive and discredited political system.

The routine coverage of the Soviet Union in the Australian media, no less than that of Australia in the Soviet media, reflects the “conventional perceptions” of their audience; in recent years, however, these perceptions have regularly been challenged and extended by expert analyses of current developments from a wide variety of sources - both Australian and overseas - published in the “quality” press or broadcast on the serious news programs. Since May 1990, Russian-speaking Australians have had direct access to an “official” Soviet view in the daily unedited transmissions of *Vremya* by SBS television. Since the 1960s, Australian interest in and awareness of the whole area of Russian and Soviet studies have been greatly stimulated and enhanced by the strong centres of teaching and research in the field established in several of the universities; Australian academics have made, and continue to make, a significant contribution to international scholarly discourse in these disciplines. Since the 1960s too, Australian travel writing on the USSR seems to have cast aside its rose-coloured spectacles to take a more realistic look at the “the real Russia”; compare, for example, Dymphna Cusack’s *Holidays Among the Russians* (1964) with Blanche d’Alpuget’s “Why Mother Russia still weeps” (1988).

If today it could not be claimed that the Australian public is uniformly or even generally well-informed about Soviet affairs and their larger historical and cultural context, it is nevertheless true that the level of interest in the community at large has never been higher, and that the range of information about Russia and the USSR available to Australians as a matter of course has never been wider.

The links between Russia and the “fifth continent” which can be traced back almost two hundred years have developed in the last decades of the twentieth century into a varied and productive relationship. Once exceptional events, contacts at all levels and in all areas are now almost daily occurrences. Sporting connections, beginning with Soviet participation in the Melbourne Olympics in 1956, are nowadays taken for granted; cultural exchanges, which began with the visit of David Oistrakh to Australia in 1958, now regularly enrich the musical and artistic life of both countries. Under governmental and institutional agreements, Australian teachers, researchers and students now have more (if still not adequate) opportunities to work and study in the USSR; while the number of Australians visiting that country as tourists grows every year. For Soviet citizens such possibilities remain limited; yet, following the relaxation of restrictions on foreign travel, there has been a marked increase in visits to Australia by Soviet academics and, no less
importantly, by private individuals sponsored by relatives in the local Russian community. Commercial relations have grown in significance and diversity since the Second World War; if the pattern of trade remains less evenly balanced than Soviet economists would like, recent changes in the USSR have created new opportunities for joint ventures and other forms of commercial partnership which some Australian companies at least have been quick to take advantage of. New possibilities for cooperation are opening up in other areas too: if the proposed spaceport on Cape York peninsula becomes a reality, it will in all likelihood be as the result of the combined efforts of Soviet technology and Australian business.

The recent increased momentum in the development of Soviet-Australian contacts reflects not only the "new thinking" of the Soviet Government but also a new political understanding between the two countries. To a significant extent at least this is grounded on a new awareness that Australia and the Soviet Union are neighbours on the Pacific rim. Whatever the uncertain future holds for Russia and the Soviet Union - or Australia, for that matter - it seems likely that the recognition of shared regional responsibilities will play a major role in the further development of relations between the two countries. Herein lies the basis, if not for a "spiritual rapprochement", at least for the realisation of common interests and the emergence of a new mutual understanding. A sure foundation for both is the rich and multifarious relationship to which the present volume is a testimony and, its editors hope, a contribution.
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Russians in the Pacific and Russian-Australian Relations in the Nineteenth Century

K. V. Malakhovsky

The third voyage of Captain Cook, in the course of which he visited the Northern and North-Western Pacific, attracted particular attention from the Russian Government and inspired a sizeable number of publications in Russia.¹ The reason for this is clear enough: by the 1770s, Russia itself had established a firm presence in the northern regions of the Pacific Ocean, and was jealous of her interests in the area.

Fifty-five years after the Cossack Ermak had led his armed band over the Urals in 1581, the Russian penetration of Siberia finally reached the Pacific coast in 1636, when a detachment from Tomsk under Ataman Dmitry Kopylov arrived at the shores of the Sea of Okhotsk. In the years that followed, various Russian expeditions charted the coastline north and south of this area: between 1643 and 1651, Poyarkov and Khabarov explored the basin of the river Amur, while in 1648 Dezhnyov and Popov sailed from Kolyma through the Aniansky (now Bering) Strait into the Pacific, proving that Asia and America were separate land-masses, and discovering the Diomede Islands (now Ratamanov and Kruzenshtern Islands) and probably Alaska as well. However, these discoveries had been forgotten by 1724, when Peter the Great commissioned a Great Siberian-Pacific Expedition to explore a passage from the Arctic to the Pacific and to establish whether Asia and America were connected by land or separated by sea. Peter appointed Vitus Bering to head the Expedition, which began in 1728 and continued for over twenty years. In reality, there were several expeditions, involving several thousands of participants: Bering's, which explored the straits between Asia and America, and Chirikov's, which proceeded directly to the North American coast south of the Aleutian Islands, as well as those of Fedorov and Gvozdev to the Diomede Islands and of Shpanberg to Japan. In 1741, Bering and Chirikov set out on another voyage with the object of exploring "Kamchatka, the Kachatsk or Pacific Sea, and the lands and islands lying to the East, South and North."² They made important
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geographical discoveries, as can be judged from a map prepared by one of their companions, Miller, and published in 1758. This map, as a special government report of the early nineteenth century recognises,

provides evidence of the first discoveries made by Russians, the most important of which is the landfall made on the south-west coast of the American continent at latitude 49° North by Captain Chirikov under Bering's command, in 1741; from which time dates the era of Russian commerce on this sea.³

In fact, Miller mistakenly located Cape Chirikov at 55°N, so that despite the existence of Russian settlements south of this (at 48° - 49°N), the Russian Government came to regard as its possession the territory north of 55°N.⁴

The voyages of Bering and Chirikov brought Russia into the Pacific area and caused alarm in Western Europe. As John Campbell wrote in 1748:

. . . If the Russians continue these discoveries, it is possible that they will make discoveries of greater importance and in all likelihood will turn them to great advantage to themselves and to great disadvantage of the rest of the world, especially to the British nation.⁵

The value of the furs brought back by Chirikov's expeditions delighted Russian and Siberian merchants and inspired Sergeant Basov of the Kamchatka garrison to set sail for the hunting grounds "in the island nearest to Kamchatka, called Bering's Island"⁶ in 1743. He opened up the way for Russian trade in the Northern Pacific, and in 1747 and 1750 mounted further expeditions in partnership with the merchant Trapeznikov which returned with furs to the value of 112,220 roubles and 39,376 roubles respectively. Since the best sea-otter and polar fox furs sold at that time for only 50 copecks each, while even silver fox pelts fetched only 1 rouble 50 copecks, the volume of trade was clearly considerable.⁷ Between 1743 and 1803, sixty-five trading companies were formed by Russian entrepreneurs, while proceeds from the sale of furs over this period rose to a total of 6 million roubles.⁸ The Russian Government did all it could to encourage the trade, and claimed a share in the profits. Thus, in 1764, the merchants Yugov and Trapeznikov were granted a monopoly on condition that "as well as collecting on behalf of the Treasury the fur-tribute of the Aleutians, they pay one-third of the proceeds of their own trade."⁹ The local authorities in Okhotsk, Kachatsk
and Kamchatka were instructed to assist their expeditions and even to furnish supplies and crews at public expense in order to maximise the returns to the state. Catherine the Great even instituted a special decoration for merchants who completed their expeditions successfully. One company founded in 1784 paid more than 1,700,000 roubles into the Treasury in thirty years of trading with North West America and the Aleutian Islands.

To protect these valuable interests, Russia declared her sovereignty over the American continent from the North Pole to 55°N, including "the Aleutian Islands and other islands and shores lying to the north." Russian settlements were established on the Andrianovsky Islands, the Lisy Islands, the Paul and George Islands, the Komandorsky Islands and Kadyak, and on Baronov Island. In 1797, the Russian-American Company was established with wide powers over all the Russian territories and the right to explore and claim any unoccupied lands south of 55° N. As the company stepped up its activities, more and more Russian settlements sprang up in America, trading in furs, walrus tusks, whalebone and other commodities in demand in Europe, Asia, and North and South America. At first there was no competition, but in the second half of the eighteenth century the situation changed. As the celebrated Russian navigator I.F. Kruzenshtern noted in his *Voyage Around the World*,

...Captain Cook's third voyage inspired British merchants to active enterprise. After the return of his ships from Macao with news of the huge profits to be made from the sale of sea-otter furs in China, English merchant vessels began to visit the north-west coast of America.

British and American traders now began to penetrate the Russian possessions in America, acquiring furs by means of illegal barter and exporting them to Canton at enormous profit. During his stay in Canton, Kruzenshtern noted how one small British vessel arrived from North West America with a cargo of pelts which was sold for 60,000 piastres. Russian attempts to put an end to this trade through diplomatic negotiations proved of no avail. Russia's own fur trade was routed first through Okhotsk, where the furs were brought from America and the northern islands, and then through Khyakhta. Cargoes were at least two years in transit, and shipwrecks were common. Kruzenshtern at once saw the advantages of shipping Russian furs directly from America to China, and resolved to propose this to the Government on his return from the East.
were, moreover, other problems in Russia's Far Eastern and American possessions which demanded attention. As Kruzenshtern reported:

... All the most essential items were delivered overland by way of Yakutsk and Okhotsk. The huge distances and the extraordinary difficulties in transporting all manner of things demanded the use of over 4000 horses each year and raised the price of all items to extremes, even in Okhotsk. For instance, a pood [16.32 kg] of rye flour, even when prices were low and it was selling in the eastern provinces of European Russia for 40 or 50 copecks, would cost 8 roubles ... 

Transport to Okhotsk was difficult and expensive enough, but from there to the islands or to America it was just as inconvenient and dangerous. Navigation was hazardous and ships were usually ill-constructed and poorly commanded; about a third of all the ships which attempted the crossing foundered. As a result, in Russian North America there was always an acute shortage of bread and other provisions, as well as of weapons and gunpowder. Salt was so scarce that sea-water was used as pickling brine, and meat kept in this spoiled very quickly.

There seemed to be only one solution to the situation: a direct maritime link between European Russia and her North American territories. Regular visits by Russian ships to the Pacific would also serve to avert any attempts by other powers to seize the Russian possessions and make possible the further exploration and charting of Kamchatka, Chukotka, Sakhalin and the Bering Strait, and also the northeast passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

The idea of an expedition to Kamchatka by way of Cape Horn had first been put forward in 1732 at the time of Bering's second voyage. Twenty-three years later, after the cessation of trading operations at Khyakhta, Captain Trevenon and Academician Pallas elaborated a proposal for sending ships to China and Russian America from Archangel [Arkhangel'sk] or the Baltic. Admiral Golenishchev-Kutuzov, later President of the Admiralty, assumed responsibility for briefing the members of the expedition, while the Academy of Sciences provided instruction in the techniques of astronomic observation and calculation. It was decided to send, not two ships as originally intended, but a naval squadron of four warships, in order to give due emphasis to Russia's declaration of sovereignty over the maritime regions accessible to her in North West America and her ban on foreign vessels entering her ports there. By autumn, 1787, the squadron, under the command of Captain Mulovsky of the Kholmogory, was ready to sail, but the expedition was cancelled following the
declaration of war by Turkey and in anticipation of a similar move by Sweden. Mulovsky was killed in a naval battle off the island of Åland in 1789.

It was not until August, 1803, that the first Russian vessels to circumnavigate the globe, the *Nadezhda* [Hope] and the *Neva*, sailed out of Kronstadt under the command of Lieutenant-Commander Ivan Fyodorovich Kruzenshtern. Born in 1770, Kruzenshtern had begun his naval career in 1787, and during the Russian-Swedish War (1788-90) had served as a midshipman under Mulovsky. In 1793, he was one of a group of Russian seamen sent for training to England, and he spent six years on a number of British naval vessels in the Atlantic and the Indian Ocean. He spent almost a year in India, travelling on to Canton on a merchant ship before his return to England in 1799. Here he drafted a memorandum setting out his ideas on the development of a Russian merchant fleet and the organisation of long-range naval voyages. In order to develop Russian trade and navigation in the Northern Pacific, Kruzenshtern argued, it was essential to construct ocean-going vessels on the spot in Okhotsk and on Kamchatka. Taking advantage of her Pacific ports, Russia would then be able to compete with the British and Americans for the China and Japan trade. Goods purchased in China from the proceeds of fur sales could be sent back to Russia by sea, and not overland (through Khyakhta and across Siberia) as hitherto. Trading relations could also be developed with India and the countries of South East Asia through the establishment of a Russian East India Company, which, however, unlike its British counterpart, would not annex territory or maintain garrisons, but would rely on fair and honest trading to guarantee the safety of its commercial interests.

To strengthen the Russian outposts in the Northern Pacific, Kruzenshtern advocated that shipbuilding materials be sent under escort from Kronstadt to Okhotsk, Kamchatka and Russian America. Ship-builders and navigators would also be dispatched to the region, while ships making the journey from Kronstadt to the Pacific were to carry essential supplies, medicines and doctors to the Russian settlements. On the return journey, instead of carrying ballast, the ships would take on commercial cargoes in China, Bengal or Manila and deliver them to St Petersburg. Kruzenshtern calculated that one such cargo would cover the costs of the whole expedition. Moreover, these expeditions would bring great benefits to the Russian Navy, since a single voyage to Kamchatka was more valuable to officers and ratings than ten years of cruising in the Baltic.

Finally, Kruzenshtern suggested that one or two vessels be sent to Kamchatka each year, and that two frigates, to be relieved by other ships
every two or three years, should be stationed in the Northern Pacific. Their task would be to protect the Russian settlements on the coast of East Siberia and North America, to ensure the security of Russian trade and "to undertake further exploration of the largest (eastern) archipelago, which until now remains so little known."

Kruzenshtern sent his memorandum to the Ministry of the Navy in January, 1801, and it was on the basis of his suggestions that the expedition was dispatched in 1803. It was charged with several tasks: to convey an embassy to Japan, to transact business on behalf of the Russian-American Company, to conduct meteorological, scientific and ethnographic research and to explore the region of the Pacific east of Japan, where Spanish mariners in the early seventeenth century had reported a vast mountainous island, rich in gold and silver and inhabited by white people.

The Nadezhda, commanded by Kruzenshtern himself, and the Neva, under Captain Lisyansky, with a combined complement of 129, rounded Cape Horn and entered the Pacific on 3 March 1804, after six months at sea. Following the orders of Rumyantsev, the Minister of Commerce, Kruzenshtern then set his course to the north-east, in order (as he later explained) to avoid those places visited by Biron, Wallis, Carteret, Bougainville, Cook and others, and sailed almost due north. On 7 May 1804, the Nadezhda arrived at the island of Nukukhiva, in the Marquesas. The expedition then visited Hawaii, Kamchatka, Russian America and Japan, where it remained for more than six months. Kruzenshtern explored the coast of Sakhalin and the Amur estuary before returning to Petropavlovsk-on-Kamchatka, from where he began his homeward journey of 23 September 1805.

While Kruzenshtern did not visit Australia, such a visit had at one time been considered a possibility, and the Russian Government, through its Ambassador, Count Vorontsov, had officially informed the authorities in London of preparations for the expedition. In June, 1803, Lord Hobart had duly written to Governor King in Sydney:

Sir,

His Excellency Count Woronzow, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Russia at the Court of St James's, having notified to His Majesty's Government an intended Expedition of two Russian Vessels on a Voyage of circumnavigation and discovery . . . I am to desire that in the event of said Vessels arriving within the limits of your government, you do afford them every assistance, and that you do give directions to the Lieutenant-Governors of the Settlements under your Command, to shew them every
mark of Hospitality and Friendship which the subjects of His Imperial Majesty are entitled to expect. The names of the Vessels are the Neva and Nadegda [sic], commanded by Krusenstiern and Liseanskoy [sic].

I have, etc.,

Hobart. 25

Following the initial voyage around the world, Russian mariners during the first half of the nineteenth century completed thirty-eight analogous expeditions - considerably more than the British and French together.26 In the course of these voyages, Russian ships regularly put in at Australian ports to replenish supplies and water, to carry out repairs and to rest the crews. Invariably, the Russian sailors were accorded warm hospitality and assistance. Since these vessels were usually also engaged in scientific research, there were generally scientists of various kinds on board, and the masters were also men of some education. The captains' reports and log-books of the voyages and the observations of the scientist members of the crews, especially about Australia, are therefore of considerable interest even today.

It is not within the scope of this article to enumerate all the voyages completed by Russian ships in the course of the nineteenth century, or to cite all the published materials of this kind. But I do wish to draw attention to the invariably cordial references of the Russians concerning their sojourn on the "Fifth Continent".

The first Russian ship to visit the shores of Australia was the Neva under the command of Leontiy Vasil'evich Gagemeister [Hagemeister], which put into Port Jackson in 1807. Seven years later, on 12 August 1814, the Suvorov, under the command of Captain M.P. Lazarev, entered Sydney Harbour. For the duration of its stay, the ship was given a place of honour in the shelter of an inlet not far from the residence of the Governor. Towards evening, there resounded the unexpected noise of cannon fired in salute. The navigating officer of the Suvorov, A. Rossiysky, in his journal described their arrival in Sydney as follows:

... An officer sent by the Governor came out to us from Port Jackson with instructions that are issued to all foreign ships concerning their stay at this port. He endeavoured to obtain from us the political news concerning the military situation in Europe. They had not had fresh news for some time, since the mail boat from England comes to New Holland only once a year. As we had taken on board newspapers in England and in Rio-Janeiro [sic], we gave him these for presentation to the Governor. . . . We had barely completed berthing when the thunder of cannon from all the forts announced that the joyful news concerning the capture of Paris
had been received. Everyone rushed to find out the reason. On the streets there was much excitement and running around. Finally, in the afternoon, an official announcement of the news was made. It was marvellous to see the expressions of joy with which we were met and the respect that was accorded to everyone that went on shore from our ship. They dragged off the sailors forcibly to the taverns and stood them drinks in brotherly fashion with cries of 'Russian dobra!, Russian dobra!' [The Russians are good!] : 'French no good!' At nightfall all the city streets were illuminated. Lampions were burning in front of every house. Even in the poorest, there were three or four candles in the windows, and in the more prosperous ones there were even more. In many places they set off rockets. The residence of Governor-General Macquarie was lit up magnificently, and there was an excellent fireworks display. People were gathering in crowds on the square. In one place a magnificent band was playing, and in another a choir performed. Everywhere one could hear sounds of celebration and laughter. In a word, the whole town seemed to be the happiest in the world . . . Who among us could have imagined that on the day after our arrival we should spend our time with such pleasure! 27

In 1820, Sydney was visited by four ships of the largest of the Russian naval expeditions - the Vostok [East], Mirnyy [Peaceful], Otkrytie [Discovery] and Blagonamerennyy [Well-Intended] under the command respectively of F.F. Bellingshausen, M.P. Lazarev, M.N. Vasil'ev and G.S. Shishmarev. In 1819, the Russian Government had decided to send vessels into the regions adjacent to the poles. Vostok and Mirnyy constituted the “division” bound for the latitudes of Antarctica with the task of penetrating as close as possible to the South Pole and establishing whether or not there was a land-mass in the vicinity. The sloops Otkrytie and Blagonamerennyy that formed the second “division” were to search for a sea-route from the Bering Strait to the Atlantic, circumnavigating North America, and deciding the question of the North-West Passage.

The expedition was considered to be a matter of major significance, as is evidenced by the fact that Tsar Alexander I paid a visit to its ships, as Bellingshausen recalls:

... On the 24th June we had the great pleasure of seeing his Majesty, the Emperor, in Kronstadt, who had arrived to review the ships which on his personal command will carry the Russian flag to the most remote limits of South and North. His Majesty deigned to honour the sloops Vostok and Otkrytie with a personal visit, inspected everything and wished us a safe voyage.28
This visit was followed by an Imperial invitation to Peterhof:

... On this occasion, his Majesty was pleased to express his imperial wish that during our sojourn with both civilised and savage peoples we should seek to win their love and respect. We were to treat savage peoples in as friendly a fashion as possible and not to use firearms unless it was absolutely unavoidable.

The commanders of both contingents were given analogous instructions by Admiral Travers of the Ministry of the Navy. The following extracts are from the instructions of 28 June 1819 issued to Lieutenant-Commander M.N. Vasil'ev, who was in command of the expedition to the North Pole:

... The 2nd Division assigned for discoveries is entrusted by his imperial Majesty to the command of Lieutenant-Commander Vasil'ev, who initially will follow the same instructions as those issued to the 1st Division, from which he will operate independently. Calling at the Canaries, he will continue to the Cape of Good Hope and... then proceed South to the furthermost latitude of the southern pole to which he is able to penetrate... Changing meridians in an easterly direction when the season makes it inadvisable to continue sailing in the latitudes close to the South Pole, he will continue the voyage by previously uncharted routes until such time as he reaches Port Jackson in New Holland in order to re-victual his ships and rest his crew...

The sloops Otkrytie and Blagonamerennyy left Kronstadt on 3 July 1819 together with Vostok and Mirnyy. They reached Copenhagen on 11 July, and on 27 July they were in Portsmouth. From England the ships proceeded to the southern hemisphere, which Vostok and Mirnyy reached on 19 August and Otkrytie and Blagonamerennyy on 31 August. On 2 November, Vasil'ev's "division" approached the coast of Brazil, from where it crossed the Atlantic to Cape of Good Hope; then, without stopping on the coast of Africa, it proceeded across the Indian Ocean to Port Jackson. The ocean transit to Australia took until 16 February, that is eighty-seven days without any ports of call. From Sydney, the ships continued north to Fiji on 16 March 1820. In The Observations of Lieut.-Commander M.N. Vasil'ev concerning the Region of New South Wales, the sojourn of the ships in Sydney is described as follows:

... On the 19th, we entered a bay and dropped anchor in Sydney. My first obligation was to see the Governor and to convey to him the
respects of myself and all my officers. He received us very kindly and expressed his willingness to supply us with everything necessary for our voyage. We were allocated a site on the shore to set up an observatory and workshops. Our surgeon, Stein, who also served in the capacity of naturalist, wished in this connection to view the interior, and the Governor willingly acceded to my request and provided guides for a tour of the sights. Academician Korneyev made the trip with our naturalist in order to sketch the views. Both of them brought back much of interest. One found several plants and minerals previously unknown, while the other drew some excellent views. Well-disposed as he was towards us, the Governor satisfied our curiosity completely, and travelled with us into the interior of New South Wales to the towns of Parramatta and Windsor and to the lighthouse at the entrance to Port Jackson which has been built as a result of his concern...31

In the *Mineralogical Observations Made by the Naturalist Stein during a Twelve-Day Journey from Sydney to the Blue Mountains in New South Wales* we read that, "In the overall system of our earth, the Blue Mountains connect in the North by way of the islands lying between New Holland and Asia, with the mountain ranges of Asia and in the East, through the innumerable islands of the Pacific Ocean, with the seaboard Cordillierias". During his journey in New South Wales, Stein noticed a number of curiosities. Close to King’s Tableland he discovered a huge cave which had been unknown until this time, and which he named Levens’s Cave in honour of Commander Levson; while in the bay of Port Jackson, Assistant Surgeon Zaozersky found “the skeletons of two animals no longer existing in New Holland”. Because of the similarity of the rocks and strata to those generally found in countries producing gems, Stein came to the conclusion that precious stones would be found in time in all parts of Australia and surrounding islands.32

We are also given some interesting details in the notes of A.P. Lazarev’s younger brother [Aleksey], who at the time was serving as a lieutenant of the ship *Blagonamerennyy*:

... General Macquarie’s house is built of cut stone and all its precincts are maintained with typical English cleanliness. Opposite his house there is a large green lawn on which many marsupials were running about, and there were cockatoos... Discovering my name, the Governor inquired after my brother and asked that we should visit him as often as possible; he recounted how he had travelled in Russia by post-horses and that he had lived for a short while in Astrakhan. In connection with this, he remembered the Russian word "podorozhnaya" [travel-order], which
had remained engraved in his memory because at every post station he was asked for this document. He was unusually active for his sixty years and much loved by everybody.33

The ships *Vostok* and *Mirnyy* arrived in Sydney seven days later, on 7 April.34 They spent a month in port, repairing damage caused by pack-ice, and sailed out of Sydney Harbour on 8 May 1820. These two vessels made a second visit to Sydney, from 10 September to 1 November 1820 and as M.P. Lazarev put it in a letter to a friend, “it was not without regret that we left this beautiful port - a place where, it could be said, we were received like welcome friends or relations.”35

One of the members of the expedition was the astronomer Ivan Mikhailovich Simonov, subsequently rector of the University of Kazan, where the ethnographic collection he assembled during the voyage is preserved. Addressing a formal assembly of the University on 7 July 1822, Simonov recalled his researches in Sydney, in the course of which the angle of ascent of the fixed stars of the southern sky was defined for the first time since the visit of Lacaille fifty years before.36 Less scientific, but no less interesting, are the recollections of one of the sailors on the *Vostok* recorded in his diary. The following entry is dated 30 March 1820:

... We have arrived at the recently discovered New Holland in the town of Port Zekson [Jackson]. The islands around are inhabited by a great number of savages which live in the bush like wild animals. They have no habitations of any kind and live on kinds of nuts from the trees and on fish. They have a king who wears a badge on his chest bestowed on him by the King of England. And the Captain bestowed on him a Hussar uniform and bronze medal and on his wife a white blanket and a pair of ear-rings.37

Bellingshausen’s account of life in New South Wales in his *Brief Observations about the Colonies of New South Wales* gives some idea of how Sydney looked at this time:

... The city has not been built according to an overall plan. Until the arrival of Governor Macquarie, little attention was paid to standards of building, but now the houses and streets are better. There are a few public and private buildings which would not disgrace the fine cities of Europe. Since the town occupies a large area, the traveller at first glance is inclined to think that the number of inhabitants is large, however it does not exceed eleven thousand! The houses for the greater
part are occupied by one household and each one has a garden, but their price and the cost of renting accommodation are very high.\(^{38}\)

Two years later, in June 1822, Sydney was visited by the sloop *Apollon*, under the command of S.P. Khmshchev. One of the officers, A.P. Shabel'sky, made a tour of the colony of New South Wales with the permission of the Governor (Sir Thomas Brisbane), and published his impressions in the monthly journal *Severnyy Arkhiv* [The Northern Archive] in 1826. A few extracts convey the general tenor:

... No curative waters have so far been discovered, but I observed many mineral springs in the vicinity of Parramatta, particularly near the Nepin [Nepean], which flows beside the Blue Mountains. These springs make their way through ferriferous clay and contain a lot of iron... It seems to me that the Botanical Gardens in Sydney prove what enlightenment can achieve when it is motivated by the desire to benefit mankind. It is only a few years since the garden has been established, but nevertheless one sees with astonishment that it has been laid out in first-class order and with beautiful simplicity... Apart from the Botanical Gardens there is much here to attract the traveller. The largest and most beautiful building in the whole city is the Barracks... The stables of the President and Governor, General Macquarie, would not disfigure the squares of any European city. In constructing buildings of this calibre for his horses, the General only followed the national taste, but it is strange that the municipal church in Sydney is almost completely lacking in distinction. However, this will change soon, as a cathedral of quite attractive architecture is now under construction. Although the hospital is a fairly commodious building, the circumstances of its construction evoke recollections likely to offend the observer's sensitivities. A trading company proposed to General Macquarie that it would build this hospital, but on the condition that it would receive sole rights for seven years to sell spirituous liquor. At the end of this period the company was so wealthy that without suffering ruin it could have set up five similar buildings... It is impossible to define the frontiers of the English colonies on this huge continent. They expand each year. But whenever the traveller happens to stop he is welcomed. With the most friendly courtesy he will be shown all the sights, and he will observe that the most cordial hospitality rules over all the territory of the colonies. On 25 June, everything was ready for our departure. The fort gave the *Apollon* a salute of 13 guns, and it replied in similar fashion.\(^{39}\)

As we have noted, the attitude of the Australians to the Russian mariners was invariably friendly. The position only changed at the time of the Crimean War, when the Australian colonies feared an attack by the
Russian fleet. The fear remained alive in Australia for many years, although the archive material shows clearly that at no time during the war did the Russian Government have any intention of attacking Sydney or any other cities in the Australian colonies. Nevertheless, the Australians set to work on the construction of fortresses in Sydney Harbour.

One Russian visitor to Australia after the war, Midshipman Mukhanov of the corvette *Bogatyr'*, noted how in the past the Australian colonists had been too busy raising sheep, developing natural resources and securing their civic rights to pay much attention to military and naval defences:

It was only the 1854 War against Russia and the presence in the Pacific Ocean of a Russian squadron which compelled the Australians to consider the millions which would inevitably become the booty of the first Russian frigate to take it into its head to have a look at their remote and unknown corner of the world. Even now they speak with a kind of alarm about the years of panic when the name *Aurora* or *Diana* caused them to tremble. But even though their fear was considerable, their energetic measures to defend Sydney were no less considerable... They ceased only with the news of the fall of Sebastopol.40

Further interesting accounts of the voyage of the *Bogatyr'* in 1862-1863 were published by two more of the participants - Vice-Admiral Popov, commander of the Pacific squadron, and Lieutenant-Commander Linden. The corvette arrived in Melbourne on 1 June 1863 and Vice-Admiral Popov was warm in his praise of the town:

... Melbourne is not one of those towns built "off the cuff", just to satisfy the immediate needs of a population that has come rushing to grab as much money as possible and then to return home with it as soon as possible. No, this characteristic, which is general to the majority of the cities that are being built in the Pacific region in our time, does not exist in Melbourne: there you invariably notice that its population has its home there. Moreover, this distinguishing feature does not belong to Melbourne alone, but is common to the Australian colonies. Melbourne, however, sets its sights higher. Undoubtedly, it wants to be the heart and capital of Australia... Already now, in absolutely every respect, Melbourne belongs among the truly important cities of the whole world. I shall not begin to enumerate all its useful institutions, all its amenities for a healthy, active, useful and pleasant life both because my dispatch would turn into a whole book and also because I have prepared for
transmission to St Petersburg a whole library of pamphlets filled with statistical, historical and every possible kind of information, which are published in most generous fashion by the local government . . . Incidentally, in the museum here I found excellent models of various machines used by our Siberian gold-miners, with detailed explanations concerning the advantages and merits of each. The majority of the local population, like Englishmen in general, does not know if we have a literature of our own, and indeed is not certain whether or not we are Christians, yet they apply our machines to their needs with almost greater benefit than the inventors themselves.41

The Admiral was no less enthusiastic in his praise of Sydney, opining that its harbour was indisputably the finest in the world.42 The local wines also elicited his approval, although he found them inferior to the best Crimean vintages.43

Melbourne, according to Lieutenant-Commander Linden, was:

. . . a completely European city which, moreover, has been built in the new style, with wide, paved streets, beautiful buildings, gas-light and sumptuous shops. One of the most remarkable features of Melbourne which immediately catches the eye of all newcomers, is the beauty of its women and their sumptuous style of dress. Indeed, if you are strolling along the street or going to the theatre, you encounter at every step the most attractive, blooming faces of the Australian Englishwomen.

In Melbourne, although it has only existed for such a short time, you can find very many public entertainments which have become an essential need of society. There is absolutely no shortage of places of amusement. There are, for instance, three very presentable theatres, and from time to time there is an Italian opera company.

In general there is a marked animosity between the two rivals, Melbourne and Sydney. During our stay in the first of these cities they usually replied to all our queries about Sydney in the following terms: “When you get there you will be able to judge for yourself the difference which exists between that city and our Melbourne. You won't see such beautiful buildings, the streets are narrow and there isn't the same traffic and life that we have here. It is true that there are people there with fabulous wealth but they don't use their money in the way they should”.44

Midshipman Mukhanov recorded similar impressions of Sydney:

. . . The city was far from what we had expected from the descriptions. It had nothing of the feel of a capital city. Transferred to England, it would
figure among the most second-rate. It also promises less than Melbourne, where the streets are wide and intersect at right angles. In Sydney they are long but irregular. One does see a few handsome buildings, but they are surrounded by two-storey shanties. In general, Sydney does not present those features of a contemporary European city which we encountered in Melbourne at every step. It does not have the same theatres, shops, illumination or the same unceasing, feverish activity...

Mukhanov also describes an evening at Government House:

... We found ourselves in brightly-lit, fragrant rooms, amid fashionable ladies with ringlets cascading over their décolletage. We listened to the charming murmur of conversation and the sounds of "Lucia". It is not often that sailors like ourselves voyaging on the distant waters of the Pacific Ocean have the pleasure of such evenings. But imagine our annoyance when, after a cup of tea which was drunk hurriedly and standing up, and a couple of quadrilles, all the guests streamed in a crowd to the doors. Such is the Sydney custom! It was eleven o'clock, and in the local society this is the accepted signal to leave parties of this kind. On the invitation cards it simply said: Lady Young. At Home.

After the sale of the Russian possessions in America to the USA in 1867, Russian vessels visited Australia less frequently. The visits that took place were mainly ceremonial ones, connected with special events in the Australian colonies. Thus, in 1888, the Russian Government sent the corvette Rynda to Sydney to participate in the festivities marking the centenary of the foundation of New South Wales. The ship’s commander, Captain First-Class Avelan, described the occasion in a report dated 4 February 1888:

... The festivities began on January 12 [old style; January 24 by the Western calendar]. A statue of Queen Victoria was unveiled near the entrance to Albert Park, opposite the memorial to her late husband, Prince Albert... On the following day, January 13 [25], an agricultural exhibition was opened... On that evening, the city and all parks and gardens were brilliantly illuminated. During the course of the whole day on January 15 [27], there was a regatta of private rowing boats, sailing boats and yachts... During the races, the Governor with his guests and a large crowd of sightseers was present on the large steamship Arisaba of the Orient Line, which was magnificently decorated, and where free refreshments were provided to the public. On the evening of this day there was a large dinner at the Governor's, after which he gave a
reception, but without dancing . . .

On January 18 [30] in the morning there was the laying of the foundation stone of the new parliament building, and in the evening a grand concert in the building that had housed the World Exhibition, and at the same time there was a ministerial banquet at Parliament House. This banquet dragged on until after midnight and was more like a parliamentary debate, since it was taken up completely by the speeches which were made by all the governors, by the representatives of the upper and lower houses and the representatives of the press of all the colonies. The theme of these speeches predominantly centred on the idea of a Union or federation of all taxation revenues, one faction, of course, being for this idea and another against it. The festivities concluded on January 20 [February 1] with a magnificent fireworks display on the harbour-front which was let off simultaneously from all the ships, forts and various places on the shore. The naval ships, as well as our corvette, were all supplied by the government with multi-coloured lanterns and with rockets and Bengal lights, which by previous agreement were set off at a signal from the Admiral. All the expenses incurred in the organisation of this nine-day celebration were met exclusively from government funds, and the total amount spent must represent a very sizeable sum.47

Among the number of Russian scientists who visited Australia towards the end of the nineteenth century, the first place belongs indisputably to N.N. Miklouho-Maclay. His work there is well known and there is no need here for any detailed account. Another Russian visitor, E.P. Zimmerman, describes how he heard of Miklouho-Maclay wherever he went in the colonies:

... In Adelaide, they told me that I would catch up with him in Sydney. I was told the same in Melbourne, and not only by learned people but by persons that were far from the world of science. I purposely mention this circumstance, since from it one can judge the wide renown which the name of our compatriot enjoys on the Southern Continent. 48

The work of Miklouho-Maclay in South East Asia and in Oceania was widely discussed in the Russian press of that time. There was also great interest in his Australian activities. The St Petersburg newspaper Golos [The Voice], for instance, having established a direct link with Australia, began to receive detailed information about Miklouho-Maclay. For instance, on 3 July 1880, the newspaper in its issue No. 182 printed a report from a correspondent in Brisbane, dated 20 May:
The famous Russian traveller, Miklouho-Maclay has been in Brisbane from 12-18 May. He has only recently completed a difficult journey to the islands of Northern Malay and Western Polynesia which was devoted to scientific purposes, and he now intends to deepen his knowledge of the Australian continent. At the present time he has already left Brisbane for a destination 500 miles from here where he intends to investigate a tribe of black aborigines which has almost become extinct, and is consequently very uncommon, and also such other tribes as he may encounter.

Mr Miklouho-Maclay is subsequently planning to acquaint himself with the black tribes in South Australia, where he plans in future to traverse the whole continent from Adelaide to Port Darwin . . . He does not like to be the subject of press reports, but knowing the degree to which the Russian public is interested in his activities, I consider it my duty to pass on any news about this remarkable traveller.

This report from Brisbane was soon reprinted in the newspaper Moskovskie Vedomosti [Moscow Mail], No. 209, and in a number of other newspapers. At the end of September, 1880, the Geographical Society received from Miklouho-Maclay a detailed account of his work during “his sojourn in Sydney from August 1878 to March 1879.” This was subsequently published in the Izvestiya Geograficheskogo Obshchestva [Geographical Society News] for 1880. Here the scientist set forth the program of his research in Australia:

1. The continuation of a comparative anatomical study of the brain plagiostomata. (This is advancing rapidly).
2. An investigation with detailed photographic illustrations of the brain of the aborigines of Polynesia, Australia, Malay. (This has been commenced).
3. An anthropological study (with photographs) of the Australians (In progress).
4. A study of the brain of the following species: Ornithorynchus echidna, Halicore dugong, Ceratodus Forsteri (In spe)
5. A continuation of my ethnological description, "Artes papuanae" (In progress)

During his stay in Australia he published a number of scientific papers in the Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales, and waged a successful campaign for the establishment of a zoological research station at Watson’s Bay.

Miklouho-Maclay’s last visit to Australia was in 1887, when he
sailed from Odessa to Sydney to collect his wife and sons. His travels are recorded in a detailed letter headed "A Few Days in Australia: travel sketches." Here he reports, for instance, that in Adelaide he came across a successful experiment in tree-planting in the arid lowlands of South Australia. Another topic of interest was that unwelcome "guest", the rabbit:

... From a zoological point of view it is a matter of interest that the European rabbit has changed its habits very considerably in Australia and has adapted so easily to its new environment. It has begun to scramble over fences, to get up into trees, like an Australian possum, to cease being afraid of water. Even the rivers are no obstacle to its spread...

In Sydney, in May, it was reported as a fact that the government of the colony of New South Wales intended to offer a prize of 25,000 pounds sterling (which according to the present rate of exchange equals 260,000 roubles) for the best method of exterminating rabbits... The offer of such a high prize is not particularly surprising, since the budgets of the colonies show that in Victoria a sum of over a million pounds sterling has been spent to date on the eradication of these animals, and in New South Wales the losses caused by rabbits and the expense involved in their extermination cost the colony over 500,000 pounds sterling annually.

On this occasion Miklouho-Maclay did not spend long in Sydney, leaving with his family on 24 May and arriving in St. Petersburg on 14 July 1887, some five months after he had left Odessa. He died on 2 April 1888.

From the late 1850s, honorary Russian consuls were appointed to assist Russian subjects in Australia. Writing from Melbourne on 13 November 1881, E. Zimmerman described the local representative of Russian interests for the readers of Otechestvennye zapiski [Notes from the Fatherland]:

... Mr Damyon - that is the name of our consul - is an Englishman by birth, but lived for a considerable time in Russia, mostly in the South. He learnt Russian by the same means by which the majority of foreigners learn our language today - that is to say he lived for a few months in the country as a paying guest with one of the village priests who offer their services as language tutors to foreigners. As a consequence Mr Damyon even now not only speaks but even writes Russian reasonably correctly, which is not frequently the case with our consuls in distant parts of the world. In spite of Australia's remoteness from Russia, however, Mr Damyon frequently has occasion to receive Russian subjects in Melbourne. From time to time squadrons call in on their way from Russia
to the Pacific Ocean. While I was there, the consul received letters, Russian newspapers and journals for transmission to the naval vessels which are expected here on their return voyage to Russia.

What interested me the most, however, was to learn of the arrival in Melbourne of two sailing ships under the Russian flag. They had arrived from Finland with a cargo of building timber which can be disposed of very profitably in these parts. For the return voyage, the ships load wool here for delivery to Europe. In this manner the enterprising Finnish skippers every year carry out overseas voyages from Russia to the southern hemisphere. What surprised me, however, was how such goods could be exported here with any profit considering the abundance of virgin forests here in Australia. I took the opportunity to discuss this with some local carpenters, who explained to me that the forests here do not contain any coniferous varieties and consist almost entirely of eucalyptus, which give a rugged and close-grained timber unsuitable for a number of applications in building. For window frames, doors and even for floors, they therefore prefer here to use soft wood which is imported from North America or from Russia.

The first actual consul to be appointed by the Russian Government in Australia was A.D. Putyata, who held the rank of collegiate councillor in the Civil Service. On his arrival in Melbourne in January 1894, he made a formal call on the Governor of Victoria, Lord Hopetoun, and informed him that the appointment of a consul by the Russian Government was prompted by a desire to become better acquainted with the economic development of the British colonies in Australia. Following the appointment of regular consuls, their dispatches relating to various aspects of Australian economic life began to be published in the Russian periodic press. Reviews of the state of the Australian mining industry, with particular reference to the production of gold, were published in Russian journals in the eighties and nineties.

Australia was regarded as a market with considerable potential for the sale of Russian merchandise. During the 1894 International Exhibition, the consul in Melbourne reported: “The exhibition which is about to open is an excellent opportunity to send our goods. The Australians are enthusiastic about the idea of organising a Russian section at the exhibition.” The consul named a wide range of Russian products for which Australia would provide a ready market: timber, oil, kerosene, textiles, rye flour, beer, sugar, leather, soap, vodka, sunflower oil and candles.

In a report of the Department of Trade and Manufacturers, which appeared in the Vestnik finansov, promyshlennosti i torgovli [Bulletin of Finances, Industry and Trade] much emphasis was placed on the role of
the “great Siberian Railroad” which would assist in bringing “the main commercial centres of the Russian Empire closer to the shores of the Pacific Ocean”. At the same time, it was pointed out that, thanks to the geographical position of its ports on the Black Sea, Russia was “a great deal closer to Australia than Germany and the other European states.”

But Russian interest in Australia at this time was not merely commercial. In 1903, at the very beginning of this century, the Russian natural scientist Aleksandr Leonidovich Yashchenko made a journey to the continent, in the course of which he assembled an extensive ethnographical collection, now preserved in the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography in Leningrad.

The general upsurge of interest in the economic and socio-political development of the British colonies in Australia at the end of the nineteenth century was felt in Russia as in the rest of the world. From the 1890s onward, books examining various aspects of Australian history began to appear, at first translated from other languages, but later original studies in Russian too. The Russian Australiana of the beginning of the twentieth century totals several dozen books. Generally speaking, the authors of these books belonged to the liberally-inclined Russian intelligentsia, and therefore they sought not only to acquaint their readers with the historical development of the British colonies in Australia, but also to emphasise those aspects of the political life of the continent which were of interest for Russia. After all, this was the period which directly preceded the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917, and as the well-known Russian economist Professor A.F. Fortunatov wrote:

... However far Australia might be from us, and however alien many of the aspects of the life there may seem, it can surely not be denied that any Russian who is concerned about the economic well-being of Russia will find there is a great deal to be learnt from what is going on in the Antipodes.

An examination of the views of these early Russian students of Australian history goes beyond the scope of the present article. It will be enough, in conclusion, to indicate the three subjects which attracted the greatest amount of attention: the development of democratic institutions, the workers' movement and the system of land ownership and land use.

Translated by Boris Christa
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N.N. Miklouho-Maclay came to Australia in 1878 from Singapore, where he had been ill for some time. His health was one of the reasons for the journey, but not the principal one: his doctors in Singapore had indeed advised him to go to Australia, but they suggested South Russia and Japan as well. In order to discover the main motive behind his choice of Australia, we must return to Singapore, three years previously.

In May 1875, during the interval between his first and second expeditions around Malacca, Miklouho-Maclay proposed the establishment of a Russian protectorate over a portion of New Guinea, and asked for money to be dispatched to him for a journey to the Maclay Coast. In October 1875, not waiting for a response, he declared that he would appeal to the Russian Tsar "as Tamo-boro-boro (highest headman) of the Papuans of the Maclay Coast... with a request for the protection of my country and my people." In February 1876, the distinguished geographer P. P. Semyonov-Tianshansky wrote him that his proposal had been rejected "at the highest level" and that the Russian Geographical Society had declined to provide financial assistance. He also expressed his sorrow that Miklouho-Maclay was turning his attention from science to purely practical concerns. This letter only reached Miklouho-Maclay at the end of January, 1878. Before that, during 1876-77, he had spent almost one and a half years on the Maclay Coast (having borrowed money for the expedition in Singapore at high rates of interest), and in the middle of January 1878 had returned from there to Singapore. Still unaware of the rejection of his plans "at the highest level", he was preparing to return to Russia; however, when he learned of this response, he decided to go instead to Australia as plenipotentiary of the Papuans of the Maclay Coast, their supreme leader, Tamo-boro-boro, in order to protect "his blacks" from the threat of colonisation, and ultimately to set up on the Maclay Coast an independent Papuan state, the Papuan Union. It was in this that Semyonov-Tianshansky saw a turning away from
scientific to purely practical concerns. For Miklouho-Maclay, however, science was always closely linked with practical matters. As long ago as 1868 in Jena he had chosen New Guinea as the site for the creation of an independent state under his rule. The study of the Papuan language (at the time he supposed that all Papuans spoke the same language) and Papuan culture was for him not an end but a means: it was his intention to build his Papuan Union on the basis of the local language, communal institutions and customs. Possibly it was this he had in mind on Cape Garagassi at the end of September 1871, reclining on the trunk of a fallen tree, content to have reached the first rung of the long ladder leading to the realisation of his goals.

For this very reason he did not want to leave the Maclay Coast in 1872. As Miklouho-Maclay noted in his diary, “I am already quite accustomed to the idea of remaining all my life on this coast.” Right from the start he set himself a practical goal - first the establishment of the Papuan Union, and secondly the study of other representatives of the “Papuan race” (the Negritos of the Philippines and Malacca, and Melanesians). He left “his coast” and “his blacks” only when he found out that there was a possibility of returning soon on a Dutch vessel which would sail (around New Guinea) from Java. For this reason, he travelled from the Maclay Coast to Java. He named the coastline of Astrolabe Bay after himself, Maclay Coast, in order to emphasise that this was his coast, his country, his people. His hope of returning on the Dutch vessel did not eventuate, however, and he lacked the funds for an independent expedition. It was then that he turned to the second of his objectives - the study of different representatives of the “Papuan race” - since this would involve no great expense. He travelled to the coast of Papua-Koviai (1873-74) and completed two expeditions around Malacca (1874 and 1875). At the same time, the idea of returning to the Maclay Coast, as he wrote, “came fairly often into my mind during these two years.”

Even on the coast of Papua-Koviai, already colonised by the Dutch, he set himself a practical goal - he wanted to establish, if not an independent state, then at least an autonomous (and virtually independent) Papuan region under his administration. The form of this authority was not fully clear to him: whether he would make do without importing Europeans to Papua-Koviai and rely on a few dozen Javanese soldiers (as he wrote to the Russian Geographical Society), or whether he would establish on this coast a small European settlement (as he wrote to the Governor-General of the Netherlands East Indies). One thing was clear to him - he must have complete independence of action from the Dutch authorities. The Governor-General of the Netherlands East Indies, who had rendered him every assistance in his scientific investigations, blocked
this attempt of Miklouho-Maclay to turn to practical matters and turned
down his request.

Why did Miklouho-Maclay set himself a practical goal as his first
priority, but the study of the "Papuan race" as the second? The reason
was that in his life ideas were inseparable from deeds, and could be proved
only by action. The conceptual basis of his researches is set out in an
essay he wrote on South America: race is the result of the influence on
people of the natural environment and ways of life; the physical
characteristics acquired by one generation (colour of skin, shape of skull,
type of hair, etc.) are passed by inheritance to another, becoming stronger
from one generation to another and leading in the end to the appearance
of a new race. This concept (which, incidentally, contains elements of
Lamarckism and is not without its weaknesses) cannot be proved by
means of observation, and he was compelled to confine himself in his
reports and scientific works only to hypotheses. Moreover, it is possible
to demonstrate with the help of this concept exactly the opposite (the
inequality of races), as indeed did the polygenists: whites live in a good
natural environment, they contend, and therefore whites are the
superior race; the blacks live in a poor environment, and that is
why they will never rise to the level of civilisation.

It is important to remember too that Miklouho-Maclay lacked the
time for lengthy scientific researches; the threat of colonisation hung
over New Guinea, including also the Maclay Coast. Later on, after
colonisation, it would be too late to prove anything, especially in the
field of ethnography which, as he himself acknowledged, was not his
specialty. Therefore he strove to take the problem of race beyond the
confines of theoretical disputes in scientific lecture-halls, and to carry
on this debate by means of practical demonstration. He bowed down,
in the words of I. P. Pavlov, before "the almighty fact", determined
not only to search for those facts which refuted racism, but to produce
them by his own practical efforts. The racists said that an abyss existed
between whites and blacks, but Miklouho-Maclay would live among
the Papuans just as they lived, "in order to become almost one of them" (later he would call himself a "white Papuan"). The racists said that
Papuans could not rise to the level of civilisation, but he would
raise them to this level and establish a flourishing state on the Maclay
Coast.

The path leading to this goal turned out to be longer than he had
imagined in September 1871, reclining on the trunk of a fallen tree at
Cape Garagassi. The Papuans were not a single people speaking one
language, as he - like Ernst Haeckel before him - had thought, but a great
number of tribes, speaking various languages. In 1871-72 he united
the Papuans of the coastal strip under his rule, and in 1876-77 he enlarged this strip and strengthened his influence, but at the same time became convinced that, by themselves, the Papuans would not be able to offer the necessary resistance to the colonisers. This was why he raised the question of a Russian protectorate over the Maclay Coast and, having been refused, he went to where he could keep in touch with all events connected with New Guinea, i.e. to Sydney. "There was no better observation post," as E. M. Webster notes. 8

Immediately upon arriving in Sydney from Singapore, he learnt of the threat hanging over the Maclay Coast. "My coast is in grave danger," he wrote to his sister at this time. "I feel vexed, and sorry for my blacks." 9

In Sydney Miklouho-Maclay was received by many influential figures. He lived in the home of William Macleay, member of the Legislative Council of New South Wales, zoologist and owner of a zoological museum. Alongside his efforts to protect the Papuans of Maclay Coast, Miklouho-Maclay undertook intensive study in zoology and anatomy, continuing investigations begun in his student days. At that time he had conceived the idea of a large work in five parts, Contributions to the Comparative Neurology of the Vertebrates, but had published only two parts (on the cerebrum of the shark and on the middle brain of the ganoid and bony fish respectively). On Java in 1873 he resumed this work, gathering material for a fifth part (the brain of dark-skinned races), but was forced to give it up within two weeks, for want of appropriate accommodation.

During the next five years he had little time for comparative anatomy and lacked, besides, a suitable place to carry out such a study. Only in 1878, upon arriving in Sydney, could he return to this topic, "considering the investigation of the brain of dark-skinned races a matter of first importance for anthropology", 10 as he wrote Professor Rudolf Virchow. He was given six Melanesian brain specimens by one hospital, and managed to obtain elsewhere brain samples of Australian Aboriginals and Polynesians; furthermore, he made a study of the brains of mammals (dingo, dugong, echidna, etc.). He worked in Macleay's museum and in the Australian Museum for 8-10 hours a day. While Macleay and Edward Ramsay, curator of the Australian Museum, assisted him in his research, Miklouho-Maclay even here had no suitable laboratory; therefore (as early as in 1878) he put before the Linnean Society of New South Wales the question of establishing a zoological station in or near Sydney. 11 Having obtained the agreement of the Society's members, he approached the Secretary for Lands, the Colonial Secretary and other government officials, who earmarked a site for a zoological station close
by Sydney, in the area of Watson's Bay. Having obtained this, Miklouho-Maclay started to collect money by subscription.

One might ask why did he not prepare the results of his ethnographic and anthropological investigations in New Guinea, Malacca, the Philippines and the islands of Melanesia and Micronesia for publication. He provided an answer to this question in 1877 when he was living among the Papuans of his coast, at Point Bugarlom: “I decided neither directly nor indirectly to assist the establishment of relations between whites and Papuans.” The publication of the results of his ethnographic investigations would indirectly have facilitated the penetration of New Guinea by white colonisers.

In January 1879 he sent an official letter from Sydney to the High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, Sir Arthur Hamilton Gordon. As he informed the Secretary of the Russian Geographical Society: “I considered it my duty to set forth... some points to which I would wish to direct his attention as ‘High Commissioner’ should the British Government consider it necessary (as is probable) and opportune to annex the south-east half of New Guinea.” In his letter to Gordon, Miklouho-Maclay asked the British Government to recognise the right of the Papuans of the Maclay Coast to their land, and in the event of their attempting to defend these lands with weapons against the claims of white invaders, not to dispatch punitive expeditions. Copies of the Gordon letter were sent to the Admiral-General, Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich, and to Semyonov-Tianshansky. Miklouho-Maclay understood that Gordon could restrain only British subjects from seizing land on the Maclay Coast; he still hoped to find protection for “his blacks” in Russia, seeing that in Australia his voice “remains for the present a voice in the wilderness.” In letters to his family he wrote of his intention to return shortly to Russia.

In 1879 the Australian Colonisation Society was formed to promote Australian colonisation of New Guinea. Miklouho-Maclay changed his plans, and decided not to go to Russia, but to the Maclay Coast. Understandably, he told no one of the real purpose of this trip, and even sought to conceal it with talk of his desire to visit various Melanesian islands for scientific purposes. It is interesting that he mentioned this desire in a letter to Virchow, evidently hoping that the latter would publish the letter in a German journal. In the letter to Virchow, incidentally, the Maclay Coast was not mentioned. But in a written agreement with the skipper of the schooner Sadie F. Caller, it appeared in the first clause: “The three-masted schooner Sadie F. Caller, after visiting New Caledonia, the New Hebrides, the Solomons and other islands will put in at the Maclay Coast of New Guinea, where it will remain at least 14 days.” Dr Otto
Finsch, who knew Miklouho-Maclay personally, wrote that the Russian scholar on board the schooner Sadie F. Caller wanted to visit Astrolabe Bay, investigate the coast and arrange trade links, where possible, with the local Papuans. Miklouho-Maclay usually answered Finsch's enquiries evasively, and in this case evidently told him far from everything. It is not improbable that in the space of two weeks he planned on building himself a hut on Maclay Coast and staying there to live among the Papuans.

If indeed he made such plans, he was far from confident that he could fulfil them. He wrote on 3 April 1879, five days after the schooner sailed from Sydney:

> If I had a chance to return to the Maclay Coast and stay among the natives, as I sojourned there some three years, I would probably write no letters but would prove in deed that it is possible, with some patience, the necessary modicum of tact, a real understanding of the character and position of both sides [i.e. the Papuans and white Australians N.A.B.], and a knowledge of the language and customs of the natives, to avoid the unjust and cruel destruction of the natives.  

Miklouho-Maclay's tragedy was that he could visit the Papuans only in the company of the least worthy representatives of the other side, the whites. After five days on the schooner with these whites, he understood that, even with all the patience and tact in the world, he would scarcely be able to protect his black friends from injustice and cruelty if he permitted his companions a two-week stay on the Maclay Coast. He soon saw himself how cruelly the skipper and sailors treated the inhabitants of the islands which they visited. The proposed visit to the Maclay Coast proved impracticable, and a longer sojourn on the vessel seemed pointless, and when the schooner was stuck for almost a month in the lagoon of the Candelaria reef (July 1879), he decided to return to Sydney. However, it was not Miklouho-Maclay but the skipper who commanded the schooner, and they were obliged to call in at the Admiralties (which he had already visited in 1876) and a number of other islands.

Only in January 1880 was Miklouho-Maclay able to leave the schooner at the Basilaki islands (Louisiade Archipelago) in order to visit villages on the southern coast of New Guinea on the mission steamer Ellangowan and settle the question of a "yellow race". By May 1880 he was in Brisbane. He lingered there for nine months (Queensland was particularly active in the campaign for the colonisation of New Guinea), occupying himself, among other things, with his research into
comparative anatomy. From Brisbane he undertook a trip to the Queensland interior (by train, and then by wagon) to verify a rumour about the existence of a tribe of completely hairless people in the outback. In his scientific investigations he was greatly aided by G. M. Kirk, the proprietor of the Gulnaber cattle station on the Ballone River. Further assistance was given by Joshua Bell, of Jimbour station, near Dalby, with whom he stayed for several weeks, and by Donald Gunn of Pikedale station near Stanthorpe and Clairvaulx station near Glen Innes; and also by the Australian explorer Augustus Charles Gregory, of Reinvart, near Brisbane, with whom he lived for one and a half months.

At Reinvart, Miklouho-Maclay wrote an account for the Russian Geographical Society of his voyages on the Sadie F. Caller and the Ellangowan which lasted in all over thirteen months. There he also contemplated an expedition into the Australian interior to study the remnants of native tribes, but this dream never came true. With the permission of the Queensland authorities, he obtained the heads of executed Aborigines, placing the brains in a solution of chromium potassium and alcohol without extracting them from the skull; after about two or three days, once the brains had hardened, he removed them from the skull and photographed them from eight sides. In addition, he procured the corpse of an Aboriginal man, and after a thorough preliminary study, packed it in a barrel and sent it to Virchow in Berlin. He also wrote from Brisbane to the commissioners of the International Exhibition then being held in Melbourne, proposing that several Aboriginal families be assembled (husband, wife and two children of various ages) from all regions of Australia at the Exhibition and that a competent person be entrusted with the task of scientifically describing, measuring and photographing all of these 20-25 individuals. The commissioners, lacking the necessary means, were unable to carry out such a project.

In January 1881 Miklouho-Maclay arrived in Sydney from Brisbane. Again the New South Wales Government facilitated his scientific investigations, making available premises for the study of comparative anatomy and a photographic workshop. It also assisted, financially and otherwise, in the construction of a biological station at Watson's Bay, where Miklouho-Maclay worked for more than six months, and provided him with free, year-long train passes, suitable storage space for his collections and other items and material for his research in the form of the brains of Melanesians kept in Sydney Hospital. As a member of the Linnean Society, Miklouho-Maclay lectured on zoological and anatomical problems at its meetings, and published articles in its journal. The Australian ethnographer P.M. Worsley has pointed out that during these
years, Miklouho-Maclay enjoyed greater recognition in Australia than in his own country.  

In 1881 the German traveller and ethnographer-collector Otto Finsch arrived in Sydney on a secret mission from Bismarck - to colonise the eastern part of New Guinea. Finsch became acquainted with Miklouho-Maclay. "What partly surprised me," the Russian wrote later, "was his detailed knowledge of my articles on the ethnography of the Maclay Coast and his questions about New Guinea, although Dr Finsch never gave any hint of his intention to go to New Guinea."  

In April 1881 Miklouho-Maclay asked Sir Arthur Gordon to prevent the sending of a New Zealand expedition to the Maclay Coast. Gordon "found it possible to interfere, so that this expedition could not take place."  

In August 1881 a letter arrived in Australia from white missionaries in Port Moresby reporting that twelve teachers - Rarotongan Christian preachers - had been killed in one of the villages. The process of converting the inhabitants of the southern coast to Christianity had begun with the arrival of the Rarotongan teachers in 1872, but the first three Papuans, residents of the village of Anuapata, were baptised only in 1881. In view of such moderate success, the teachers should have behaved more cautiously. Meanwhile, they banned local customs, dances, songs, etc. and, moreover, as one missionary, the Reverend James Chalmers, later admitted, behaved imprudently in their treatment of the Papuan women. In response to this letter from Port Moresby, an Australian punitive expedition was dispatched to the southern coast. Knowing that this represented a threat to the Papuans, Miklouho-Maclay joined the expedition with the object of averting disaster. "My plan fully succeeded," he wrote. "Instead of the burning of the village and the total extermination of its inhabitants, the affair was limited to a few fatalities in the course of a skirmish in which the main culprit in the murder of the missionaries, the village chief by the name of Kwaipo, was killed, and to the destruction of the chief's hut."

In 1881 at Clovelly, the home of the former premier of New South Wales, Sir John Robertson, Miklouho-Maclay met Sir John's daughter, Margaret. She was at this time twenty-two years old. She had been married at the age of seventeen, but very soon lost her husband and had already been a widow for five years. Miklouho-Maclay confided to her his plan for development of the Maclay Coast (The Maclay Coast Scheme).

The essence of the Maclay Coast Scheme was that Miklouho-Maclay would assist the Papuans, on the basis of their own institutions and customs, which he knew well, to reach a higher stage of purely native
self-government: he would set up a Council, comprising the most influential elders of the principal villages; the Council would expand the construction of roads, bridges and schools, and would introduce better methods of cultivation and establish trade links with other regions of New Guinea, and possibly also with other islands of the Western Pacific. The Maclay Coast would become a major centre of tropical farming, and the Papuans would achieve this themselves; but Miklouho-Maclay would be their adviser and their representative in their relations with foreigners. In elaborating this plan, Miklouho-Maclay was not indulging in fantasies - Australians had come to the conclusion fifteen years before that New Guinea would soon "become one vast plantation unequalled by any other country of the world". They stipulated a condition, however: Europeans would manage affairs. Miklouho-Maclay was of a different opinion - the Papuans themselves could and must manage their own affairs in their own land.

It is unlikely that Margaret's relatives and friends knew that Miklouho-Maclay had initiated her into his plans, but they soon realised that Margaret would follow him, wherever he called her. But where would that be? It was clear that he would not remain in Australia, and he did not have the means to return to live in Russia. The idea that she might go with him to New Guinea, to the Papuans, was quite unthinkable for them.

The Maclay Coast Scheme could be realised only if Miklouho-Maclay's right to this coast was recognised. This might indeed have happened had his coast become part of the British or Australian possessions. Miklouho-Maclay was counting precisely on this in sending his letters to high-ranking officials in Britain and Australia, but he miscalculated. He did not see that the chief threat to his coast emanated not from England or Australia, but from Germany, specifically from Finsch, who often visited him at Clovelly and at Watson's Bay and who tried to obtain from him as much information as possible on the Maclay Coast and its inhabitants. Finsch later wrote that Miklouho-Maclay was not communicative and that he got nothing useful from him for his purposes, but this was not so.

Miklouho-Maclay was placing his chief hopes, however, on Russia. In 1881 a new Tsar, Alexander III, came to the throne. At the beginning of 1882 Miklouho-Maclay left Sydney for Russia. Margaret, in taking leave of him, made him a present of her photograph, on the back of which she wrote six letters: NBDCSU. According to her grandson, Rob Maclay, this meant: "Nothing but death can separate us." In Alexandria Miklouho-Maclay learned of the death of his sister Olga in a letter from Prince Alexander Meshchersky. Now he could rely only upon Margaret's
help in his work on the Maclay Coast. Still in Alexandria, he wrote to her with a proposal of marriage.28

Tsar Alexander III, having received Miklouho-Maclay at Livadia, gave instructions to the director of the Ministry of the Navy, Admiral I. A. Shestakov, to assist the Russian scholar in his plans. Shestakov was not pleased: Maclay, he thought, wanted to be Tsar on New Guinea. In November 1882 he noted in his diary: “Most of the day was spent with Maclay . . . I want to send the Skobelev to Aleksei and then to Pel’u.”29 “Aleksei” was Port Alexei on the Maclay Coast, while “Pel’u” was the Palau archipelago, in particular the Babeldaoab islands, where Miklouho-Maclay had acquired two tracts of land during a visit on his way to the Maclay Coast in 1876. Both parties came to an agreement: Miklouho-Maclay would stay a fixed period in Australia, where the naval corvette Skobelev would wait for him, and convey him to the Maclay Coast, and after that to the Palau archipelago. A month later Miklouho-Maclay received a letter from Margaret: she consented to become his wife.

On his way to Australia from Russia Miklouho-Maclay visited Western Europe, and in Britain received assurances that his rights to the Maclay Coast would be recognised by Britain. “I think,” he wrote his brother Mikhail on 5 February 1883, “that my hopes with regard to the Maclay Coast will come true.”30

Upon arriving in Batavia, Miklouho-Maclay saw the corvette Skobelev at anchor, on its way to Australia to collect him. He transferred from the passenger vessel to the corvette, and wrote to Mikhail: “I find myself quite unexpectedly en route for the Maclay Coast.”31 Now the Captain of the Skobelev, N.V. Kopytov, would not have to go to Australia, but with Miklouho-Maclay on board, could proceed directly from Batavia to the Maclay Coast.

Miklouho-Maclay, after arriving on his coast, planted various seeds at Point Bugarlom, intending, as Finsch observes, to return and take up permanent residence. However he concealed the nature of his mission even from Finsch, and the German supposed that Miklouho-Maclay had come to his coast “by mere chance”.32 After visits to the Admiralty and Palau islands, Miklouho-Maclay transferred to another vessel and made for Sydney.

Judging from the indirect evidence, two years seems to have been the period agreed with the Tsar for receiving a decision on the Maclay Coast. Thus, Miklouho-Maclay reported in one of his letters that he would not seriously get down to work on matters connected with the Maclay Coast for at least two years.33 He had no doubt at this time that the Maclay Coast question would be resolved in Russia as he desired, and therefore
began to prepare the results of his anthropological and ethnographic researches for publication, allotting for this work the same period - two years. He would therefore be back on the Maclay Coast creating the Papuan Union before these works might be used by colonisers to harm the Papuans. Alexander III provided much needed funds to support him over this period. Once again, however, Miklouho-Maclay had miscalculated. He should have set to work on the Maclay Coast project there and then, and not waited two years.

On 27 February 1884, the marriage of Miklouho-Maclay and Margaret took place. "You are perfectly right," he wrote a week later in one of his letters, "when you call me a happy man. I realise now that a woman is able to bring true happiness into the life of a man who never believed that such a thing existed in this world." The year 1884 was one of the happiest in Miklouho-Maclay's life. He edited (in two volumes) the results of his anthropological and ethnographic researches, with a view to publishing them simultaneously in Russian and English. He continued his investigations into zoology and comparative anatomy. During his five-year stay in Australia he published in various publications some sixty papers in Russian, English, German and French. He managed to prevent yet another colonising expedition to the Maclay Coast by interceding with the Colonial Secretary in London. By his side was his beloved and loving wife Margaret. In Australia he was highly esteemed, and was assisted in his scientific researches. True, he was short of money. He wanted to build himself a house, but instead of this he had to rent a flat for a while on the coast at Snails Bay; he later on changed it for cheaper lodgings at Watson's Bay, close to the biological station. At the very end of 1884, his son Alexander was born. Then suddenly, like a bolt from the blue, Germany annexed the north-east coast of New Guinea, including the Maclay Coast.

Before then, it is true, storm clouds had begun gathering over the Maclay Coast. In April 1883, Queensland announced the addition to its possessions of the entire eastern half of New Guinea, but the British Secretary for the Colonies, Lord Derby, declared this annexation null and void. Queensland persisted, and in December 1883 confirmed its claim on New Guinea. Miklouho-Maclay had foreseen this a month earlier. Britain was prepared to recognise New Guinea as a protectorate of the Australian colonies, but only if the Australians would meet part of the expenses connected with administering the new colony.

Miklouho-Maclay was not idle at this time. Here is what he writes in his autobiography (referring to himself in the third person):
Having satisfied himself from correspondence with the Russian Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the impossibility of obtaining a Russian protectorate for the Maclay Coast, N.N. [Miklouho-Maclay] appealed to the Russian and British governments with a proposal to recognise the independence of the Maclay Coast under his authority. While the correspondence continued, the German government hoisted its flag on many islands of Micronesia, but also on the northern coast of New Guinea. Thus the Maclay Coast was included in the German protectorate.37

The seizure of the Maclay Coast was accomplished by Finsch. He arrived there, introduced himself to the Papuans as “Maclay’s brother”, was cordially received by them, and quietly implemented a formal act of annexation of the north-eastern part of New Guinea. Within a month Britain proclaimed the annexation of the south-eastern part of New Guinea.

On 9 January 1885 Miklouho-Maclay sent an official telegram to Chancellor Bismarck: “Maclay Coast natives reject German annexation. Maclay.” On the same day he wrote a letter to Alexander III and to the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, N.K. Giers, notifying them that the special commissioner appointed for British New Guinea, Major-General Peter Scratchley, whom he had seen in Melbourne, had again assured him that the British Government supported Russia's recognition of the independence of the Maclay Coast. Miklouho-Maclay intended going to Berlin for negotiations with Bismarck, and asked his brother Mikhail and A.A. Rakovich to come to the Maclay Coast by July 1885. In principle they had already promised to do this, and now it was a question of their fulfilling their promises, and deciding on a specific arrival date. Mikhail and Rakovich, once having arrived on the Maclay Coast, would thereby establish Miklouho-Maclay’s de facto rights to this coast which, breaking with the tradition of explorers, he had named after himself. “In my negotiations with Prince Bismarck,” he wrote his brother Sergei, “I will have to rely on the fact of actual possession rather than on mere words and papers.”38 Mikhail and Rakovich never came to New Guinea. The Russian Ministry for Foreign Affairs promised Miklouho-Maclay its assistance if he would submit the matter to negotiation. The talks with Germany lasted for some time, but did not lead to any positive results from Miklouho-Maclay’s point of view.

In 1886 Miklouho-Maclay left Australia for Russia. At Livadia he saw the Tsar twice. “I succeeded in securing part of what I wanted, or what I came to Livadia for, but far from all,” he wrote his brother Sergei.39 There began (evidently with the Tsar’s permission) furious
activity by Miklouho-Maclay to set up a Russian settlement on the Maclay Coast. However, a commission appointed by the Tsar to consider this question produced a negative decision. “Although the Sovereign had, it seems (?), no objection,” Miklouho-Maclay wrote his brother Sergei, “the Ministers decided otherwise and in the end won out.”

Miklouho-Maclay returned to Sydney in 1887 to take Margaret and the children, Alexander and Vladimir, back with him to Russia. But this time he was in Australia for a few days (May 1887), and in July 1887 returned to Petersburg.

Life was not kind to him. He was very ill, rarely left the house and was in need of money, but he did not give up his dream of moving to a permanent residence in New Guinea. As his brother Mikhail recalled, “Even when, seemingly, all his hopes of saving his land from seizure by strangers were shattered, he never stopped thinking of ways to take away from Germany the Maclay Coast which it had seized.”

After the death of Miklouho-Maclay (14 April 1888), Margaret returned to Australia with her children. At the present time three grandsons of Miklouho-Maclay are living in Sydney: Paul (the son of Alexander), and Rob and Kenneth (the sons of Vladimir). With their active assistance, the Miklouho-Maclay Society of Australia was organised to perpetuate the memory of Miklouho-Maclay; it puts out a quarterly newsletter.

In 1975 a new, politically independent state made its appearance on the world’s map - Papua New Guinea, with a population of three million people, which includes the Maclay Coast. Also in 1975 the Papuans published in the city of Madang the New Guinea diaries of Miklouho-Maclay, translated into English by C.L. Sentinella. The Prime-Minister of Papua New Guinea, Michael Somare, in a preface to the second edition of this book cordially thanked Sentinella for his work. E.M. Webster writes that they will always remember their Russian friend on the Maclay Coast and that Miklouho-Maclay was the “spiritual father of New Guinea nationhood”. Indeed, he attempted to create an independent Papuan state over one hundred years before the appearance of the state of Papua New Guinea.

Translated by Thomas Poole
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Russians in Australia:  
A Demographic Survey

Charles Price

A demographic history of the Russian people in Australia faces one formidable obstacle, namely, that there are no published statistics relating solely to ethnic Russians. Until World War I the Australian censuses gave figures for persons born in the old Tsarist Empire as a whole, without any subdivision. After 1920 official statistics showed Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania separately, and after 1951 the Ukraine. But the Australian birthplace category “USSR” still includes Belorussia, Moldavia and the republics of the Caucasus, Urals and Asia as well as the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic itself.

Additionally, until 1954, Australian statistics rarely distinguished between immigrants of Jewish and non-Jewish origin, a matter of considerable importance, because before 1940 the Jewish element in migration to Australia was substantial: about eighty per cent for Poles, Lithuanians and Belorussians and over sixty per cent for Ukrainians, though less than fifteen per cent for Russians, Estonians and Finns.

To some extent these two difficulties—region of origin and Jewish affiliation—can be resolved by analysis of the colonial and Commonwealth naturalisation records; these usually give precise district or town of birth and enough information on name, occupation and associates to permit reasonable estimates about Jewish faith, and indeed about other faiths. Unfortunately, the naturalisation analysis does not yet go beyond 1947; though very rich in information, it involves detailed examination of individual case records and considerable research resources.1 What has been done to 1947, plus the census statistics of birthplace by religion since 1954, give the following estimates of origin for immigrants arriving by 1976 (see table 1).

From this table the predominance of Jewish immigrants, except from Finland and Estonia, is very clear, as is the later catching up of non-Jewish immigrants, especially with the Displaced Persons of 1947-52. In general terms these statistics fit well with Boris Christa’s division of
### TABLE 1 Australian census years: birthplace = Tsarist Empire and successor states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jew Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Jew Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Jew Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>598 600</td>
<td>4 1360</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41 50</td>
<td>13 249</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>97 296</td>
<td>114 255</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>26 419</td>
<td>179 43</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>223 1260</td>
<td>1216 571</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>5662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>73 401</td>
<td>860 690</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belorussia</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>9 179</td>
<td>470 173</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>56 167</td>
<td>154 1308</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2249</td>
<td>1123 3372</td>
<td>3010 4649</td>
<td>7659</td>
<td>8476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Totals for the Tsarist Empire were about 720 in 1871, 1308 in 1881, and 2970 in 1891 but, at present, information is insufficient to subdivide these totals safely.
Russian immigration into five waves: the settlers and exiles coming before World War I; the White Russians of the interwar years; the Displaced Persons; the Russian émigrés from China coming from the mid 1950s until the early 1980s; and the Russian Jews arriving from the mid 1970s onwards.  

In recent years Jewish immigrants from Russia usually think of themselves as heirs of the Russian language and culture as well as of the Jewish faith and culture. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, however, the Jews of the Tsarist Empire identified much less with any particular nationality: rather did they think of themselves as members of East European Jewry, using Yiddish as their common language, experiencing similar conditions of repression, confined to similar occupations and living in similar areas - the ghettos. When they moved abroad to Western Europe, the Americas and Australasia they tended, on the one hand, to form small groups based on family and district of origin and, on the other hand, to mix quite freely with other Yiddish-speaking Jews from central and eastern Europe. In Australia groups formed from places such as: Kovno and Vilna in Lithuania; Riga and Libau in Latvia; Brest-Litovsk, Minsk and Mogilev in Belorussia; Lvov, Kiev, Odessa and Dnepropetrovsk (Ekaterinoslav) in the Ukraine; and a handful from Leningrad (St Petersburg or Petrograd), Smolensk and Moscow in Russia itself. From these little groups they mixed first with Jews from Polish and Austro-Hungarian regions and then with Australian Jewry as a whole. Many of their descendants are now prominent in industry, education and the professions.

Non-Jewish immigrants from the Tsarist Empire also at times formed family and district groups, but not as solidly as Jews because they came from a much wider area and were more thinly scattered. Table 2, based on naturalisation records and covering immigrants arriving before 1947, omits persons born in Finland, Poland and the Baltic states but gives detailed places for all other regions, except that the towns and villages of Belorussia and the Ukraine are summarised into larger districts. For Russia itself, plus the republics of the Caucasus, the Urals and Asia, the 844 naturalised men arriving before 1947 came from over 180 towns and villages, stretching north-south from Archangel (Arkhangel’sk) to Baku in the west and from Petropavlovsk in Kamchatka to Vladivostok in the east, and east-west from Nikolaevsk on the Sea of Okhotsk to Leningrad on the Baltic.

Some regions and districts naturally provided more immigrants than others, and the migration flows varied over time (see table 2). The western areas, particularly seaports such as Leningrad, Archangel, Yeysk and Batum, provided more of the early settlers but, the larger number of
### TABLE 2  YEAR OF ARRIVAL AND BIRTHPLACE*

Males naturalized 1904-1947 (non Jews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PLACES</th>
<th>- 1885</th>
<th>1886-1905</th>
<th>1906-16</th>
<th>1917-29</th>
<th>1930-40</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UKRAINE</td>
<td>Crimea</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tavrida</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dnepropetrovsk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Ekaterinoslav)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kharkov</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poltava</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chernigov</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Podolsky</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lvov</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volynsky</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uknown and Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[* Note: The spelling of the names of regions and districts in Table 2 has been standardised to reflect current usage; where applicable, pre-revolutionary names are shown in brackets. Except in the case of larger centres, no attempt has been made to standardise the spelling of "places" (i.e., towns and villages), the names of which appear in the (sometimes obscure) form in which they were originally recorded in the statistical records. - eds.]*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PLACES</th>
<th>-1885</th>
<th>1886-1905</th>
<th>1906-16</th>
<th>1917-29</th>
<th>1930-40</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELO-RUSSIA</td>
<td>Minsk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mogilev</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grodno</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vitebsk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMORE</td>
<td>Leningrad</td>
<td>Leningrad 53, Gdov 1, Kronstadt 4, Lemborg 3, Narva 5, Nilma 1, Volsk 1, Rerat 1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novgorod</td>
<td>Novgorod 8, Bor 1, Pskov 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smolensk</td>
<td>Smolensk 7, Alexino 1, Baranov 1, Lubavicki 2, Meshkova 1, Obcha 1.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2  YEAR OF ARRIVAL AND BIRTHPLACE (CONTINUED)

**Males naturalised 1904-1947 (non Jews)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PLACES</th>
<th>1885</th>
<th>1886-1905</th>
<th>1906-16</th>
<th>1917-29</th>
<th>1930-40</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPPER VOLGA AND NORTH</td>
<td>Kostroma</td>
<td>Kostroma 4, Papvoka 2, Varnavin 3, Votchinka 2, Yaroslav 1.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vologda</td>
<td>Vologda 1, Michalevo 2, Visinga 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archangel (Arkhangelsk)</td>
<td>Archangel 12, Kem 1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSCOW AREA</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Moscow 51.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tula</td>
<td>Tula 7, Kaluga 2, Sukinichi 1.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryazan</td>
<td>Ryazan 5, Vladimir 1.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalinin (Tver)</td>
<td>Kalinin 3.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>PLACES</td>
<td>-1885</td>
<td>1886-1905</td>
<td>1906-16</td>
<td>1917-29</td>
<td>1930-40</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL DON AND AREA</td>
<td>Orel</td>
<td>Orel 7, Botchova 1, Bryansk 2, Klintsky 2, Lovne 1, Other 3.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kursk</td>
<td>Kursk 3, Hanok 1, Borisovka 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voronezh</td>
<td>Voronezh 7.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tambov</td>
<td>Tambov 3, Davidov 1, Kirsanov 1, Pavlovka 1, Studenka 3.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER DON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anastashevko 2, Aleinokov 2, Kozanski 1, Kamensk 2, Novocherkassk 3, Rostov 2, Taganrog 6, Yeysk 1, Kerlach 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>PLACES</td>
<td>-1885</td>
<td>1886-1905</td>
<td>1906-16</td>
<td>1917-29</td>
<td>1930-40</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUCASIA</td>
<td>Kuban</td>
<td>Novorossiisk 6, Armavir 1, Otradnaya 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terek</td>
<td>Kizlyar 2, Selo 1, Ordzhonikidze (Vladikavkaz) 19, Sura 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Baku 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Batum 1, Gori 2, Kutais 3, Tbilisi (Tiflis) 5.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLGA</td>
<td>Lower Volga</td>
<td>Astrakhan 3, Tsareff 2, Cherni Rynok 1, Volgograd (Tsaritsyn) 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saratov</td>
<td>Saratov 15, Balashov 7, Millaev 2, Petrovsk 1, Penza 3, Novoyabloanka 1, Saranovsk 1, Tlinka 1, Volsk 6.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>PLACES</td>
<td>-1885</td>
<td>1886-1905</td>
<td>1906-16</td>
<td>1917-29</td>
<td>1930-40</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLGA (Continued)</td>
<td>Kuybyshev</td>
<td>Kuybyshev 24, Kinel 1, Pestravka 2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ulianovskaya</td>
<td>Ulianovsk 12, Bartaki 1, Kalachevko 2, Nizovco 2, Maklovo 1, Pochinki 1, Sizrain 4, Tazino 1.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kazan 18, Mataky 1, Samaroff 1, Varsovi 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorky (Nizhni Novgorod)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gorky 8, Arzamas 2, Pesbrovka 2, Shalki 2, Timnichoff 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirov (Vyatka)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirov 17, Elabuga 2, Ishevsk 2, Kotelnich 4, Orlov 1, Pischalce 2, Troitsk 1, Urzhum 2, Sarapul 7, Votkinsk 4, Yaransk 3.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>PLACES</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1886-1905</td>
<td>1906-16</td>
<td>1917-29</td>
<td>1930-40</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URALS</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Guryev 6, Uralsk 14, (Ural Cossacks)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orenburg</td>
<td>Orenburg 15, Orlovsk 2, Pavlovka 4.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashkir SSR</td>
<td>Beloresk 2, Ufa 8.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelyabinsk</td>
<td>Chelyabinsk 5, Varna 1.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm 23, Almash 2, Budarin 2, Bogatske 2, Keishtina 2, Kungur 2, Nijitagil 3, Ochersk 1, Sverdlovsk (Ekaterinburg) 6, Trogosk 1, Usol 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA</td>
<td>Turkestan</td>
<td>Lepinsk 2, Pishpek 1, Trorogva 2, Vyernyi 3.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 YEAR OF ARRIVAL AND BIRTHPLACE (CONTINUED)

**Males naturalised 1904-1947 (non Jews)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION (Continued)</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PLACES</th>
<th>-1885</th>
<th>1886-1905</th>
<th>1906-16</th>
<th>1917-29</th>
<th>1930-40</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIA Tobolsk</td>
<td>Tobolsk</td>
<td>Tobolsk 5, Ishim 2, Omsk 4, Spask 1.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomsk</td>
<td>Tomsk 20, Barnaul 2, Bish 7, Bori 2, Gutovo 1, Kamenk 2, Klychevsk 1, Novosibirsk 1, Maralinsk 2, Zyransk 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeniseisk</td>
<td>Yeniseisk 6, Achinsk 1, Kansk 1, Krasnoyarsk 10, Minusinsk 6.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baikal</td>
<td>Irkutsk 16, Zima 2, Chita 18, Kiatka 2, Petrovsk 2, Other 10.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amur</td>
<td>Blagoveschensk 18, Tshmenvka 2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladivostok</td>
<td>Vladivostok 40.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritimes</td>
<td>Khabarovsky 6, Marinsk 2, Nikolaevsk 8, Ussuri 2, Halkidon 1, Kamchatka 4.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2  YEAR OF ARRIVAL AND BIRTHPLACE (CONTINUED)
Males naturalised 1904-1947 (non Jews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PLACES</th>
<th>1885</th>
<th>1886-1905</th>
<th>1906-16</th>
<th>1917-29</th>
<th>1930-40</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIA (Cont.)</td>
<td>Harbin (in China)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>Europe, Americas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia, unspecified or unknown.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Excluding Baltic States, Belorussia and the Ukraine; and all Jews.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The years before 1903 are understated as some immigrants were naturalised by the colonies before then.
persons arriving 1906-16 came more from the Moscow, Volga, Ural and Asian regions. After World War I migration was predominantly from Asia, though an appreciable number of Ural Cossacks was also involved.

Not all of these came directly to Australia. Over the whole period, 1861-1940, only thirty-nine per cent did so; the rest arrived after spending time in Western Europe, the Americas and Asian countries such as China, Japan, India and Persia; many indeed lived for some years in several countries before finally deciding to settle permanently in Australia. But the pattern varied greatly over time. Before World War I nearly sixty-two per cent came directly and nearly fifteen per cent via Western Europe and the Americas; these migrating via China made up only fourteen per cent. Between the wars, however, only sixteen per cent came directly from the Soviet Union; about sixty per cent came via China, five per cent via Persia, India and Japan, some three per cent via Europe, and the rest through the Americas, Africa and the Pacific, or else through a number of countries in succession.

This essay is demographic in emphasis and avoids discussion of the political and economic reasons underlying these migrant flows. It is important to note, however, that just as some of these arriving before 1914 were exiles from Tsarist repression, so many of those arriving in interwar years were members or friends of the “White Russian” forces fighting the “Red” armies of the Revolution, and had fled Russian territory when the Reds triumphed. (The term “White Russians” is used here in this political sense; migrants from the province of White Russia are Belorussians). But Australia received relatively few of the White Russian refugees who fled westwards into Germany, France and other parts of Western Europe: rather did she receive those who fled eastwards into China, joining the Russian community already established there, particularly at Harbin in Manchuria where Russian engineers and others had settled in numbers when building, managing and using for trading purposes the Chinese railway linking Beijing and northern China with the Trans-Siberian Railway. From this centre, some of them, together with Russian families established in Manchuria before 1917, moved periodically to Australia, including a number born in Harbin between 1905 and 1920 who came to Australia either as children with their parents or else, especially during the 1930s, as young adults migrating on their own.

At this time relatively few came from the Russian communities of Beijing and Shanghai (except when stopping there awhile on their way from Harbin); both these communities grew considerably in the interwar years, not only from White Russian refugees but also by a general movement south, as many Harbin Russians left the disturbed political
conditions in which the railway had become involved. Nor in these years did many come to Australia from the more rural Russian settlements of the Three Rivers Districts in north-western Manchuria and of the Sinkiang province of China which bordered the Semirechinsk and Lake Balkash districts of Russian Turkestan further west; these were to come after World War II. The few who did come from Sinkiang were apparently connected with the small-scale movement of the ethnic Russians from Tashkent and nearby parts of Turkestan which had begun before the Revolution and continued on afterwards (see table 2).

Also of interest is the small group of Ural Cossacks who had little connection with Australia before 1917, but who started moving south into Persia from 1919 onwards and, after some time there, moved to India or China and thence to Australia in 1923; a few stayed longer in China and migrated to Australia in 1925 after receiving good news from their friends about settlement possibilities. Another interesting group, mainly from the Tomsk and Yeniseysk districts of Siberia, moved into China in the early 1920s and thence to Manila in the Philippines; they came on to Australia in the mid twenties, here following in the footsteps of two Tomsk engineers who had worked in Manila from 1907 until migrating to Australia, one in 1908 and the other in 1914.

It is interesting to see where these various immigrants went - see table 3 - and what they did. Less than a quarter settled in the south and west: a few architects, engineers, commercial men, skilled tradesmen, cooks and others, from various parts of Russia, settled in Melbourne; some families from western Russia and the Volga took up farming in Gippsland; and a handful of tradesmen and labourers made their homes in Adelaide with a small group working in the smelters of Port Pirie, mainly from Caucasia and the Volga; the odd seaman, butcher and electrician from western Russia settled in Hobart. There were also a few tradesmen and labourers from western and central Russia in Perth and one or two farmers, engineers, miners and clerks in the Northern Territory.

The great majority, however, settled in New South Wales and Queensland, both before and after World War I. Round about thirty per cent of all Australian Russians settled in NSW, three quarters of them in Sydney. These entered a good variety of occupations - engineers, mechanics and carpenters being especially common - and came from all parts of Russia; those from Siberia, the Maritime provinces and Harbin were more numerous after 1917. A small group from the Tobolsk-Tomsk districts established themselves as poultry farmers in the outer western suburbs of Sydney while seamen, mechanics, miners and others settled in ones and twos in NSW towns such as Newcastle, Lithgow and Nowra.

Queensland, attracting just over half the Russians coming to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Settlement</th>
<th>1907-47</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane-Metro.</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreton, Downs</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coastal</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Coastal</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Metro.</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Metro.</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Metro.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

1. From Naturalization Records; 2. Average of Nationality "Russian" and birthplace "USSR"; the 4,251 is the Nationality Total; 3. 1981 census re birthplace USSR; 4. Queensland statistical divisions: "Central Coastal": Maryborough, Rockhampton, Mackay; "Northern Coastal": Townsville, Cairns, Peninsula; "Western": Roma, South-Western, Central Western, Far Western, North-Western.
### TABLE 3  RUSSIANS IN AUSTRALIA: PLACE OF SETTLEMENT (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1907-47</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WESTERN AUSTRALIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Metro.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTHERN TERRITORY</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AUSTRALIA NUMBERS</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>844</td>
<td>4251</td>
<td>16953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Australia, was clearly the favourite state, not only because it was the nearest state to China but also because, once Russian groups were established, it attracted many immigrants coming direct from Russia itself. About forty per cent of Queensland Russians stayed in Brisbane: those from western Russia were mainly engineers, mechanics, carpenters and other skilled tradesmen; those from Caucasus, the Volga and the Urals were also skilled tradesmen but included hairdressers, photographers and flower-makers; those from Asia included numerous carpenters, painters, shoemakers and mechanics.

About a tenth of Queensland Russians settled in Ipswich and the Downs as carpenters, mechanics and the like, while five per cent from all parts of Russia moved on to Roma, Blackall, Mt. Isa and other western towns where they did some hawking, opened stores, worked on the railways or became miners and mine mechanics.

Another quarter settled on the eastern plains from Maryborough to Mackay and another fifth from Bowen northwards. Some from the Leningrad (St Petersburg or Petrograd) area did carpentering and labouring here and there, a few working farms near Cairns. Settlers from Moscow and surrounding areas worked farms - both sugar and other kinds - in a number of places, often employing fellow-countrymen as cane-cutters and farm-labourers. Some from the Volga, Urals, Tobolsk and Tomsk areas became cotton-farmers and labourers in the Biloela-Thangool-Callide districts; others took up sugar farming or practised their mechanical and carpentering skills. Those from central and eastern Asia also spread widely as cotton-farmers, sugar-farmers, cane-cutters, general labourers and mechanics. Here and there little colonies formed, as with the Ural Cossacks from Guryev who mostly settled at Cordalba near Maryborough, or a group from Perm in the Urals who settled at Thangool, or the two groups from Blagoveshchensk who settled in Biloela and Brisbane.

Not all immigrants stayed in the one place - some travelled quite widely. One iron-worker from Kazan arrived in Melbourne in 1912 and by the time he became naturalised in 1923 had worked in Melbourne, Adelaide, Bundaberg, Mt. Morgan, Cairns, Innisfail and Brisbane. Another man from Kazan arrived in Queensland in 1913 and worked as a general labourer or miner in Brisbane, Darwin, Newcastle, Wonthaggi, Adelaide and Tasmania before finally settling in Melbourne in 1934. Similarly a carpenter from St Petersburg (Leningrad) landed in Sydney in 1887 and worked for a while in Newcastle, Melbourne, Adelaide and Port Augusta; he then moved, spending some time in Kalgoorlie and Murchison before settling in Geraldton in the early 1920s. Even those living in Queensland sometimes moved a great deal. One man, born in
Vladivostok in 1900 and spending some of his youth in Harbin, landed in Brisbane in 1923, worked in Mt. Isa, Mt. Morgan and Darwin until 1928 when he made a two-year visit back to Harbin and there married a Russian girl of seventeen; he returned to Queensland in 1929, leaving his wife to have their son in China, but brought them to join him the next year and with them took jobs in Innisfail, Thangool, Rockhampton and Bundaberg. When naturalised in 1935 at Bundaberg they had four children and may well have had more children, and more places of work, after that.

This case shows that high mobility could involve married men, though it was naturally more common amongst single persons; the two Kazan men mentioned above were both single, one still unmarried at the age of fifty. Of all those arriving single before 1917, a third became married after an average stay of seven years; the others were still single after an average stay of ten years, fourteen per cent still being single after twenty years of adult life in Australia. These long-time bachelors provided many mobile miners and prospectors. Arrivals after 1917 were somewhat different. Forty per cent got married, within an average of six years, while the proportion of those still single after twenty years was only three per cent.

After the revolution, moreover, more men arrived already married: forty-two per cent as against twenty-three per cent. This was partly because post-revolution immigrants were older, their medium age at arrival being twenty-nine compared with twenty-five for earlier immigrants. All this reflects the disturbed political conditions of both Russia and northern China, conditions which led many to migrate in family groups, rather than by the earlier mode of single men coming first to establish themselves and then deciding to marry, either by a short marriage visit home or by wooing a woman already in Australia.

Marriage patterns, too, were different. Of those migrating single before the Revolution, and then marrying after settlement, over eighty per cent married non-Russians, compared with thirty-five per cent of later immigrants. This difference reflects the growth of balanced Russian communities in Australia. In the earlier period Russian communities were small, with a marked surplus of males; in 1911 there were less than thirty Russian women for every hundred Russian men, and many of those wanting marriage had little choice but to link themselves to women of Anglo-Celtic, or occasionally Polish or German descent. By 1947 there were nearly eighty Russian women for every hundred Russian men, these women having either been born in Australia or else in China; the scope for in-marriage was thus much greater. Not that this continued into the second generation. Available statistics suggest that less than ten per cent of Russian children born in Australia grew up to marry into their ethnic
community; the great majority married non-Russians they had met at school or at work. This in turn reflects the fact that in the 1930s and 1940s, although appreciably larger, the Russian communities were widely scattered and lacked ethnic schools; though the children might attend an Orthodox church on Sundays, their main peer contacts were non-Russians.

Family size, too, varied somewhat. In-marriages of more than ten years' duration, those where both husband and wife were Russian, averaged 2.6 children compared with 3.8 children for Russian immigrants marrying non-Russian women. This arose largely from migration interruption to fertility - some men being in Australia for up to ten or more years before being able to bring their wives or fiancées to join them. Those with non-Russian wives nearly all married in Australia, and were therefore far less affected by migration interruption.

In general, then, ethnic Russian communities in Australia before World War II were somewhat scattered and seldom very large; in 1947 they totalled about two thousand five hundred foreign born (about one thousand eight hundred born in Russia itself and seven hundred born in China and elsewhere overseas) plus their Australian-born children and grandchildren. Then, quite suddenly, in the period 1948-52, this number increased threefold, primarily because Australia agreed to help the International Refugee Organisation (IRO) resettle numerous post-war European refugees and displaced persons, not only those in Europe but others in East Africa, Lebanon and the Far East; many of these last mentioned were White Russians from China who, fearing a communist victory, were seeking IRO help in Shanghai, some to be evacuated temporarily to an IRO camp on the Philippines island of Samar. Between late 1947 and early 1952 Australia received over 182,000 refugees.

Just how many of this total were ethnic Russians is difficult to say; there are anomalies in both the nationality and birthplace statistics of the Australian immigration and census records. The safest figure is that of the IRO itself, this being based on a combination of citizenship, country of last permanent residence and ethnic identification. It showed Australia receiving 19,607 Ukrainians (many born in pre-war Poland), 670 Belorussians and 4,944 Russians. An appreciable proportion came from the Far East, Australia receiving two thousand nine hundred from Shanghai and Samar, some Jewish but mainly Russian. Of those coming from Europe very few gave their religion as Jewish (less than a dozen of those coming with Russian, Belorussian and Ukrainian nationality), but some Jewish refugees, still badly shaken by the holocaust, may well have concealed their true origins.
These Russian and Belorussian refugees were comparatively young: about twenty-six per cent were aged 0-14; thirty-one per cent were 15-29; twenty-two per cent were in their thirties; only nineteen per cent were in their forties and fifties, and only two per cent aged over sixty years. Moreover, most were married, coming with their families: sixty-one per cent of men aged twenty and over and sixty-eight per cent of women aged sixteen and over. Demographically speaking, these Russians were making a valuable contribution to an Australia striving to increase its population through the immigration of healthy young men and women. Australia was also helping the less fortunate: sixteen per cent of women were widowed or separated.

In terms of occupation, the situation was less clear, primarily because refugees knew Australia was seeking less skilled labour rather than professional and highly skilled persons, so often they downgraded their skills in order to be selected. For what they are worth, the statistics show that five per cent of men had been in commercial, clerical or protective occupations, while a tenth came from a rural background; apart from a few elderly and incapacitated persons, the remainder described themselves as craftsmen or operators (thirty-seven per cent) or general labourers (thirty-two per cent). Nearly seventy per cent of women were not counted as being in the workforce - this reflecting the high proportion of married women with children while of those giving an occupation eighteen per cent had seen domestic service, seventeen per cent had worked as craftsmen or operators and the rest had been rural or general labourers; less than six per cent had professional training.

Unfortunately there is no information readily available about exact places of origin. Those from China apparently had much the same background as earlier arrivals, many being born in China itself or in the Asian and Maritime districts of the Russian Republic, especially in towns associated with the railways. Those from European Russia also seem to have come from a wide scatter of districts, again following the pre-war patterns.

In Australia, however, the settlement pattern was very different from earlier years - see table 3. Admittedly many came under the Australia IRO contract system, whereby refugees had to work for two years in a job and place determined by the Australian Government, and these contracts took them to places unknown to pre-war Russian settlers. But by the census of June 1954 well over ninety-five per cent of contracts had finished and families were moving to homes and jobs they themselves had chosen. These were far less in Queensland than before the war, notably more in Sydney and Melbourne (see table 3); like many other immigrants, post-war Russians were taking jobs in the expanding
industries of the southern metropolitan areas, and finding homes in expanding suburbs such as Dandenong in Melbourne.

Russian and Belorussian migration to Australia continued after the end of the IRO program, the IRO's protective functions being taken over by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and its resettling functions by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM). Additionally, Australia was establishing its own migration posts abroad and these arranged for numbers of European Russians - both refugees and other - to migrate to Australia. Many who came did so with the financial and welfare help of the Resettlement Service of the Australian Council of Churches, acting as agent for the World Council of Churches and the Orthodox and other Russian religious bodies associated with it.

Between mid 1952 and mid 1986, over twenty-one thousand Russians and Belorussians arrived for settlement in Australia, fifteen thousand or so, mainly Russians, coming from China. After that, because many of those still left had intermarried with Chinese men and women and became much more part of the general Chinese population, this particular program came to an end. Those that came first, in the mid 1950s, were largely from the old Harbin-Shanghai group, while later immigrants came from Russian colonies elsewhere in China. Many were from Sinkiang province where some White Russian troops sought refuge after 1917, there joining Russians trading between China and the Tashkent-Lake Balkash districts of Soviet Kazakhstan, and also groups of Old Believers, Baptists, Seventh Day Adventists, Pentecostals and others who had left Russia because their religious beliefs were out of line with both Soviet religious policy and official Russian Orthodoxy. Others came from northern Manchuria, some from towns along the northern section of the Chinese Eastern Railway and others from the Three Rivers District north of Hailar; these last included a number of Cossack families originally from the Russian region of Lake Baikal.

This immigration from China had several ups and downs. After averaging three hundred and fifty or so a year in 1952-56, it rose to over one thousand a year in 1957-62, dropped back to four hundred a year, in 1963-65, dropped sharply to fifty a year in 1966-67, but picked up again to five hundred or so a year in the early eighties as the last families eligible to come hurried to make travel arrangements before the program ended. Of the whole fifteen thousand, half or more were born in China.

Most of the remaining six or seven thousand came from Europe, some being already in western and southern Europe when the IRO program finished and some leaving the Soviet Union in later years. Movement was heaviest during the fifties and early sixties, then dropped
somewhat until the mid seventies when numbers rose again, reaching a peak of nearly two thousand in 1979-80, but dropping back again after 1982. Many of these later arrivals were Russian Jews.

Again, there is little information about exact areas of origin in Russia one day the naturalisation survey may be continued to this and other questions. But there is no reason to suppose the general pattern of pre-war years did not continue. In Australia, however, the trend to settle more in the south - especially in Sydney and Melbourne - continued very strongly (see table 3). By 1981 the settlement pattern for the combined waves of immigration survivors of pre-war as well as post-war movements - was quite clear for persons born in Russia and Belorussia. That for Russians born in China is less clear, since census birthplace statistics include them with ethnic Chinese and others in China; though where the census shows appreciable numbers of Chinese-born persons living alongside solid groups of Russian-born persons, there is a fair presumption that at least some are Russians born in China. The following estimates include those born both in China and Russia and also the smaller number born in Belorussia, but exclude their children and grand-children born in Australia.

The largest group was in Sydney - about eight thousand five hundred in 1981, mainly in the western suburbs running from Burwood to Concord westwards to Fairfield, Holyroyd and Blacktown; another concentration, some being Russian Jews, was in the eastern local government areas of Randwick and Waverley. There were also two hundred or so apiece in Newcastle and Wollongong. In Melbourne there were about seven thousand five hundred all told, in three zones: Sunshine, Keilor and Broadmeadows in the north-west; Prahran, St. Kilda and Caulfield in the south-east, some being Jews; Nunawading, Waverley and Dandenong in the east, Dandenong having a particularly large number of Russians born in China. There was a solid group in Geelong. In Brisbane, about one thousand four hundred strong, most lived in the local government areas of East Brisbane and Woolloongabba while in Adelaide, again about one thousand four hundred, most lived in the north-western areas of Woodville, Enfield and Port Adelaide. The Perth group, six hundred or so, lived mainly in Stirling and Perth. It was these various city concentrations which produced the main ethnic institutions - churches, social clubs, welfare organisations - although some had their headquarters in the inner city rather than in the suburbs where most families lived.

In education these Russian immigrants (from now on “Russians” included “Belorussians”) were better qualified than the Australian-born population. The 1981 census shows that 16.0 per cent of men aged
fifteen and over had diplomas or degrees and 27.5 per cent had trade and other certificates, compared with 9.6 and 24.7 per cent for the Australian-born. Likewise, 11.3 per cent of Russian-born women had degrees and diplomas compared with 8.0 per cent of Australian-born women. This superiority was not reflected so markedly in the workforce. Admittedly 17.6 per cent of Russian-born men were in the professional and technical group, compared with 12.4 per cent for Australian-born men, but they were much weaker in administrative and other better paid jobs; conversely, they were more concentrated in the tradesmen, process-worker and labouring group, 52.2 per cent compared with 38.4 per cent for Australians. To some extent this reflects the time it takes immigrants to obtain recognition for their qualifications and sufficient Australian experience to take senior positions; also, there may have been some work-discrimination.

In demographic terms the Russian-born population of 1981 was considerably older than the Australian-born: only 8.2 per cent were under twenty compared with 39.1 per cent for the Australian-born. This kind of difference is normal in many immigrant peoples because young couples have some of their children in Australia after arrival. But the distribution of older ages is important: 64.2 per cent of Russian-born being over fifty-five years compared with 28.9 per cent for the Australian-born. This reflects the fact that Russian immigration was heaviest in the years 1948-62 and that those arriving in their twenties and thirties at that time were by 1981 concentrated in the older ages. This aging process has produced more work for church and other institutions catering for aged Russians in Sydney and elsewhere.

There were, of course, younger Russians - both foreign-born and Australian-born - to help care for their aged relatives and friends. But Russian couples in Australia had fewer children than the Australian average: 2.6 children for every Russian-born mother living in a stable marriage of 15-34 years compared with 3.0 children for all foreign-born mothers, and 3.3 children for Australian-born mothers. But this was so for all eastern European groups; their fertility was often severely interrupted by refugee conditions and migration separation. Some immigrant peoples were also affected by marriage breakdown; English, German, Dutch, American and New Zealand marriages in Australia were particularly affected, a fifth or more women ever married (aged 35-39 in 1976) having experienced divorce or separation. Russian couples in Australia experienced fewer marriage breakdowns than these nationalities - about fifteen per cent - but more than southern European couples.

It is not clear whether marriage breakdown was more common amongst mixed marriages than when both husband and wife were
Russians. Intermarriage was certainly more common, more like the early days of Russian immigration than the 1920s and 1930s where only thirty-five per cent of Russian immigrant men married non-Russian women (see p. 73 above). After World War II the intermarriage rate for Russian men averaged about sixty-five per cent and that for Russian women fifty-four per cent, some sixty per cent in all. Not all these out-marriages, however, were with Anglo-Celtic Australians; two-thirds were with immigrants from other countries, mainly European. Second-generation intermarriage, however, as in earlier years, was considerably higher, about eighty per cent.\textsuperscript{11}

Intermarriage naturally affects the language spoken at home. Where husband and wife are from different language backgrounds the common language for both them and their children is usually English. The 1982 census language statistics show the position for Russian-born persons aged fifteen and over.

**Language spoken at Home: Per cent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English only</th>
<th>Other Language &amp; Good English</th>
<th>Other language and Poor or No English</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that more men had stopped using Russian at home, and had better English, than women, but that Russian was still the home language for over eighty per cent of both men and women. This is a much higher level of language retention than the fifty per cent of German and Dutch immigrants, appreciably higher than that of Finns, Poles, Czechs and immigrants from the Baltic states (all a little under eighty per cent), and about the same as that of Ukrainians. It is, however, lower than that of Italians, Greeks and Yugoslavs - all near or over ninety per cent - mainly because these three groups had large ethnic concentrations and low levels of intermarriage.

Language retention amongst the second generation is harder to estimate as the 1976 census - the only one asking details of languages used at home - did not treat Russian as a distinct language; with intermarriage relatively low amongst the second generation, however, retention of Russian into the third and later generations is unlikely, unless second-generation parents adopt a policy of sending their children
to Russian ethnic schools or special Russian language classes. These days, however, preservation of ethnic culture has little to do with citizenship: in 1981 about eighty-four per cent of USSR-born persons were Australian citizens.

Mention of the third generation raises the last demographic question: how many persons are there in Australia of Russian ethnic origin? And here we are once more distinguishing between Russians and Belorussians. There are three principal measures of origin: Unmixed Origin, Total Descent, Ethnic Strength. Unmixed Origin measures those persons with nothing but Russian in their recent ancestry - those, say, with four Russian grandparents. Total Descent measures the number of persons who have any Russian ancestry at all, even though it be only one-quarter (one Russian grandparent) or one-eight (one Russian great-grandparent). Ethnic Strength adds all the halves, quarters, eights, sixteenths, and so on, together into whole persons (four persons, with one Russian grandparent each, equal one whole person), so measuring the strength of the Russian ethnic contribution to the total Australian population. This last is basically a genetic measure and is useful to those studying the extent of various genetic characteristics in the total population. These measures can all be traced to the third generation by applying relevant marriage patterns to the numbers of second-generation persons as revealed in statistics of birthplace by birthplace of parents; from then onwards one uses genealogical records, special surveys or - as in this case - models of ethnic intermixture.

Using such techniques the three measures for Russians, Belorussians and Ukrainians, after omitting Jewish immigrants and their descendants and adding in Russian families originating in China, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origins</th>
<th>Unmixed Origin</th>
<th>Ethnic Strength</th>
<th>Total Descent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belorussians</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such estimates as these enable one to assess the degree to which persons of Russian ethnic origin are continuing to support ethnic churches and organisations and how many of the second, third and later generations are maintaining an interest in ethnic institutions and the Russian language. Such assessments will be easier when the Australian
Statistician releases the information collected by the 1986 census on ancestry, religion and language spoken in the home.

This concludes this brief demographic survey of the Russian people of Australia. Though not among Australia's largest immigrant or ethnic populations, they are substantial enough to have played an appreciable part in building the Australian nation and in bringing to this continent in the southern seas cultural and religious traditions of considerable diversity and interest. Their origins in Siberia and China, as well as in Europe, give them a special place, enabling them to bring to their new home an understanding and experience of the oriental as well as western worlds.

Notes

1. For a description and assessment of the Naturalisation records see Charles A. Price, *Jewish Settlers in Australia* (Canberra: Australian National University, 1964), pp. 4-5.
3. Ibid.
5. Australian census and immigration statistics do not distinguish Belorussians and show some confusing overlap between Russians and Ukrainians.
8. Ibid.
9. More details about these Russian immigrants from China are in unpublished 1974 mss. by L. Benyei and Eric Richards titled "Some Aspects of the Resettlement in Australia of Russian Refugees from China"; the authors were for many years in the Resettlement Department of the Australian Council of Churches.

12. For calculations see Charles A. Price: (a) "The Ethnic Composition of the Australian Population", in *Australian Immigration: a Bibliography and Digest*, No. 4 (Canberra: Department of Demography, Australian National University, 1979), and (b) "The Ethnic Character of the Australian Population", *Encyclopaedia of the Australian People* (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1988).

**General Note:** The Australian Statistician has published, since 1907 or so, statistics of immigration by nationality and, and since 1959, by birthplace. The Australian Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs also publishes statistics of immigration, giving more details about refugees, assisted passage programs and naturalisations. The Australian census also give details of foreign-born persons by birthplace, nationality and religion; the colonial census sometimes did this also.
Great Bear and Southern Cross: The Russian Presence in Australia

Boris Christa

The Russian contribution to the development of the “Fifth Continent” has received rather scant attention by Australian historians. Understandably enough their interest has tended to be focused on the contribution of the British peoples whose flag first flew over Australia. The realisation that the contemporary Commonwealth of Australia is in fact a multicultural society to which many ethnic groups have made notable contributions has found acceptance only in recent years. It was particularly the Australian Bicentenary in 1988 which gave support to this concept and encouraged historians to look at Australian history from a wider point of view. In this context, the study of the Russians in Australia has attracted increased attention and it has become recognised that their contribution is a distinguished one and almost unique in that it dates from the very early days of Australian colonial history.

Captain Cook’s voyages to Australia and the South Pacific had received wide publicity in Russia and acted as a source of inspiration to the Imperial Government and to the Russian Navy, which took a keen interest in the Pacific region. In the context of a network of colonial possessions that encompassed Alaska, several North Pacific islands and even parts of California, Russian ships made a considerable number of voyages by the round-the-world route from their home ports in the Baltic to these distant destinations. Skilful and costly operations were mounted which under great Russian sea-captains contributed significantly to the exploration and mapping of the whole region. On such epic journeys Sydney or Hobart were logical ports of call for victualling and refitting. Russian ships were warmly welcomed in the early Australian colonial settlements, since Britain and Russia had close bonds dating from their long and close alliance against Napoleon. The Russian voyagers were, in fact, frequently enough in Sydney for the promontory near Neutral Bay, where they made their base, to become known as “Russian Point”. It was only much later that it was renamed Kirribilli.
The sojourn in Australia of Russian mariners during the age of sail forms a generally happy introduction to the more lasting Russian presence which commenced with the arrival of the first free settlers from Imperial Russia half a century later. Although the stay of the early voyagers was necessarily brief, they contributed to the life of the colony in various ways - trading, bringing news, providing cultural impetus and, above all, they were keen and reliable observers and recorders. Their contribution to Australian historical science, even if belated, is valuable and permanent.

During this early era Russian-Australian relations could hardly have been more cordial. The bonds between the Russian Imperial Navy and the Royal Navy were remarkably close and there was much exchanging of visits and personnel. For example, Captain M.P. Lazarev, the famous Russian navigator, who took ships to Australia on four occasions, as a trainee officer had served four years on British warships. Governor Lachlan Macquarie, three times his host, had spent several weeks travelling in Russia in 1807 and in the course of this journey had visited Astrakhan, Moscow and St Petersburg. British naval personnel were frequently loaned to the Russian fleet as instructors and there were several high-ranking British officers serving under contract with the Russian Imperial Navy. Among the names of the Russian officers who sailed to Australia we note the English surnames Boyle and Hall. Under these conditions mutual suspicion, xenophobia and obsessive secrecy in relations between the two navies simply had no place.

The average time spent in port in Australia by each of the Russian ships that called during the first half of the nineteenth century was just over one month. As well as being occasions for festivities, excursions and cordial exchanges of hospitality, the visits also fostered the establishment of close working relationships and there was much unfettered exchange of information, not only about professional maritime matters, but about Australia, the land - its aboriginal inhabitants, flora, fauna and the affairs of the young colony.

The voyage from the Baltic to the North Pacific via Australia was the longest and most demanding mission available in the Russian Navy. The crews for that task were therefore selected very carefully. A remarkably large percentage of the officers who visited Australia subsequently reached admiral's rank. Among them is P.S. Nakhimov, the hero of Sevastopol. As well as having highly competent and articulate officers, the crews often included amateur or professional naturalists and scientists. The Russian voyagers were briefed to record their observations in some detail, so that their log-books, journals, reports and letters constitute a valuable stockpile of information on Australia during its early colonial period.
An illustrative selection of quotations from these sources is given by K.V. Malakhovsky in his enlightening article in the present volume, which surveys some of the historical events referred to here.

A close study of the manning charts of the Russian ships\(^4\) shows a great deal of continuity among the senior personnel. Most of the captains made the journey at least twice and, after the *Neva’s* initial visit in 1807 each ship or squadron always had at least one officer who had been “down under” on a previous occasion. The Russians thus acquired a good deal of collective knowledge about the Fifth Continent and its waters. This was helpful not only in navigational matters but ensured that they could build up and maintain a network of good and useful connections with individual officers, tradesmen or providers in Australia.

During its two-week stay, from 15 June to 1 July 1807, the *Neva* had been fully resupplied and refitted in Port Jackson and every attention and kindness had been shown to Lieutenant Hagemeister and his crew. Australian hospitality had been generous and culminated in a spectacular ball with fireworks given for the Russian visitors by Governor Bligh at Government House.\(^5\) The news of the great success of this inaugural visit did not fail to make an impact in Russian naval circles and increasingly Sydney now beckoned the Russians as a ready source of reliable supplies and a civilised haven for rest and recuperation between the lengthy and arduous segments of their voyages in cold and dangerous latitudes.

The welcome which Sydney extended in August 1814 to the *Suvorov*, the second Russian ship to enter Port Jackson, was especially fervent and cordial. By a happy stroke of fate it brought to the colony the first news of the capture of Paris and of the Allied victory over Napoleon. As reported in the local press and recorded in the journal of one of the Russian navigating officers, A. Rossiysky,\(^6\) there was an outburst of enthusiasm and the the Russians found themselves feted and lionised.

The visit of the *Suvorov* is memorable, however, not only for its rejoicings. It also marks the emerging of a critical Russian presence in Australia. Rossiysky was an honest observer and did not confine himself to flattering reports. His journal also describes unfortunate aspects of Australian life at the time, such as a battle of Aborigines which he witnessed and which evidently took place with the knowledge and consent of the colonial authorities.\(^7\) The casualties were numerous and severe, and Rossiysky speaks with distaste of the harshness of the British colonial administrators who not only allowed such events to take place, but allegedly encouraged dissension and warfare among the Aboriginal tribes and regarded the spectacle of the resulting lethal fights as a normal entertainment. Rossiysky’s evidence here, incidentally, conflicts with that
of another Russian, I.M. Simonov. Writing six years later he dwells at length on the pacific nature of the indigenous peoples, adding that “the Englishmen leave them in peace and help them as much as they can”.

The three-week visit of the Suworov also brought the first recorded Australian-Russian commercial transactions. They were clearly of a rather basic kind. To conserve their currency the Russians traded some superfluous clothing and various trinkets for Aboriginal curios and took ashore as much scarce rum as they were allowed to, and possibly more, to pay for various supplies and services. As well as this, other goods to the value of a hundred pounds were sold from the ship while it was in port in Sydney.

The 1820s were unique in early Russian-Australian relations since during that decade Russian ships called in to Australia at regular intervals. There were thirteen visits altogether and all had a very high profile. Whenever they occurred, the colonists were much aware of the Russian presence. Guns boomed in Royal and Imperial salutes. There were imposing official welcomes with bands and speeches and the Sydney Gazette or Australian would print high-flown reports and notices invariably inspired by warm pro-Russian sentiment. Most of the ships that came during this period were, of course, not ordinary merchantmen, but vessels on special missions of discovery or supply with elite crews sailing under the direct patronage of high Imperial officials in St Petersburg. Most significant of all, perhaps, were the visits of the Russian squadron in 1820.

Against a historic background of settled peace that followed the Congress of Vienna (1813-14), there was renewed interest by the colonial powers in completing the geographic exploration of the globe. Russian attention focused particularly on the polar regions - on the search for the North-West passage linking the Atlantic and the Pacific, and on the exploration of the Antarctic region. For these purposes, a special fleet of four vessels was fitted out in Kronstadt in 1819. Since the principal aim of the mission was to discover new islands and routes in the Pacific area, best reached by a voyage around the world via the Cape of Good Hope, it was decided to use Port Jackson as a main base. The names chosen for the vessels seem to express the philosophy underlying the venture: Otkrytie [Discovery], Blagonamerennyy [Well-Intended], Vostok [East] and Mirnyy [Peaceful]. Details of their commanders and routings are given by Professor Malakhovsky earlier in this volume.

From the Russian point of view the visits by this squadron are certainly the best documented. Several of the officers kept detailed journals recording their impressions and experiences, the scientists on board made valuable observations relating to astronomy and the natural
phenomena of the Fifth Continent while Pavel Mikhaylov, the artist travelling with F.F. Bellingshausen on the Vostok, produced some excellent sketches and drawings.

After stormy passages from Europe, several of the ships required extensive repairs and refitting in Australia. In the event, the 522 Russian personnel manning the squadron spent a total of 229 days or nearly three million man-hours in Port Jackson - ample time for Sydney's population of a mere eleven thousand inhabitants to become thoroughly aware of the Russian presence. For a good part of the year 1820, the Russian language was constantly heard in the streets of Sydney at the harbourside. The uniform of the Imperial Russian Navy became a familiar sight as the visitors mingled freely with the locals, making social calls, proceeding on excursions to Parramatta or the Blue Mountains, or simply pursuing the workday tasks associated with the repair and resupplying of their ships. For the residents of the colony the visitors brought diversion, stimulus and some lucrative business. Governor Macquarie and his staff took a close personal interest in the welfare of the Russians and numerous receptions, dinners and a final "splendid subscription ball" were arranged in honour of the visitors.

The tradition of endowing the Russians with most-favoured-nation status, and treating them as brothers-in-arms, continued right through to the twenties. Both the Apollon and the Ryurik, which called shortly after each other in 1822, received a very warm welcome which was duly acknowledged by the Russians. In the case of the Ryurik, this was reported by Akhilles Shabel'sky, a one-time fellow-student of Aleksander Pushkin at the Lyceum of Tsarskoe Selo, who had joined the ship's company of the sloop Apollon in the official capacity of interpreter. He wrote a lively record of his experiences and impressions which he subsequently published as a book. This provides an interesting link between Australia and Russia's great national poet, as it gave the opportunity to Pushkin to learn something of the newly discovered Fifth Continent. Shabel'sky presented his book with a personal inscription to Pushkin who retained the volume in his library.10

In the following year the Russians made their first visit to Tasmania. May 1823 saw the arrival in Hobart of a Russian squadron under the command of that Pacific veteran M.P. Lazarev now promoted to captain's rank. It consisted of his own ship, the 44-gun frigate Kreyser, and of the 20-gun sloop Ladoga commanded by his brother, Andrey P. Lazarev. This small force was ostensibly carrying stores and supplies to Russian Alaska but was also under orders to show the Russian Imperial flag on the American West Coast as part of an aggressive Empire-building policy promoted in St Petersburg by V.M. Golovnin and other decision-makers.
at the Admiralty with a view to asserting Russia's sovereignty over a large part of the North Pacific.

It has been suggested that Hobart was chosen because Captain Lazarev felt awkward about going to Sydney, since past welcomes there had been so very generous and the Russians had not repaid adequately the hospitality of the Australians. This explanation, which comes from one of Lazarev's persistent critics, seems very far-fetched. More likely the choice of Tasmania was prompted simply by curiosity and a quest for variety. This was, after all, Captain M.P. Lazarev's fourth visit to Australia and, in the event, it proved to be the most trying. This was not, however, due to any failure on the part of the colonial authorities in Tasmania to accord to the Russians their usual cordial welcome, or to assist them in every way to resupply and repair their vessels. The problem which Lazarev encountered rather was an internal one and although at one point it threatened to involve colonial authorities in a very major way, it was eventually resolved without outside help by the Russians themselves. The evidence regarding the events which occurred is sparse and one-sided, but there seems no doubt that centrally involved in the affair was the Kreyser's second most senior midshipman - Dmitry Zavalishin, the future Decembrist.

It is a matter of considerable interest that on the first Russian ships to visit Australia there was a strikingly high proportion of officers, such as M.K. Kyukhlebeker (Apollon), K.P. Torson (Vostok) and D.I. Zavalishin (Kreyser), who subsequently became involved in the famous revolutionary movement that culminated in the uprising in December, 1825, when for a few critical hours the fate of the Romanov autocracy lay in the balance. It is tempting to speculate that observation of the democratic elements in the Australian way of life, even at that early stage, might have encouraged the liberal aspirations of these men. This does, however, appear open to considerable doubt, if we bear in mind the harsh realities of the convict system which conditioned much of the development of Australian society at this stage. Perhaps it was more simply that boldness of spirit and individuality of character were natural ingredients of the make-up of the Russian naval officers who volunteered for round-the-world voyages. Certainly, the long months at sea would have given ample time for critical study and reflection.

Zavalishin was in many respects the archetypal Decembrist. Talented, sensitive and idealistic, he was also incurably romantic and prone to fantasy. This makes him an often unreliable historical informant, although there is undoubtedly a substantial basis of fact in the colourful reminiscences which he wrote late in life. Zavalishin is our main source of information on the mutiny which occurred while Captain
Lazarev’s squadron was in the Derwent in June 1823. His account of it was written half a century after the event when he had completed his savage sentence of thirteen years of convict labour and a subsequent term of twenty-four years of exile in Siberia, imposed as a result of his participation in the Decembrist revolt.

What exactly occurred is to some extent a matter of speculation, but the rebellion of the sailors seems to have been symptomatic of on-going tension on the Kreyser. There was evidently considerable friction between Zavalishin and Ivan Kadian, the ship’s second-in-command. Kadian allegedly was a stern disciplinarian whose unreasonable demands frequently antagonised the sailors. Zavalishin’s keen sense of justice was out-raged and he sided with the ratings.

On arrival at Hobart Town, the Harbour-master Captain T. Bromley, who had met the Russians with “a welcome gift of ready-cooked roastbeef and salad”, allocated to them not only a good anchorage but also a shore base some twenty-five miles up-river accessible by longboat, where they could cut firewood, prepare charcoal, establish a forge and carry out various tasks associated with the restocking and maintenance of their vessels. It was there that, a few days before they were due to leave, the Russians, reportedly provoked by Kadian’s harshness and egged on by some run-away convicts, went on strike and refused to return to the ship. It appears that the Governor, Colonel Sorell, was informed of the mutiny before Captain Lazarev and was greatly concerned as it was thought that the rebellious Russians might form an alliance with local bushrangers and attack Hobart which was defended only by a company of sixty men. Five of the sailors almost immediately disappeared into the bush and it was feared that the rest would follow.  

Ironically, it was Zavalishin, the future revolutionary who, if his account is to be believed, single-handedly tackled the rebellion, brought in four of the absconders and arranged a lenient settlement in which the main offenders were punished by minor loss of seniority and the whole affair was hushed up by Lazarev. The Russian squadron subsequently delayed its departure for six days, waiting for the return of the last of the Russian deserters who had gone off with three Englishmen. The man concerned, Stanislav Stankevich, a particularly able and intelligent seaman from Riga, was expected to surrender himself but failed to show up and his ultimate fate is unknown. The Hobart authorities promised to capture him and transport him to Sydney for return to Russia on the next available ship. There is no record that this occurred and it seems likely that Stankevich survived and settled in Australia.

In any event, Stankevich was neither the first Russian migrant, nor the first or last of the early Russian voyagers who chose to remain in
Australia. A precedent was set already in 1814 when the Suvorov lost one of its navigating officers, Joseph de Silvier, who defected from his ship in Sydney. Subsequently, during the first call of the Amerika in 1832 one of the tradesmen of the Russian crew also jumped ship in Sydney to make his fortune in the Antipodes.

In spite of their early arrival date, none of these ex-mariners can be claimed to have been the first Russian settlers in Australia. This honour would seem to belong to a Russian who arrived on a convict ship from England in 1804. Our main information about him comes from the lively journal of Andrey Lazarev, who reports meeting a few people resident in Hobart who could speak Russian. Among them was an elderly man born in Belorussia who claimed to have served as an officer in the Russian Army in the reign of Catherine II. In the course of an adventurous life he found himself in England, from where he was sent to Australia as a convict, having been sentenced for some misdemeanour. He arrived in Hobart Town on the Ocean with Colonel David Collins and became known as John Potaskie. In 1810, he was freed after serving his term and by 1823, when Lazarev met him, had a house in Hobart where he lived with his wife and children. His subsequent contribution to Australian society, however, appears to have been dubious. Lazarev recalls that he was warned about the man by Governor Sorell and other local officials. Perhaps it was a feeling that here was a fellow countryman in moral danger that prompted his gift to him of a Russian Bible from the Ladoga's library. This effort at redemption unhappily proved too late, for the man soon after was arrested and imprisoned for sheep-stealing.

As well as the gifts of a Russian and a French Bible recorded by A. Lazarev, the 1823 visit of the Russian squadron to Hobart also brought another contribution to Australian cultural life - a shore performance by the Russians' excellent orchestra. It played to great applause at an elaborate subscription banquet arranged by the citizens of Hobart for the Russian visitors. The Russians also contributed many vocal items and there were speeches and toasts. In fact, it seems that the music was not the only Russian cultural contribution on this festive occasion. We are informed that "no less than 27 bumper toasts were drunk" - a number that seems considerably in excess of English, or even Scottish norms for such occasions.

The visits to Port Jackson in the late twenties and early thirties by the Russian ships Elena, Krotkiy, and Amerika mark the end of an era. They were the last during which the Russians enjoyed in full the privileges and hospitality accorded to a trusted ally without any admixture of suspicion or latent rivalry. The seven-week visit of the Elena under
Captain P.E. Chistyakov in 1825 is noteworthy as the longest stay in Sydney of any Russian ship in the nineteenth century. Once again there was lively interaction with the local population as witnessed by some quite large-scale social activities reported in the press.\textsuperscript{22} The \textit{Elena}, however, was a small ship engaged on a freight-carrying task and thus carried few officers and no special personnel, so that there are only laconic Russian records of this lengthy visit. Moreover, the novelty of Australia for Russian voyagers had to some extent worn off. Although other events of the \textit{Elena’s} second Pacific voyage in 1829 are recorded at some length in the journal of her new captain, V. S. Khromchenko, the five-week stay in Sydney on this occasion is dismissed in two sentences devoted to nautical observations.\textsuperscript{23}

For the residents of Sydney, on the other hand, the novelty of the Russians was still very considerable. Particularly the arrival on 7 April 1829 of a further exploration vessel specially constructed for long-range cruising made a strong impact. This was the \textit{Krotkiy} under the command of the famous sea-captain, L.V. Hagemeister, who was revisiting Port Jackson after an absence of twenty-two years. One wonders whether he would have found any old acquaintances from his previous visit. Certainly, the city and port had changed greatly in the interim. Nevertheless, Sydney took him to its heart and feted him with a round of entertainments and celebrations. His visit also provoked intelligent comment from W.C. Wentworth’s \textit{Australian} regarding future relations with the Russian Empire.\textsuperscript{24}

The extent of the public interest in Hagemeister’s visit and the depth of the pro-Russian feeling that was current can, however, best be gauged by the form and content of the Australian work of literature which it inspired. To honour the occasion John Dunmore Lang wrote a long poem entitled: “To the Commodore of the Russian Squadron Bound for Kamchatka, Now Lying in the Harbour of Port Jackson.”\textsuperscript{25} It was published in full in the \textit{Sydney Gazette} on Thursday, 30 April 1829 - the day of the \textit{Krotkiy’s} departure from Sydney. To understand the depth of the pro-Russian feeling current in Australia at the time, we need to bear in mind that our poet is not a romantic maverick but a sober Scotsman, republican, democrat, Presbyterian churchman and influential intellectual leader.

Lang’s poem has fourteen stanzas of regular iambic tetrameters. It is a carefully crafted literary artefact in which each stanza has an initial quatrain with alternating masculine rhymes, followed by an energetic valedictory couplet with especially sonorous masculine rhymes. The tone is panegyrical, yet emotionally intense. It opens with a cordial invitation addressed to Captain Hagemeister:
Hail! Chieftain from the distant lands
That own the Czar's imperial reign;
With British hearts and British hands,
We greet you welcome from the main:
Then rest your weary keels awhile,
Embosomed in Australia's isle.

Lang goes on to sing the praises of the Romanov tsars and their able servants who are dedicated to the task of bringing enlightenment, peace and prosperity to the untamed savages in the remotest parts of the earth, turning even the wild Kamchatka into "a land of light and liberty". It is the pursuit of such civilising, noble goals which unites the two great colonising nations in the Pacific:

So shall the Russ and Briton vie
In friendly strife along the deep,
Where pagan isles unnumbered lie,
And the vast South Sea's billows sweep;
And each be hailed the friend of man,
From far New Zealand to Japan.

As Lang warms to his theme, Russia is extolled as a land of unique freedom that has defended her liberty against all intruders, including "Gaul's Imperial Despot" - Napoleon. The Tsar is urged to extend his civilising, Christian influence ever further to free the Balkan nations from the Turkish yoke, to bring the infidel to heel, to conquer Constantinople and extend the benefits of benign Russian rule over all the peoples of Asia Minor. Perhaps the most striking quatrains is a climactic exhortation to the Russians to fulfil their national destiny:

Hail! Russia hail! Land of the North,
Thine is a destiny sublime;
For Heaven's decree has issued forth,
And now, behold the appointed time!

It was the first and probably last time that the Russians would elicit such boundless faith and unreserved enthusiasm from a notable writer. Feelings about Russia were soon to change dramatically. When in 1831 the news of Tsar Nicholas' iron-fisted suppression of the Polish national
uprising reached the colony, popular opinion responded with shock and outrage, and the image of the Russians as the trusted and like-minded allies dedicated to the overthrow of all oppressors was irreparably damaged.

The two visits of the naval transport ship Amerika to Sydney in 1832, and again in 1835, proved to be last of the Russian stop-overs that made use of Australia as a regular port of call on the round-the-world route from the Baltic to Alaska. On the first occasion the captain once again was V.S. Khromchenko, who had previously brought the Elena to Port Jackson in 1829 and, on the second, continuity was provided by the presence as second-in-command of Lieutenant E. Berens who had previously sailed with Hagemeister on the Krotkiy. 26

Although the Russians made every effort to be agreeable - Khromchenko gave an elaborate luncheon aboard his ship for seventy-two persons - the previous rapport had clearly been lost. Both visits were on all accounts very low-key, especially the second visit of the Amerika in 1835, when the Sydney press was venting a good deal of hostile feeling. On the occasion of the departure of the Russian ship the Sydney Herald once again printed a poem with a Russian theme. This time, however, it was a lament about the lost liberty of Poland, replete with ample anti-Russian sentiments.27

During the closing years of the reign of Tsar Nicholas I the previous, almost limitless goodwill towards the Russians was gradually supplanted by an insidious Russophobia that in spite of later periodic alliances was to become almost endemic. The newspapers from England now were reporting an increasing strain in Russo-British relations. More directly, refugees from Poland brought reports of severe oppression in Poland in the wake of the anti-Russian risings. Russia in consequence came to be regarded as repressive and a threat to all liberal and democratic aspirations. The Crimean War hardened the change in Australian attitudes. The Russian Navy was now viewed with apprehension as a threatening and sinister force. Australia was thought to be vulnerable and unprepared. There were several scares when Russian invasion was thought to be imminent and defensive forts were constructed to protect the major ports against possible Russian attack.

Calls by Russian ships now became very infrequent, the average rate dropping to one every ten years. The deterioration in relations was not the only reason for this. The age of discovery was over. Colonial claims had been staked out and trade routes had become established. With the passing of the age of sail, ships no longer had to follow the trade winds. The Russian ships from the Baltic to Far Eastern Siberia now generally took the shorter route via Singapore. Moreover, the interest of the Tsarist
Government in the Pacific region declined noticeably in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The far-flung Russian colonial settlements proved difficult to defend during the Crimean War and were a drain on the Russian treasury. Support was withdrawn from colonial ventures and Alaska was sold to the USA in 1867.

A measure of residual Russian scientific interest in the Pacific region continued, however, now largely promoted by private initiative. An outstanding Russian contribution to the study of the South Pacific at this stage was that of N.N. Miklouho-Maclay, scientist, ethnographer and explorer of New Guinea. He lived intermittently in Sydney from 1878 to 1886 and married a daughter of the former NSW Governor, Sir John Robertson. He holds the distinction of being the first Russian to make a major contribution to Australian science. On his initiative, the first marine biological station in the Southern Hemisphere was established in 1881 at Watson's Bay, Sydney. The building still stands and bears a fine commemorative plaque.

Miklouho-Maclay was also responsible for creating a good deal of interest in Australia. He conceived the plan of founding a "free" Russian colony in the South Pacific. In 1886, advertisements appeared in the St Petersburg press asking for volunteers wishing to settle in Papua, New Guinea or "other Pacific islands". The project did not eventuate, but it attracted thousands of replies and focused a great deal of public interest on the topic of migration to this part of the world. It also stimulated the publication of a spate of Russian books which described Australia in glowing colours as a country of unlimited opportunities and progressive social institutions. This publicity acted as a great stimulus to migration.

By the end of the nineteenth century the Russian perception of Australia was of a new and vigorous nation built on principles of individual liberty and social justice that offered a welcoming haven to all those who for various reasons - political, religious or racial - felt themselves disadvantaged in the Empire of the Tsars. So in spite of the fact that official policy discouraged emigration, adventurous or restless Russian subjects began to find their way to the Fifth Continent. The 1891 census already recorded 2,350 Russian-born males and 531 females living in Australia, and in the ensuing thirty years the numbers show a steady net increase. However, not all of the immigrants concerned were ethnic Russians since the census did not differentiate them from minority groups of the Russian Empire such as Georgians, Finns or Balts.

A particularly large group of early arrivals was that of Russian-born Jews. Disadvantaged and oppressed as they felt themselves to be in the border regions of the Jewish Pale of Settlement, enterprising spirits
among them were looking for a new home “down under”. The majority of them came via England and settled in Melbourne or Sydney where, at an early stage, they established Russian-Jewish organisations such as the Bund and the Kadimah. As they put down roots, they sponsored further migration of relatives and friends. This group of Russian-born settlers included a number who achieved great success and prominence in their new homeland, such as Norman Myer, founder of the Myer stores, and Judah Waten, the author, who recorded his immigrant experiences in an autobiographical work, Alien Son. 28

Russian migration to Australia in the twentieth century has been markedly episodic. Its successive waves have followed the occurrence of major historical events that destabilised the Russian people. Its demographic patterns are conditioned by revolution, war and political persecution.

Virtually all the Russians who have come to Australia since 1905 belong to one of five distinct groups or waves. Ultimately, of course, there is a blending, as the newcomers assimilate with those who have come earlier and with the Australian population in general, but at the time of arrival each wave has its own characteristics; each has its own social, ideological or regional composition - its own outlook and style.

The Russian-born migrants who arrived in Australia before World War I, i.e. those referred to here collectively as the “first wave”, may be divided into two categories of people - the settlers and the exiles. In the first category it is the representatives of the minority groups from the Russian Empire who predominate. Feeling persecuted and disillusioned in the land of their birth, they were happy to make their home permanently in Australia. We note that among the names of the Russian-born migrants who sought Australian naturalisation in this period, there are very few that are distinctly Russian.

As regards the second category, that of the exiles, it is here that we find most of the ethnic Russians, who, it seems, saw Australia initially as just a land of temporary abode. Whether they came looking for adventure and riches, or whether they were political adversaries of the Tsarist Government, they were hoping in either case for favourable developments which would enable them to return home. Nor did they at first show any great urge to congregate together. They were distributed very evenly at the beginning of the century without statistical predilection for any one of the Australian states or cities. Unsettled and restless, they were slow to found clubs and evidently saw little need for churches.

The number of political exiles increased considerably when in the years after the Revolution of 1905 the Russian Government returned to reactionary policies. Australia soon became a haven for deserters,
escapees, revolutionaries and other oppositional elements. Generally, they did not come via Europe.

The completion of the Trans-Siberian and the North Manchuria and Chinese Eastern Railways in 1904 gave Russian travellers ready access via Harbin to ports on the Pacific. From there Japanese steamers offered inexpensive passages to Australia with Brisbane as the first port of call. Queensland was particularly migrant-minded at this stage, having at twenty-six per cent the highest proportion of non-Australian born people in its population and offering the maximum assistance to newcomers. Its entry controls were also notoriously lax. We read of passports being sent back to Russia again and again to enable new migrants to enter with the same document. There is even one well-attested instance of a Russian migrant without personal papers gaining entry by showing a Moscow theatre program.³⁰

Patterns of migration tend to be self-perpetuating and the route pioneered by the exiles also paved the way for the settlers. For nearly forty years Queensland continued to attract the greatest number of Russian migrants and to provide the main base from which, as they became familiar with their new land, they sallied forth to find opportunities and careers in other parts of Australia.

In retrospect, the first wave of Russian migration to Australia has a curious ambivalence. In some respect it was the most transient and uncharacteristic, yet it could be argued that it had the most powerful impact and made the Australian public keenly aware of its presence. This is due to the fact that the political exiles who formed such a prominent part of it were not only activists in theory but dynamic personalities and able leaders. Most of them were highly educated. Among them were many former students, some teachers and at least one professor.

By 1910, when the Russian political scene offered few indications of early change, the exiles evidently reached the conclusion that Australia would be their abode for some time and they set about founding an organisation to further their common interests - the Union of Russian Emigrants. It was centred in Brisbane but local branches existed at various times elsewhere - in Sydney, Melbourne and Broken Hill. In Brisbane there was a well-patronised club with a well-stocked library that subscribed to Russian periodicals. Its premises provided scope for study-circles as well as literary, musical and dramatic activities. In Brisbane, too, the first Russian newspaper was founded in 1912. Originally named Ekho Avstralii [The Echo of Australia], it changed its name after one year and took the politically more purposeful title Izvestiya Soyuza Russkikh Emigrantov [Bulletin of the Union of Russian Emigrants].
When this publication was banned in 1916 because of its stand against the war, it was replaced by Rabochaya Zhizn' [Workers' Life].

While generally favourably impressed on arrival in Australia, the Russian political exiles soon found much to criticise. Although holding very diverse views, they all tended towards internationalism, radical political theories and a messianic outlook. They not only sympathised readily with Australian left-wing political causes but were prepared to become passionately involved.

The well-publicised success of the Russian political activists in their actions against the Tsarist Government also gave the Russians in Australia the reputation of being formidable revolutionaries. Already in 1909 during the lockout at Broken Hill, the "experienced Russians" were accused of blowing up a railway line and derailing a wagon. In Queensland, militant Russian trade unionists figured prominently in several bitter industrial conflicts.

A particularly dynamic and colourful personality among the Russian political activists in Australia was F.A. Sergeyev, who pursued his revolutionary career under the pseudonym of "Artem". An early member of the Bolshevik Faction, he was a trusted associate of Lenin whom he first met in Paris in 1903. As a young man he was active in Russia as a revolutionary and he was imprisoned for several years. He escaped from Siberia and made his way to Australia, where he settled in Brisbane. Known as "Big Tom", he was prominent in trade union circles as a militant organiser, participating with like-minded Russians in demonstrations supporting strikers in various hard-fought disputes.

Founder and editor of the local Russian newspaper, he made it the mouthpiece of his own Marxist views. As his English improved he entered Australian politics and became a prominent member of the Australian Socialist Party. He was a frequent Sunday speaker in the Domain and became a leading campaigner for free speech. Arrested for speaking without a permit, he spent a brief period in gaol. He opposed the war and as soon as the news of the February Revolution broke, he returned to Russia.

Back in Petrograd in July 1917, Artem played an important role in establishing the power of the Bolsheviks. He rose rapidly to become one of the new State's top leaders. In 1921 he died prematurely and tragically in the crash of an experimental high-speed rail car, the construction of which he had sponsored. His funeral was a day of national mourning and he was buried on the site reserved for the Soviet Union's greatest heroes. His tomb is directly behind the Lenin Mausoleum on Moscow's Red Square.

During the 1914-18 War the Russians were divided in their attitude,
but many opted for a policy of “revolutionary defeatism” and several
played a leading role in supporting anti-war causes such as the campaign
against conscription. With the news of the overthrow of Tsarism, many
Russians decided to return home immediately. A cable was sent to the
Provisional Government in Petrograd requesting assistance with
repatriation. It agreed to make funds available and a ship with some five
hundred political exiles from all Australian states sailed from Sydney for
Russia.

For those who did not go immediately, return became more difficult
when, after the October Revolution, the Allies realised that the new
Soviet Government was disinclined to continue fighting the Germans.
Russians were now forbidden to leave Australia to return home. The un­
rest generated among them by this prohibition, combined with a certain
revolutionary euphoria, led to the Red Flag Riots which constitute a
colourful episode in the history of the Russians in Australia.

On Sunday, 23 March 1919, a hundred Russians, many with red
banners, spearheaded a demonstration in Brisbane protesting against
the banning of the red flag under the War Precautions Act and against
the refusal of the Australian authorities to allow them to return home.
There were many scuffles between the protesters and opponents who tried
to prevent the march. A counter-demonstration in the evening, which
tried to raid the Russian Hall, dispersed when several shots were fired
from the premises. This use of a firearm by the Russians created a major
uproar.

On the following morning the press carried banner headlines that
declared that “bolshevism had come to Queensland”. This news sparked
a further protest rally, mainly of ex-servicemen, which decided to march
to South Brisbane to storm the Russian Hall in Merivale Street. When
the marchers arrived there, all the Russians had gone, but the police
had taken up positions to guard the premises. In the ensuing skirmish
some of the policemen were hit by flying missiles, some mounted police
were knocked from their horses and in all nineteen people were injured.
Frustrated in their intentions, the rioters surged through Woollong­
gabba breaking the windows of places believed to house Russians. In the
aftermath there were fines and jail-sentences and eight Russians said to be
the ringleaders in the original demonstration were sentenced to be
deported.

A small rear-guard of Russian political activists continued for a while
to exercise a strong influence on Australian politics even after the
departure of the main body. The success of the Bolshevik Revolution
greatly boosted the prestige of the Russians in Australian left-wing
circles. Inspired by the concept of world revolution, several joined in a
final attempt to bring Australia into the international revolutionary fold. Peter Simonoff, an acknowledged supporter of the banned IWW [Industrial Workers of the World] aspired to the dual role of Consul-General of the Soviet Union and organiser of a united Australian revolutionary front.

Throughout 1919-20 Simonoff worked hard in Melbourne and Sydney publicising the USSR and trying to unite all Australian socialist groups into a single party pledged to emulate the Soviet model. In October 1920 he eventually succeeded in helping to found the Communist Party of Australia. It was a pyrrhic success, for not long afterwards he was deported from Australia. By then, most of the Russians in sympathy with the new Soviet Government had left for home, the money for their return being provided from Moscow. Ironically most of them who survived the Civil War were subsequently shot in Stalin’s purges.

Just as the first wave had run its course, the second wave of Russian migration was ready to gain momentum. The defeated opponents of the Red revolutionaries, the so-called White Russians, began to arrive in Australia in the early twenties. They came in a steady stream which peaked in 1925 and would no doubt have been even more plentiful if Australia had not been forced to curb its migrant intake in the twenties because of the depression. In all, the total number of Russians arriving 1920 to 1940 was 4,438. Most came from the Russian Far East and used the Pacific route to land in Brisbane.

Politically, the new arrivals presented a total contrast to their predecessors. They were devoted to the old regime and generally had fought with the loyalist forces against the Red Army. Quite a large number, in fact, came to Australia in contingents based on former units of the Tsarist Army. Sixty-six Ural Cossacks, for instance, arrived in Brisbane, complete with regimental banners, under the leadership of General V. S. Tolstoff. As their Ataman, he had originally commanded forty thousand Cossacks. Their journey had been a veritable Odyssey. They had fought in many battles against the Germans and Austrians in the Great War. This was followed by extensive campaigning in the Civil War in Admiral Kolchak’s forces, when they crossed the Karakum Desert in their final retreat to end up in Persia. From there, they had sailed to Vladivostok which at the time was still in White hands. In 1922, they were driven by the Red Army into Manchuria and from there they had migrated to Australia. Other such contingents consisted of remnants from the Orenburgsky Cossacks, the Izhevsky Regiment and, last to arrive, from the Zabaykalsky Cossacks. Many others came in family groups or alone. In the twenties they generally settled in urban areas although work became increasingly hard to find.
In the most difficult period of the thirties the newcomers generally had to look to country areas to provide them with a livelihood. Mostly they were used to country life and to animals - especially horses. Lacking the capital at first to start on their own, they mostly organised themselves into gangs and headed into the farming areas to find seasonal work. It became a common practice for Russian workers to cut cane in Queensland, particularly in certain places like Tully or Cordalba and then, once that work was finished, to go cotton-picking in the Biloela District. In this work, which required skill as well as endurance, the Russian women and children often worked with the men and a family working hard could earn two hundred pounds in a season.

The Queensland Government at this stage was allocating “selections” of virgin bushland in the Callide Valley to suitable applicants for nominal payment. This led to a notable episode in the history of Russian corporate settlement in Australia. Many of the White Russian migrants successfully applied for such land grants and took up cotton-growing. Soon there was a population of about five hundred of them centred in Thangool. This figure increased even further during the cotton harvest when other Russians from the city came to help.

The Russian settlers were confronted with a tough pioneering task. On arrival they found nothing but thick bush. They built simple dwellings, cleared and fenced their land, ploughed it and sowed their crops. When they found that growing cotton was hazardous because of droughts and plunges in the world price, they diversified into dairying, wheat and pigs. It was hard work and it was the Cossacks who were the most successful.

The Thangool Russian community was socially very self-contained and its life-style remained almost completely Russian. A hall was built with united efforts near the Monto Road. The road leading to it still bears the name of “Russian Club Road”. It housed a library and it became the venue for much social activity - celebrations and dances, a good choir, an orchestra and theatrical performances. Russian classes were organised for the children on Sunday mornings.

The heyday of the Russian colony at Thangool was during the decade 1932-42. Then in the forties ample work again became available in the cities and the younger generation tended to leave. Gradually the Russian farmers sold out and by 1945 about half had gone. Today only a few families remain in the area.

Brisbane continued as the main centre of Russian settlement during this period, although the community in Sydney was growing. In spite of the hardships of the Depression, cultural and social traditions were firmly maintained. Although it took some time before permanent clubs with
their own premises were established, many successful events were organised in hired halls.

There was much artistic talent in the White Russian community and Russian influence on Australian life became cultural rather than political. Some fine Russian singers and choral ensembles now enlivened the local cultural scene. In the graphic arts, Danila Vasilieff, a former Cossack officer, exercised an influential role in bringing expressionist styles to Australian painting and sculpture. Vitaly Gzell, a creative and innovative architect, designed a range of outstanding buildings. Nina Christesen, the daughter of a former Russian sea-captain, pioneered Russian studies in Australia and subsequently headed the first academic department in the subject at the University of Melbourne.

The Russian cultural presence in Australia was greatly enhanced during these years by some notable visitors, some of whom stayed for prolonged periods or came repeatedly - the Don Cossack Choir, Anna Pavlova, Fyodor Shalyapin, the Ballets Russes de Monte Carlo, Nicolai Nadejine, the Covent Garden Russian Ballet and others.

Some of the singers of the Don Cossack Choir decided to stay behind in Australia as did some of the Russian dancers. Both as performers and teachers, the influence of the Russian dancers marked a new era in the development of the Australian ballet.

For many of the Russians who settled in Australia at this period the Russian Orthodox Church was an important and necessary part of their lives. Their religious needs soon led to the establishment of congregations practising the rites of the Eastern Orthodox Church in the Russian Orthodox manner. The first services were those held by Father A. Shabashev in Brisbane in 1925. Due to the efforts of Father V. Antoniev, the first proper Russian church in Australia, that of St Nicholas in Vulture Street, South Brisbane, was built and completed in 1935. Archimandrite M. Shlemin conducted the first Russian Orthodox services in Sydney three years later. These early beginnings created the foundation which made possible the notable expansion of the Russian Orthodox Church in Australia in the post-war period. It now comprises some twenty-four churches with various affiliations, but the majority are under the pastoral care of an archbishop of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad who also administers the Orthodox parishes in New Zealand. 32

In spite of the strong influx of White Russian émigrés opposed to the political aspirations of the Soviet leaders, the Russian community in Australia in the twenties and thirties showed little ideological unity. At one end of the spectrum some of the radical organisations sponsored by the anti-Tsarist exiles continued to exist and these were opposed vigorously by various monarchist groups. Later, during the war years, a
more central position was also strongly represented when A. Kerensky, the head of the Russian Government ousted by the Bolsheviks in October 1917, came to live in Australia. Married to Nell Tritton, a minor Australian literary figure, he resided in Brisbane until her death in 1946.

The prevalent ideological differences were also reflected in the literary sphere. There were a number of Russian periodicals, but they tended to be factional and short-lived. The journal *Chuzhina* [Foreign Land], for instance, polemicated fiercely with *Dal'nyy Yug* [The Far South]. Far more conciliatory were the various journals published in the thirties in Sydney by Father I. Seryshev and G. Davidenkov. They provided news of interest to the Russian community and gave prominence to Orthodox religious information and the traditional Russian national viewpoint.

With the outbreak of war in 1939 the Russian community did not take long to close its ranks. Initially, some 20-30 members of extreme reactionary groups were charged with being fascists and were interned for the duration of the War. Subsequently, as Soviet Russia entered the war, the community united in enthusiastic support of causes to aid the Allied war effort. It particularly identified with the appeal which sent great numbers of Australian sheepskins to the USSR to be made into winter coats for the Soviet soldiers.

During the war years all civilian movement was restricted and the numbers of Russians in Australia naturally remained stable. A sharp upward turn in the arrival figures, however, occurred soon after the cessation of hostilities. A third major wave of Russian migration began to reach Australia. It consisted above all of refugees from the Displaced Persons camps of Germany, Austria and Italy. Many were former prisoners of war, or forcibly recruited civilians, who had been brought to Germany from the occupied western regions of the USSR to participate in the Nazi war effort as Ostarbeiter - workers from the East. Australian authorities originally had difficulties in distinguishing between approximately eight thousand ethnic Russians who sought refuge in Australia in the period from 1945-54, and the considerably larger number of Ukrainians who came at the same time. Although numerically the strongest, this third wave of Russian migration proved to be the least ethnocentric and the most open to assimilation.

This is not surprising, since at this time candidates were chosen for entry into Australia by selection officers who were briefed to give preference to people who, as the official document put it, would “in one generation become real Australians”. Furthermore, many of the Russians had, in fact, made efforts to disguise their ethnic origins to avoid being compulsorily repatriated to Stalin’s Russia under the terms of the Yalta Agreement. Quite a number, for instance, assumed non-Russian names.
Disillusioned and afraid because of real or imagined concerns about their past, many were anxious to start completely afresh and so made few efforts to recover their ethnic identity even when the time for concern had passed.33

The period brought its own new style of emigration. The Russians of the third wave did not arrive as individuals or groups painfully negotiating their own travel arrangements and battling grimly to survive on arrival. Organisation was now in the hands of the Commonwealth Government which administered the procedural routines that led from the DP camps of Europe to the migrant camps and hostels of Australia, from which as “New Australians” they were ultimately discharged into the community.

A price which the new Russian settlers, like all the former DPs, had to pay for receiving assisted passages and entry into Australia was the undertaking to work for two years under contract as directed by the Commonwealth Government. In practice, this meant that over one half of them were first placed in semi-skilled or unskilled occupations and some were sent to isolated and inhospitable locations. The scheme was administered somewhat haphazardly and some of the newcomers were less affected by it than others.

Preference in the selection process had been given to physical fitness. Moreover, in most cases, an upbringing under the arduous conditions of Stalin’s Russia followed by wartime experiences in Hitler’s Germany ensured that the post-war Russian emigrants from Europe were resilient and resourceful. Once they had completed their contracts, they branched out on their own, some to complete higher education, interrupted by the war, or to find openings to suit their aspirations. In the boom conditions of full employment that prevailed at the time, few failed to establish themselves successfully.

The newcomers tended to favour the southern states and Sydney now emerged as the main centre of Russian settlement in Australia. From a communal point of view, the newcomers tended to maintain a low profile. The conditions of the time put the Russian settlers under conflicting defensive pressures - they felt they had to demonstrate that their experiences in Stalin’s Russia and Hitler’s Germany had not made them into either subversive radicals or militant fascists. They generally preferred not to be involved much in cultural Russian community enterprises and to concentrate on developing and applying their personal talents. Many of them established successful business enterprises and others achieved eminence in the professions. Mr A. Chernov, QC, became President of the Australian Bar Association and subsequently Chairman of the Bar Council of Victoria. Dr D.V. Grishin, a highly
respected academic teacher and scholar, founded the International Dostoevsky Society, Dr N.V. Dobrotworsky achieved prominence as an entomologist, discovering and naming new species of Australian mosquitoes. Professor C.M. Hotimsky acquired renown as the first historian of the Russians in Australia and as an outstanding bibliographer of Australiana.

The area of Russian communal endeavour that did show considerable development in the immediate post-war era was the Russian Orthodox Church - a number of new churches being established in Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide, Perth and in Tasmania. Services were well attended and, for instance, the Easter service in 1950 at the Pokrovsky Church in Melbourne is recorded as having attracted over five hundred people.

An important milestone was the establishment of a weekly Russian newspaper with a national circulation. Since its inception in 1950, Edinenie [Unification] has been a prominent medium for the dissemination of news of interest to the Russian community in Australia. Under its able and long-serving editor, Y.K. Amosov, it has provided a forum for discussion and a vehicle for literary expression. The regular appearance of a local Russian newspaper has been an important factor in maintaining the use of Russian as a community language in Australia. It is worthy of note that the post-war era saw the emergence of a talented group of Russian poets of both sexes in whose work the Australian experience has been a dominant theme. Some of their poems have been published in English translation and have attracted favourable critical attention.

In the second half of the fifties the nature of the Russian migration to Australia changed again. The fourth wave of Russian migration which peaked in 1957 and 1961 was in most respects a stronger continuation of the second. It brought to Australia several thousands of Russians who themselves, or whose parents, belonged to a generation that had left Russia at some stage after 1917 and which had found a home in China or Manchuria. The more senior among them thus underwent the traumatic experience of being completely uprooted twice in a lifetime. The younger among them are generally misrepresented in Australian demographic data as they appear in the statistics as Chinese-born.

The post-war settlement of White Russian émigrés from China began quite early in the fifties. A prelude to the main influx from Manchuria was the early arrival of several groups of refugees whose journey had been fraught with particular hardships. Originally forming part of a contingent of 5,500 evacuated from Shanghai in 1949, shortly before the fall of the Kuomintang Government, they had been taken under the auspices of the International Refugees Organisation to the small island of Tubabao, off Samar in the Philippines, where under canvas and exposed to tropical
typhoons and other hardships they had to wait for long months, some even years, before about a quarter of them were selected for entry to Australia. Like the DPs from Europe, they were required to work for two years as directed by the Government. Nevertheless, they considered themselves more fortunate than those left behind in China, who at the time seemed to have lost all chance of escape.

After the conclusion of the Korean War in 1953 the Chinese Government, however, decided that it did not want the continued presence of the White Russian émigrés and, to encourage their exodus, made it possible for them to obtain the necessary exit permits. This decision gave new prospects to the Russians in China, although it also sadly meant that the days of their settlements in the country were numbered. Harbin, their main city, at this stage still contained some forty thousand Russians. Their main concern now was to make the necessary arrangements to leave.

Australia was a much favoured destination, and the "White Russian Program" adopted by the Commonwealth Government opened the door for the entry of the Russians from China and Manchuria. Migrants were required to obtain sponsorship by established Australian residents but the requirement to undertake two years of direct employment was now no longer in force.

Many Russians in Harbin had relatives or friends in Australia prepared to assist with sponsorship. Once newcomers were settled, they in turn gave help to others. A chain of migration was established and functioned effectively. By the mid sixties the exodus from Harbin was complete. Over five thousand Russians who had called this city home, some for two or more generations, made a new start in Australia - about half of them in Sydney, a third in Brisbane and the remainder dispersed elsewhere.

The transit to Australia was not without its problems. Chinese regulations prohibited the export of money or valuables and baggage was severely limited. Nor could Chinese currency be converted to pay for overseas travel. Most families thus paid their way to Hongkong where the World Council of Churches generously provided temporary accommodation and made available loans from its "revolving fund" to cover the costs of the passage to Australia. After arrival at their destination the newcomers would return the sum advanced as soon as possible to enable others to follow. The severity of the Chinese restrictions naturally inspired their evasion and some of the more daring and fortunate succeeded in bringing out gold camouflaged as belt buckles and nails in packing-cases. The years of residence on Chinese territory had proved a broadening experience. As well as learning to appreciate
eastern food and other local traditions, the Russians had been exposed to much cosmopolitan influence in Harbin. Thus, in general, they were particularly well-prepared for life in Australia and adapted to it easily and successfully - grateful for its security and stability. Many, especially in Sydney, established private enterprises that have flourished and in many instances have made Russian names familiar on the commercial scene. No Russian migrant name, however, became more widely known to the general public than that of Tsientsien-born Tania Verstak, who was crowned Miss Australia in 1961 and then went on to win the title of Miss Universe, the first time that this had been achieved by a representative of Australia.

The Russians from China generally brought with them not only a cosmopolitan outlook but a high standard of education. Russian Harbin, especially, prided itself on its educational facilities. The manifest uncertainties of expatriate life had fostered a tradition which regarded education as perhaps the most desirable form of personal investment. The city had no less than twenty-seven primary schools, fifteen secondary schools and four tertiary institutions, including the Polytechnical Institute which spared no efforts to maintain and achieve the standards of a world-class technical university.

The migrants from Harbin tended to be particularly well-educated and to have unusually broad intellectual and cultural interests. Many spoke foreign languages - Chinese, Japanese, German or English - and quite a large number had tertiary qualifications. They readily found employment in Australia in the technical professions, as engineers, architects, chemists, draughtsmen, etc. A number of Russians from Harbin entered the Australian universities as students, general staff and academic teachers.

The Russian migration from China brought to Australia some notable mature writers and scholars with established reputations such as the author and naturalist N.A. Baikov; the historian I.I. Gapanovich; the orientalist, A.P. Hionin; the archaeologist, V.V. Ponosov. While all these academics were quite advanced in age when they arrived, they nevertheless contributed significantly to the Australian scholarly scene. Professor Gapanovich served with distinction at the ANU while V.V. Ponosov, as curator of the anthropological exhibits of the University of Queensland, brought order into a rich but greatly neglected collection and also played an important role in making a survey of the aboriginal archaeological sites in the Moreton Bay region.

A very distinguished migrant from Harbin also was the Russian Orthodox churchman, the Rev. Father Filaret (G.N. Voznesensky). A graduate of Harbin Polytechnical Institute in engineering, he subsequently entered the Church and came to Brisbane in 1957 as an Archimandrite. In
1963, he was appointed Bishop of Brisbane and in the following year in New York was elected by a solemn conclave of all the archbishops and bishops of the Russian Church Abroad to be their Metropolitan and Head. In this capacity, he revisited Australia on several occasions. He headed the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad until his death in 1985.

A distinct group of Russians from Manchuria is that of the Old Believers - members of a Russian sectarian group that has existed since the middle of the seventeenth century. They had a well-established community in Harbin which was also forced to migrate in the fifties. The majority went to Brazil, but a large contingent of some fifty families came to Australia and settled at Yarwun near Gladstone where they took up growing pawpaws. Although some of the members have now dispersed, a strong nucleus still remains and retains the traditional rituals and life style which go back to the days of Muscovy. The Old Believers with their obligatory beards and old-fashioned ways have become a notable feature of the Yarwun district.

Not all the Russians of the fourth wave came from Harbin. An exceptionally large group of several thousand came from the province of Sinkiang and a numerous contingent came from the North Manchurian district of Trekherchiiye [Three Rivers], where many former Zabaykalsky Cossacks had established themselves on the land.

In Sinkiang the main Russian settlements were in Kuldzha, Chuguchak and Urumchi. Originally these had been strong communities with their own Russian schools and churches. Culturally and commercially they had maintained strong links with Harbin and the end of the Russian colony there left them isolated. Over the years many intermarried with the local population but they were still regarded as outsiders. Especially during the cultural revolution conditions became unendurable, and as soon as departure became possible many made their way to Australia.

In another process of chain migration, these Russians from outlying regions of China tended to settle in a few centres such as South Dandenong (Vic.), Belfast (near Geelong) and Adelaide. Practical and used to manual work, many entered the building trade as painters and plasterers. They formed well-defined ethnic communities with their own churches which provide the focal point of their communal life.

By the seventies the immigration of the Russians from China was in its closing phase, but already a new episode in Russian settlement had commenced. A fifth wave of migration, still incomplete, was beginning to bring to Australia several thousand Russians of Jewish background. The early peak of this movement came in 1972 and coincided with President Nixon's much publicised visit to the USSR.
Soviet authorities then granted a large number of exit visas for travel to Israel. In the event, many of the immigrants did not proceed there or only stayed quite briefly. Many settlers came directly to Australia via Vienna and Rome.

Migration to Australia was a trying experience for most of these new arrivals. Many reported that once their applications to leave the USSR had been submitted, they encountered difficulties and hostility. The lengthy bureaucratic processes involved in emigration from the USSR entailed nerve-racking delays and great expense. Required was not only an exit visa, but a further costly document that certified that the applicant’s request to be deprived of Soviet citizenship had been granted. In some instances, large sums had to be paid to compensate the Soviet Government for the costs of providing education and professional training to the person wishing to leave. A small number of Russian newcomers also chose to come to Australia after defecting from Soviet touring companies or ships.

Most of these latest Russian migrants have settled in Sydney and Melbourne. They maintain an esprit de corps which is fostered in their own periodical - originally Shalom, but subsequently renamed Pyatyy Kontinent [The Fifth Continent]. The members of this recent wave tend to be professionally well-qualified and highly motivated. Some are specialised in high technology areas such as computing, but others also work in cultural fields such as architecture, film production or the humanities.

This most recent, fifth wave of Russian migration has brought to Australia some outstanding musicians, such as the violinists Nelli Shkolnikova and Natalya Koloskova, the pianist Efim Stesin, the Lakirovich brothers who have established the Stoliarsky music school in Brisbane and a number of others. The work of recent arrivals is continuing effectively the endeavours of the many generations of Russian migrants who have enriched life in Australia by contributing their personal skills and talents and by bringing with them the cultural traditions of the Russian people.

A detailed study of the impact on local life of the Soviet Russians who have been visitors or temporary residents in Australia since the establishment of diplomatic relations with the USSR in 1942 lies beyond the scope of this article. In spite of setbacks, such as the Petrov defection in 1954 and Ivanov affair thirty years later, these relations have clearly been to the overall benefit of both parties. One noteworthy aspect of post-World War II relations is that Australian ports have been much visited by Russian ships. The Soviet merchant fleet carries out of Australia a very high proportion of bulk exports, such as grain, sugar and
other agricultural produce. There are also frequent calls by training and research vessels and agreements are in place covering the use of Australian ports in support of Soviet fishing operations. Since 1974, Australia has also served as a base for Soviet passenger ships providing cruises for Australian tourists to the South Pacific and other more distant parts. Russian liners, such as Sobinov, Shalyapin and Pushkin have given tens of thousands of Australians the opportunity to obtain first-hand experience of Russian culture by hearing Russian folk-music, seeing Russian dancing, sampling Russian food and making social contacts with members of the Russian crew.

In general, the Russian presence in Australia has been more prominent in recent years than ever before. Since the advent of glasnost' and perestroika in the Soviet Union, there has been a very marked increase in the number of Soviet Russians to come to Australia for business or tourism. At the 1988 Australian Bicentennial World Exposition in Brisbane, the Soviet pavilion was one of the largest and most impressive. The historic visit to Australia of the Soviet Head of Government, Prime Minister N. Ryzhkov, in February 1990, gave further impetus to closer relations and increased economic ties. Russian specialists now come to negotiate with local partners regarding Soviet participation in the construction of large-scale projects in Australia such as the planned spaceport at Cape York in North Queensland. The stage could well be set for a more potent Russian contribution to Australian development than ever before in the history of the Fifth Continent.

Notes

1. Notable exceptions in this respect are the following pioneering studies which, however, are mainly concerned with the nineteenth century:
   C.M. Hotimsky, “Russians in Australia”, Australian Encyclopaedia (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1958);
2. A milestone in this endeavour was the volume: James Jupp, *The Australian People - An Encyclopedia of the Nation, its People and their Origins* (Sydney: Angus and Robertson Publishers, 1988). An edited version of part of the present paper was published in this volume under the title "Russians".

3. Some of this material still remains unpublished in the naval archives of the USSR. For comprehensive details of published or located manuscript sources see:


7. Ibid., pp. 64-65.


9. See above, pp. 22 ff.


14. Ibid., p. 70.

15. Ibid., pp. 71-73.


17. V. Fitzhardinge, "Russian Ships in Australian Waters, 1807-1835", p. 144.

18. Ibid.; p. 139.

29. There are few printed sources available on the Russian migration to Australia in the twentieth century. Most of the information which follows is based on interviews conducted by the present author over several years with Russian informants now resident in Australia.
Rarely has a foreign diplomatic representative received such unflattering attention as did Peter Simonoff, Soviet "Consul-General" in Australia from 1918 to 1921. Although duly accredited by the fledgling Bolshevik regime, Simonoff failed to obtain de jure recognition from the Hughes Government which had reason to fear the activities of this experienced demagogue and provocateur. Yet, strangely enough, it also refused permission for several years for Simonoff to leave Australia. As a result, the Soviet representative was in diplomatic limbo, but he was also subjected to surveillance, mail searches, fines and finally imprisonment. However, Simonoff gained a measure of revenge before departing from Australia in June 1921: he was instrumental in founding the Communist Party of Australia, which was to cause the Commonwealth considerable trouble in subsequent years.

Russian diplomatic business had been handled since the late 1850s by honorary or vice consuls stationed in major Australian centres. But in 1909 one of the first career diplomats, Count A. N. d'Abaza, was appointed as Russian Consul-General in Melbourne. The growth of trade between Tsarist Russia and newly federated Australia, Russia's expanding interest in the region and, more particularly, the rapid increase in the number of Russian immigrants to Australia - all of this justified the appointment of a full-time diplomat in Australia.

Russians settling in Australia before 1905 generally came with the intention of staying permanently in their new home. Their desire to assimilate and sever their ties with the "old country" contributed to their desirability as migrants. Because most of them came via the United Kingdom, Melbourne and Sydney, as the first ports of call, benefited most from this migration. But the Russian Revolution of 1905 changed the character of Russian migration. The enormous increase in the number of Russian refugees and migrants caused the Colonial Office to
reconsider and then to tighten up the criteria for allowing Russians to stay in Britain until the necessary documents were obtained. As a result of this, a new route was pioneered - across Siberia to Manchuria and eventually to Harbin or one of the major seaports of China. Moreover, the pioneers of this route were not ordinary migrants, but political exiles sent to Siberia after the events of 1905.

As a result of punitive measures, 74,245 political dissenters were sentenced to exile, of whom 34,740 escaped. A surprising number of those successfully fleeing the Tsarist authorities came to Australia, and Brisbane, being the first port of call from the Far East, emerged as an important centre of the Russian radical movement in exile.

Adrift in strange surroundings, the newly arrived Russians attempted to establish closer ties amongst themselves. The resultant Russian Association was the brainchild of L.G. Kalinin, a moderate leftist, who formed the association in order "to provide new arrivals in Queensland with such work as may be suitable to them, and if possible in their own professions". In February 1911 Kalinin was elected president, while Munt, an optical salesman, became the association's first secretary. A general meeting was called in December of the same year to coincide with the gathering in Brisbane of a large number of Russian itinerant workers for the Christmas festivities. It was at this meeting that Fedor Andreevich Sergeyev, who was later a member of Lenin's Central Committee and also known as Artem or (in Australia) "Tom", led the "politicals" in the take-over of the organisation. In January 1912, the Soyuz Russkikh Emigrantov (Union of Russian Emigrants or URE) was formed, with headquarters in Brisbane and "cells" in all other major centres where sufficient numbers of Russians justified their formation. In 1916 Peter Simonoff became the secretary of the Broken Hill branch of the association, which by that year had assumed the name Union of Russian Workers (URW).

It is not the intention of this paper to describe in any detail the activities of the Russian group. Suffice to say that from its inception in 1911 to the revolutionary year of 1917, the Russian radicals were involved in the Freedom of Speech movement in Brisbane, formed a number of "locals" of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), established a separate group within the Victorian Socialist Party (VSP) and set up a Russian branch of the Australian Socialist Party (ASP).

In Brisbane, the association shared premises with the ASP. The full spectrum of Russian radical thought was represented within the emigrants' league. Artem was the undisputed leader of the social democrats, and the most influential figure within the organisation. Alexis Lenin, an anarchist who had escaped from Russia to America, where he became
interested in the IWW, led the anarcho-syndicalists, while Alexander Zuzenko, who had served as a junior naval officer on the Black Sea Fleet during the Potemkin mutiny, guided the anarcho-communists. Herman Bykov (also known as Resanoff or A. Rozanov) was the spearhead of the "Maximalists", the extreme wing of the Socialist Revolutionary Party (SRs), whereas Boris Skvirsky, who for a time was a student at the University of Queensland, was the leader of the moderate SRs.

Before the February Revolution, relations between the various factions within the Union of Russian Emigrants were cordial enough, largely thanks to Artem. All of them had access to the organ of the association, Ekho Australii [The Echo of Australia], which was launched on 27 June 1912, and closed by the authorities in September of the same year. It was replaced by the Izvestiya Soyuza Russikh Emigrantov [The Bulletin of the Union of Russian Emigrants], which was also shut down, this time under the War Precautions Act, in February 1916. In both cases Count d'Abaza, the Russian Consul-General, was instrumental in urging the authorities to act against the URE (or URW). In view of this, it is hardly surprising that once the revolution took place, the URW branches in Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne demanded the resignation of d'Abaza.

D'Abaza had no intention of resigning, however. On 27 March 1917, he received instructions from the Provisional Government authorising him to approach a bank and raise £20,000 to provide "the fullest assistance to all Russian political emigrants who are desirous of returning home. In case of need to furnish them within the limits of reasonable economy with the necessary funds for their passage to Russia". The Commonwealth Bank of Australia approved the loan, and the news that the "politicals" were now free to return home to Russia was made known to the URW. These were exciting times indeed. An extraordinary meeting of the group was held in Brisbane, attended by delegates from Sydney, Melbourne, Broken Hill and Ipswich. A committee was formed to process and organise those Russians who were desirous of returning home. D'Abaza, however, made it plain that he would do nothing to facilitate the return of what he described as "Russia's unwanted anarchic element," especially those who advocated Russia's immediate and unilateral withdrawal from the war. But a shipload of several hundred Russians managed to sail from Sydney. Others followed, the exodus lasting until November 1917. Most of those who left during this period were moderates however, among them Skvirsky, together with several other SRs who were deemed to be acceptable by d'Abaza. To the rest, the Consul-General simply refused to issue visas. Artem and some of the others did not even bother to apply. They made their way to Darwin and
with the help of friendly trade unionists obtained berths on a vessel bound for Shanghai. By May, they were in Russia.23

After Artem's departure, Michael Rosenberg, later deported for participating in the "Red Flag Riots" of 1919, was appointed for a time to the editorship of the new Russian publication, *Workers' Life*. He proved to be less than suitable for the position, and Peter Simonoff, secretary of the Broken Hill branch of the URW (and reputed to have been a professional journalist) 24 was asked to come to Brisbane to take over the running of the paper and to accept the secretaryship of the URW.25

Once news of the October Revolution reached Australia, the position of the Russian Consul-General became totally untenable. He informed the Prime Minister's Department that he could represent only "those Russians who are absolutely faithful to the Allies".26 By then, however, he was no longer receiving instructions from Russia, and the Commonwealth authorities, in view of the fact that the new Bolshevik Government was not recognised by Great Britain, withdrew d'Abaza's recognition and invalidated all passports issued by him.27 Thus, on 18 November 1917, the Russians in Australia ceased to have an officially recognised representative.

Early in 1918 it was mooted that Simonoff should be appointed to the post of Consul-General by the Bolshevik Government. Indeed, Simonoff was already acting in this capacity when he wrote to Captain Wood with the request to grant exit permits to Russians who wished to leave.28 However, few were prepared for the cable from Maxim Litvinov, the unofficial Bolshevik representative in London: "Simonoff appointed Consul British Foreign office advised."29

Why would a personage of Litvinov's standing in the Party send such a cable and why, more importantly, would he nominate Simonoff, a comparative unknown and IWW supporter whose appointment to the editorship of *Workers' Life* had been motivated by pragmatic rather than ideological considerations? Certainly, on the face of it, others had a more valid claim to this honour, although many of the more obvious candidates had already left Australia. Of those remaining, there were many with the right credentials: N. Leonard-Kanevsky, President of the URW in Melbourne who had been trying to unseat d'Abaza since the February Revolution; J. Maruschak, an executive committee member of the Victorian Socialist Party; N. Dorff, a member of the Brisbane Tramway strike committee of 1912; H. Bykov, a member of the Socialist Revolutionary Party since 1905; A.E. Kalinin, a member of the Latvian Socialist Democratic Labour Party since 1904; Ya. A. Gan-Portnoi, member of the Australian Socialist Party; K. Klushin, who had spent years in various Tsarist gaols for his membership in the Russian Social-
Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP); and Peter Timms, a Bolshevik of many years standing who had known V.I. Lenin. And there were scores of others. Given this wide choice, the appointment of Simonoff was hard to understand.

Herman Bykov (alias Resanoff or Rozanov) was particularly vocal in his condemnation of Simonoff, maintaining that he must have somehow lobbied for the job without the sanction of the URW. Simonoff himself felt it necessary to justify his appointment by playing down the importance of the position. He wrote to Volkovsky of the Sydney URW: “So far as I understand, the reason for my appointment is purely [to act] as agitator.” He then resigned his position as editor of Workers’ Life and secretary of the URW, and departed for Melbourne where he established the Soviet "Consulate".

On 7 March 1918, the Secretary of State advised the Prime Minister that Simonoff’s appointment had been confirmed by Litvinov and, although “His Majesty’s Government could not admit the right of present authorities in Petrograd to appoint Consuls, they did not object to the appointment of a few ‘unofficial’ agents.” Simonoff’s position was then left to the Prime Minister of Australia for determination. In his reply to the Secretary of State, Prime Minister Hughes stated that since Simonoff, "among other things was a member of the IWW the [Commonwealth Government] is unable to accept him."

During his tenure as “Consul-General”, Simonoff never achieved de jure recognition, though, arguably, de facto recognition was granted by 1919. His acceptance within the Russian community was at best tentative. Bykov’s suspicions that the appointment had been secured by some underhand means were justified when the censor intercepted a letter addressed to Simonoff from A. Lotkin. Writing from Petrograd, Lotkin confirmed that Simonoff had dispatched him to Russia in order to plead his case: “My mission has been fulfilled. Done all that I was instructed to do. Trotsky is a very agreeable person. He made arrangements in my presence for the displacement of d’Abaza.” Trotsky then suggested that N. Lagutin should take up the duties of Consul-General, but Lotkin proposed Simonoff as a more suitable candidate: “Of course, I mentioned your name, and told him that your political views coincided with his. So your appointment came about without trouble.” Military intelligence made sure that the Russian community was made aware of the contents of this letter.

If Simonoff was having his share of troubles with the Commonwealth authorities and with the Russian community, his acceptance by Australian radicals was absolute. The success of the October Revolution had elevated the prestige of Russian radicals to an
unprecedented level, and Simonoff, the most visible of them, attracted a
great deal of attention. He used his position to advantage, having the
ear of Guido Baracchi, editor of *The Industrial Solidarity*, N. Freeberg,
editor of *The Worker*, A. Robertson, assistant editor of the *Daily
Standard*, R.S. Ross, secretary of the VSP, Ray Everitt, editor of *The
International Socialist*, Percy Brookfield, MLA., and M.P. Considine,
MHR. Of these men, Considine was by far the most active supporter of
Simonoff.

For Simonoff, the first few days in Melbourne were most satisfying.
He still believed that some form of recognition from the Government
would be forthcoming, and looked forward to the prestige that such
recognition would bring. More important was the urgent need to issue
passports to those who wished to return to Russia. Simonoff clearly
understood that, as far as the Russian community was concerned,
opposition to him would evaporate should he be successful. But doubts
as to his competence were already being voiced in Brisbane, where Bykov,
A. Lenin and Zuzenko were calling on Simonoff to resign. A few
months later, a motion of no confidence in Simonoff's ability to perform
his consular duties was passed in Brisbane.

Also high on the list of priorities was the formation of an
"Australian Revolutionary Party", ideally consisting of two separate
organisations: an "official" communist party and secret groups "for the
protection of revolutionary ideas". Various secret circles were in
existence by 1919, consisting mostly of the remnants of IWW
supporters and Russian communists. But an official party presented
greater difficulties, for Simonoff wanted to make use of an existing
organisation with an established power base, preferably in the trade union
movement and with some influence in the Labor Party. The VSP was
ideally suited for this purpose, and support for such a move could be
relied on from Maruschak, Marks (a Russian), C. France and L. Bakker.
On the other hand, R.S. Ross, the influential secretary of the VSP, was
adamant in his refusal to change the nature of his party.

After Hughes' departure for England, Simonoff felt that the Acting
Prime Minister, W.A. Watt, might be a "little more accommodating". Considine arranged for Simonoff to meet Watt in late April 1918. Watt
appeared to be quite sympathetic to the plight of the Russians wishing to
return to their homeland, but informed Simonoff that, as there was no
Australian Department of External Affairs, the decision would have to be
made in London. Simonoff took the opportunity to ask, since he was
not recognised by the Commonwealth Government, and was experiencing
great difficulties receiving both funds and instructions from his own
Government, whether he might be allowed to leave Australia. Once
again Watt informed him that, for the time being, this was out of the question.

In July Simonoff returned to Brisbane. The URW was breaking up into its various political components. Zuzenko had replaced Lagutin as secretary, A. Lenin was editing a new publication, Devyatyy Val [The Ninth Wave] and a Socialist Revolutionary Party had come into being in Selwyn. For a few weeks Simonoff watched helplessly as the organisation disintegrated. Then, early in August, he was informed that he was now free to leave Australia.

Simonoff’s elation at being allowed to leave Australia quickly turned to despair. There was no direct shipping link to European Russia or to the Far East. The only possible way was through Japan, and from there to Vladivostok, a city still in the hands of the Japanese-supported “Whites”. News of the treatment meted out to Bolsheviks who were unfortunate enough to fall into the hands of the Japanese was beginning to filter through to Australia, and Simonoff was understandably not anxious to try his luck. What made him even more suspicious was that the Japanese Consul immediately agreed to grant him a visa. As Simonoff wrote to Ross, “I don’t like at all the attitude of the Japanese Consul.” Nevertheless, if he was going to be forced to leave Australia, he was determined to embarrass the Government. He wrote to Watt:

I desire to notify you that on the account [sic] of my leaving Australia for Russia I have asked Mr. M.P. Considine to act as Consul-General for the Russian Republic in Australia, pending the appointment by the Russian Government of a permanent official.

Litvinov was informed of this development and approved. Although Watt acknowledged the letter, it was clear that the nation, if not the Government, was likely to be seriously embarrassed by the temporary appointment. The selection of a parliamentarian as a representative of a foreign power which remained unrecognised by His Majesty’s Government, and with which it was virtually in a state of war (Murmansk had already been occupied by the Allies) was without precedent. The Acting Prime Minister was bombarded with letters that described Considine’s action as “treasonable”. Watt informed the Secretary of State for the Colonies of the situation and received the following reply:

With regard to Simonoff Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs would be averse to taking any definite action against him in the present state of relations with Bolsheviks unless and until the safety of British subjects
at present in Bolshevik Russia is secured. It is therefore suggested that he should simply be watched and prevented from leaving Australia.45

It appears that Simonoff was not too distraught at being denied permission to leave the country. He could now concentrate on promoting an indigenous Australian communist party.

In Brisbane, Simonoff found the Australian radical groups in total disarray, as he reported to R.S. Ross: “the A.S.P. is closed down, the Socialist [sic] Democratic League exists only in name.”46 Undeterred, Simonoff undertook to bring about a degree of cohesion among the militants. He wrote to Percy Laidler in Melbourne, “I endeavour to bring together some of the militants next Monday night with purpose [sic] of forming some militant group, and I think we shall call it, for a start, ‘One Big Union Propaganda League . . . ‘ Of course, I myself will be somewhere in the background.”47 Laidler, together with Baracchi, formed a branch of the OBUPL in Melbourne, while the inaugural meeting in Brisbane was held on 10 September 1918. Among those present were Gordon Brown (later a senator), Jim Quinton (who represented the ASP at the Third Congress of the Communist International in Moscow),48 Jerome and Ned Cahill (the former was to become secretary of the Brisbane branch of the CPA), Zuzenko and Lagutin.49

On 28 January 1919, the annual general meeting of the Industrial Labour Party, held in Sydney, decided to affiliate with the OBUPL.50 Thus Simonoff achieved the considerable feat of forming a “revolutionary” party in all three eastern states, though arguably the party was more syndicalist than Marxist in orientation.

Ideology was always a problem. It was some time, for instance, before Australian socialists realised differences between the February and October revolutions. The ASP appears to have been the first to perceive the difference, for in May 1918, it proposed the formation of Australian “soviets”.51 With this end in mind, an attempt was made to unite the two major socialist parties - the ASP and SLP [Socialist Labor Party]. Like all such attempts to create unity out of the multitude of insignificant socialist groups it also resulted in failure.

Disappointed in his overtures to the political wing of the labour movement, Simonoff shifted his attention to industrial labour, which was beginning to show some encouraging signs. In particular, One Big Union showed great promise. In November 1918, J.S. (Jock) Garden, then secretary of the NSW Trades and Labour Council, together with E. Judd, A. Rutherford and J. Kilburn, were elected to represent New South Wales at the OBU conference.52 This election also changed the direction
of the organisation; its goal now was to capture and revolutionise the ALP.53 Clearly, the OBU had adopted a politico-economic policy in sharp contrast to the non-political platform of the IWW and the WIIU (Workers International Industrial Union). Simonoff signalled his approval through the pages of Knowledge and Unity, the new organ of the URW: "In Australia the immediate necessity is to push the One Big Union scheme through to completion . . . One Big Union is the instrument which will give the proletariat the means to do what they will."54 In an address to the Social Democratic League (SDL), Garden outlined the tactics of the OBU, which were later adopted by the CPA:

... White ants can do more damage to a building than all the gales that blow. The method of One Big Union is to "white ant" the existing craft unions from within, and when we have destroyed their substance we will build up the O.B.U. on their ruins. Our policy to obtain our ends will be to bore from within and keep on boring.55

In June 1919, the “Trades Hall Reds” failed to capture the New South Wales ALP.56 As a result of this, the Socialist Party of Australia (it shortly changed its name to the International Socialist Labour Party) came into being. Its executive consisted of J.S. Garden, S.A. Rosa, A.C. Willis, Arthur Rae, H.L. Denford, J. Howie, A. Rutherford, J. Cullinen and R. Webster;57 all of these men became foundation members of the CPA in October 1920. The newly formed party then issued an invitation to existing socialist groups to attend a conference "with a view to forming a united body of all claiming to be socialist".58 Delegates from the SPA, ASP, SDL and the SLP met on 9 August 1919. After some discussion it was agreed that sufficient consensus existed to form a united "working class party”. The name, “Revolutionary Socialist Party of Australia”, was adopted. However, Garden, the future General Secretary of the CPA, objected to the word “revolutionary” and, once again, unity was not achieved.

The ASP immediately began a campaign of opposition to the ISLP, which it described as “political buccaneers sailing under the flag of Socialism”.59 In December 1919 the ASP adopted the Minority Manifesto of the Communists of America, after approving certain amendments to take into account Australian conditions, and so became a “Communist” party in all but name.60 The Australian Communist Manifesto was published in January 1920, and reads in part:
The Manifesto of the ASP is not without confusion and falls somewhat short of orthodox Marxism-Leninism, for it goes on to say that the ASP "does not, as do other Socialist parties, make immediate demands." 

Simonoff had been urging the formation of a communist party ever since his appointment as Consul-General. Yet he virtually ignored the ASP Manifesto. On another occasion his lack of enthusiasm was also noticeable. In March 1919, the Sydney Social Democratic League declared its objectives to be "identical with that of the Bolshevick [sic] movement in Russia and the Spartacus movement in Germany". In this instance, Simonoff's cool reaction was at least logical; the SDL was a recently formed group, comprising men who were virtually unknown (with the exception of Luke Jones and H.L. Denford), and had little influence in the labour movement. This certainly was not the case with the ASP, which had its own organ and could, with justification, claim to be the "Australian section of the Third International".

In the August issue of the Proletarian Review, Simonoff, writing under the pseudonym P. Finn, hinted at the reasons behind his rejection of the ASP's claim to be the Communist Party of Australia. In the article, entitled "Is there a Revolutionary Organisation in Australia?", Simonoff argued that a revolution is "a sudden change of existing conditions to entirely new conditions". Soviets could exist only during the transition to complete communism, and only when a communist party provided essential guidance. Citing an article by G. Zinoviev, reprinted in the Proletarian Review in July 1920, Simonoff defined the function of a "Revolutionary Party" in a capitalist state as organising its "own groups in the unions and capturing them, organising soviets in the course of struggle, leading the mass struggle, agitation for the revolution among the masses". So far as Simonoff was concerned, the ASP fulfilled none of these requirements.

Simonoff's article convinced Baracchi and Laidler to form a communist group. In Sydney and Brisbane, Russian communist groups came into being a few months later. The Brisbane ASP branch declared itself to be a "Communist group" in August 1920. None of these could, or indeed did, claim to be anything but a collection of like-minded individuals trying to emulate the tactics of the Bolsheviks. One of these individuals was W.P. Earsman of the Victorian Labour College who came
to Sydney in 1919 to help launch such a workers’ school, and remained to lay the foundation of the CPA.

It was not until 1958 that Earsman broke his silence about these events. There were only three people who were instrumental in founding the Communist Party of Australia: Peter Simonoff, Christian Jollie-Smith and Earsman himself. Earsman was not referring to the inaugural meeting of the CPA held in October 1920, but rather to a secret party organised at the instigation of Simonoff. Garden was asked to join after the party came into existence. Its purpose was to fulfil the requirements outlined in Zinoviev’s article. Calling itself the “Central Executive of the Australian Communist Party”, it issued a Manifesto and a call for membership. The ASP reprinted the Manifesto in full, adding drily:

... After quoting the closing paragraph of the “Communist Manifesto” by Marx and Engels, wherein it is stated that: “The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims”, the author or authors, evidently took fright at their own audacity and ran for the hollow log, before giving their names or any addresses to the printer... However, as a Manifesto, it is certainly deserving of creators with more backbone than those who issued it.

The ASP then proceeded to adopt the Manifesto with only minor alterations. The timing of the Manifesto, however, was particularly important.

The “Central Executive’s” decision to issue the Manifesto seemed incompatible with its desire to remain secret in order to infiltrate the existing labour movement. A.T. Brodney, in an interview with J. Normington-Rawling, offers a possible explanation: the ASP had reached a point where it was ready to change its name and proclaim itself the Communist Party. However, it was traditionally a political party which had little influence in the trade union movement. Within the ASP, the Executive was divided on the question of tactics. A. and M. Reardon argued for a unilateral change of name and urged that membership be open to those who accepted the party's aims. Brodney, on the other hand, proposed that the Trades Hall group should be invited to join in forming a communist party, which would thus gain the immediate advantage of the full support of the Trades and Labour Council. In either case the initiative would have come from the ASP. The Manifesto of this “Communist Party”, albeit a secret one, forced the ASP to act immediately. Moreover, as it was generally known that Garden was somehow connected with the “secret” party, it was he who made the decision about who was to be invited to attend the conference.
Sixty such invitations were sent to prospective members. The conference was to be held on 30 October 1920. Before the conference Brodney received an invitation to dine with Simonoff. He later recalled:

. . . Simonoff tried to establish the position that he was an authority on Communism and that he was entitled to influence Communists in their work . . . The chief object Simonoff had in view was to get rid of people who were critical of him mostly from the ASP. The object of his manoeuvres was to place the ASP people in a complete minority. This was quite easily done. He succeeded ultimately in creating a situation in which an end was put to ASP influence.73

The inaugural meeting of the Communist Party of Australia took place at the ASP Hall. A provisional Executive was elected, consisting of eleven members. Of these, only three - A. Reardon, Ray Everitt and Brodney - were from the ASP. Representing the syndicalists was T. Glynn, while both Earsman and Jollie-Smith came from the Labour College and also were members of the Central Executive of the “secret” party. C.W. Baker represented the Melbourne Communist group, the rest belonging to the Trades Hall circle. Not surprisingly, Earsman defeated Reardon for the position of General Secretary. This was one of the last times that the Communist Party met at the ASP Hall. Thereafter, and for a considerable time to come, it met at 28 Station House, Rawson Place, the offices of Peter Simonoff, the Soviet “Consul-General” in Australia.74

Nothing could better symbolise the dual nature of Bolshevik diplomacy in the early years than the fledgeling Communist Party of Australia meeting in the offices of Soviet Russia’s de facto representative to the Commonwealth of Australia. Simonoff, at one and the same time, was attempting to conduct normal diplomatic business with the Australian Government, and gain its official recognition, while he was also plotting its downfall. In his dual role, the Bolshevik agent in Australia alternatively made advances to the Commonwealth, and conspired to bring about its demise. It was no easy task to straddle these divergent functions.

Also highly suggestive is the fact that Simonoff (along with other Russians) was a prime mover in founding the Australian Communist Party. Despite some protestations to the contrary, the resident Russians, led by Simonoff, had a disproportionate voice in the affairs of this “indigenous” radical movement, almost to the point where its Australian credentials might be questioned.
Finally, Simonoff was typical of many revolutionaries of the time, more a poseur than a man of action, more notable for his unrestrained rhetoric than for his actual accomplishments. After 1921 he disappeared into the shadowy world of the Comintern underground, only to perish, reportedly, in the Soviet purges in 1936-39. There was no more need for a romantic revolutionary-diplomat like Peter Simonoff, one-time Soviet Consul-General in Australia.

NOTES

1. "Consular Representatives of Russia in Commonwealth", CA7, CRS A1, Item 09/11938, Correspondence Files, single Number Series, 1903-1938, Australian Archives (AA) (ACT).
3. Staryy Bolshevik, Sbornik No. 3 [Old Bolshevik, anthology No.3], Moscow (1933), p. 57.
4. Politicheskaya katorga i ssylka: Bibliograficheskiy spravochnik chlenov obschestva politkatorzhan i ssynoposelentsev [Political Imprisonment and Exile: A Bibliographic reference book of the Members of the Society of Convicts and Exiles], Moscow, 1934. This work lists thirty-three political escapees who settled in Australia and returned to Soviet Russia after the Revolution. The figure does not include those who did not return to Russia or those who escaped before being arrested.
5. POL J34/M707, Queensland State Archives (QSA).
6. Ibid.
9. A. Sereshininov, "Tov. Artem za rabotoy v Avstralii" [Comrade Artem at Work in Australia], Proletarskaya Revolyutsiya 2 (1921), 123.
10. P. Simonoff, "Tri s polovinoy goda Sovetskogo diplomacheskogo predstavitel'stva" [Three and a half years as a Soviet Diplomatic Representative], Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn', 15 (7 November 1922): 61.
11. Ibid. p. 62.
12. Russian IWW "locals" were formed in Cairns, Mt. Morgan, Brisbane, Sydney, Broken Hill and Selwyn.
13. POL J34/M707, QSA.

Interview with Major-General Artem Fedorovich Sergeev (Soviet Army), Moscow, June 1984.

University of Queensland records.

The last issue of Izvestiya, No. 110, came out in February 1916.

Workers' Life, No. 6, 21 March 1916.

"Consul Soviet Russia, 1921-11", CA 1382, Alpha Series, 1901-43, Dept. of External Affairs, AA (ACT).

Workers' Life, No. 59, 18 April 1917.

Simonoff, "Tri s polovinoy goda", p. 63.

Solomon Stedman, unpublished manuscript. Held by Ms. Stedman, Sydney.


CRS A981, "Consuls 240: Representatives in Australia, Soviet Russia, 1916-1927", Dept. of External Affairs, Correspondence Files, 1925-1942, AA (ACT).

Simonoff, "Tri s polovinoy goda", p. 62.

CRS A2, 18/142, "Russians entering Australia 1917-18", AA (ACT).

Ibid.

BP 4, 66/4/2072, Dept. of Defence, Military Intelligence Section, AA (Qld).

MP 95/1, 19 February 1918, Box 1, Q. 2839, Dept. of Defence, Intelligence Reports, AA (Vic).

MP 367/1, 499/25/190, Dept. of Defence, 1917-1929. AA (Vic.);

MP 95/1, Q. 2839, Dept. of Defence, Intelligence Reports, AA (Vic.).


Ibid.

CRS: "Russian/Qld.", Item 42, Part 1, AA (ACT).

Ibid.

CRS: "Russia/Qld.", AA (ACT).


CRS: "Russia/Qld.", Item 42, Part 1, AA (ACT).

Ibid., 9 May 1918.

Ibid., June 1918.
41. Ibid., 30 August 1918.
42. P. Simonoff to R. Ross, 13 August 1918, MP 95/1, c553/2/505, Dept. of Defence, Intelligence Reports, AA (Vic.)
43. CRS A981, Item 8/587/5, n.d., Dept. of External Affairs, Correspondence Files, alphabetical series, 1925-1942, AA (ACT).
44. CA 1382, Item QF 1852, n.d., Dept. of External Affairs, Alpha Series, 1901-43, AA (ACT).
45. CRS A981m SG34/11, n.d., Dept. of External Affairs, Correspondence Files, alphabetical series, 1925-1942, AA (ACT).
46. MP 95/1, 2 September 1918, Box 11, 169/35/42, Dept. of Defence, Intelligence Records, AA (Vic.)
47. Ibid., P. Simonoff to P. Laidler, 2 September 1918.
49. Ibid., Item WA 1024A, W.R. 188, W209, 3 March 1921.
50. CA 5, Item 23, 969/224, Attorney General's Department, Registry Strong Room, “International Industrial Workers”, AA (ACT).
59. Ibid.
61. International Socialist, 10 January 1920.
62. Ibid.
63. Manifesto of the Social Democratic League (Sydney, March 1919).
66. Ibid., July 1920
68. Ibid.
69. J. Normington-Rawling, unpublished manuscript, Australian Business and Labour Archives, ANU, Canberra. No mention is made
as to whether the information received from Earsman was through a letter or given in an interview.

70. *International Socialist*, 2 October 1920.
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid.
“Agitation, Ceaseless Agitation”:
Russian Radicals in Australia and the
Red Flag Riots

Raymond Evans

A fortnight before the “February Revolution” of 1917 erupted in Petrograd, the Director of Queensland’s Intelligence and Tourist Bureau wrote confidently to Queensland Premier, T.J. Ryan, that he anticipated the early migration of “a Russian colony of selectors” into the State, who would engage in “tropical production” at various centres, extending from Mackay to Cape York. These “hardy pioneers of the Russian farmer type”, he predicted, would “gracefully face initial difficulties ... with the same cheerfulness and pluck which characterised the early settlement of our developed scrublands.” Encouraged by a positive response from the Premier’s Department, the Director added on 17 March that these “excellent types” of colonists emanated from “the cereal producing province of Saratov”, but that other parts of Russia might equally supply them. On the day he prepared this postscript, however, news of the Tsar’s abdication reached the Australian press. The fall of Nicholas II did not provide the same impetus towards the inspired visions and grim forebodings which would be unleashed by the Bolshevik insurrection in October - largely because Russia’s new Provisional Government anticipated no alteration in its war commitment to the Allies. Yet, with that fall, a fresh tide of revolutionary events had begun to flow which would soon prove inexorable. Within several months, the idea of renewed migration from Russia to anywhere in Australia would seem neither practicable nor welcome, but, rather, utterly unthinkable.¹

Indeed, the events of February 1917 were to ensure that many more Russians left Australia that year than entered it. In July, Queensland’s Immigration Officer noted that of the “301 souls” arriving since January, a mere 35 were Russian, disembarking from the East. Prior to the outbreak of the Great War, almost two thousand Russian refugees - many escaping Tsarist persecution and imprisonment following the abortive 1905 uprising - had entered Queensland between 1911 and 1914, joining some eight hundred Russians already enumerated there in the 1911
census. As the total Russian-born population in the Commonwealth was recorded at only 4,456 in that 1911 census, this meant that Queensland had rapidly emerged as the state with the largest Russian component in Australia, recording a seventy per cent increase in its numbers between 1901 and 1911, and an unprecedented three hundred and fifty per cent increase between 1911 and 1914. By 1915, however, the annual influx via Manchuria had fallen to only seventy-two (i.e. five hundred less than the previous year) - a consequence of wartime domestic and maritime conditions - and in July, the precautionary Federal practice of asking "Asiatic Russian" [sic] migrants to produce passports was quietly dropped. Concurrently, almost one thousand Russian settlers left Australia for their homelands between 1914 and 1917, many impelled, no doubt, by patriotic sentiments.²

The February Revolution induced a further outward surge, although the motives of these ebullient revolutionaries - whether Menshevik or Bolshevik - contrasted sharply with those of the loyalists who had preceded them. On 27 March, the Russian Consul-General in Australia, A.N. d'Abaza, received orders from his country's London Embassy to assist "all Russian political prisoners . . . desirous of returning home" by providing "funds for their passage" if necessary. For a time, d'Abaza would use his position to finance the repatriation of liberals and Mensheviks rather than Bolsheviks. Though the direction of this funding undoubtedly affected these return migrations, however, this is not meant to imply that enthusiastic Bolsheviks were thereby utterly prevented from leaving Australia at this stage. In early May, for example, members of the "all-Russian" Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) local at Cairns announced their intention of returning to their native land to fight for "Industrial Unionism" and to oppose the prospect of counter-revolution there. Before departing, they held a huge farewell gathering attended by several thousand well-wishers, celebrating under large red banners and proclaiming "Long Live the Russian Revolution".

Similarly, on 25 June 1917, the Japanese mailboat Aki Maru sailed from Brisbane carrying the Socialist Revolutionary Peter Utkin, retiring secretary of the Brisbane Union of Russian Workers (originally named the Union of Russian Emigrants) and - in his own words - "many of my mates". After an emotional farewell from a throng of Russian supporters at Brisbane's wharves, Utkin wrote: "... one of the most touching incidents occurred as our boat passed the Cannon Hill meatworks. All the employees assembled on the wharf with red flags . . . singing revolutionary songs." Utkin, a former meatworker himself, was profoundly moved. At this time, too, the fervent Leninist, Fedor Andreevich (or Tom) Sergeev (alias Artem) - a founding member of the
Brisbane URW in 1911 - left Australia, “literally aflame with emotions”, to assume a crucial role as a member of the Bolshevik Central Committee planning the October rising in Russia, and subsequently served as a revolutionary activist in the Kharkov region and in the Ukraine. Concurrently, Boris Skvirsky (alias Taranoff), a supporter of Kerensky’s regime, resigned his position as Chairman of the Union of Russian Workers (URW) and continued negotiations for the return of political exiles. Although the new regime in Russia was not “a real revolutionary body”, Skvirsky admitted in March 1917, it was developing a “very progressive” republican, democratic program, which all workers and peasants should support. Consequently, when a ship carrying more than four hundred refugees from all Australian states and the Northern Territory sailed from Sydney with Skvirsky on board in mid 1917, the majority of these expatriates were once more hand-picked Mensheviks, in accord with Skvirsky’s own political predilections.

The departure of such “moderates” exemplifies the manner in which reactions to the February Revolution healed old divisions in the URW, whilst creating new ones. Prior to this Revolution, John Paul Gray, then secretary of the URW and John Cook (also known as Alexander Kuk), from the literary staff of the Queensland Russian newspaper, Izvestiya [Bulletin], depicted the Brisbane organisation, along with its branches at Mt. Morgan and Canungra - as being composed of a mélange of Social Democrats and Socialist Revolutionaries who, during their daily December “meetings, lectures and social evenings . . . from ten in the morning to eleven at night - with real distinguishing Russian enthusiasm . . . were debating worldwide questions”. By mid 1917, however, such debates had become increasingly heated, after the publication of Lenin’s “April Theses” opposing “a predatory imperialistic war”. While the Bolshevik wing of the URW vigorously promoted Lenin’s line, Menshevik supporters continued to uphold Kerensky’s adherence to the war effort (or, at least, to a “defensive” war policy for Russia). Hostile denunciations of Menshevik “traitors” were only allayed by their substantial repatriation, leaving behind - according to Eric Fried - “a solid Bolshevik nucleus.”

Although Menshevik influences were substantially muted by such departures, it might equally be argued that the exodus of former leadership figures like Skvirsky, John Paul Gray (along with his father Paul, and his two sons), Sergei Alymov (the “People’s Poet”), and particularly the Bolshevik, Tom Sergeyev, created a power vacuum among the remaining activists which various commanding personalities then competed to fill. Peter Simonoff, who returned to Queensland from Broken Hill as secretary of the URW in June 1917 and who was soon to be appointed
Soviet consular representative in Australia, first came to the attention of the Brisbane censor on 9 October 1917, due to telegrams he had sent to Melbourne and Bundaberg indicating “much trouble” in the URW and calling for support. Although the nature of this “trouble” was not specified, several suggestions regarding its character may be made. During the subsequent Red Flag riots of March 1919, a loyalist mob wrecked a fruit shop and restaurant in Stanley Street owned by a Russian, John Shouinoff, on the grounds that Simonoff had once held workers’ meetings there. But, as Shouinoff angrily attested in the Brisbane Courier several days later, Simonoff’s group, prior to his consular appointment, had actually met in the Hargraves & Atlas Buildings, Stanley Street, not at his fruit store. Instead, Shouinoff belonged to a group of liberal Russians, antagonistic to Simonoff, and they regularly held their meetings at the Alliance Hall, Woolloongabba. Thus, to some degree, local opposition had probably survived the mid 1917 repatriations.

Challenge to Simonoff and his supporters from the moderate right was paralleled by challenge from the ultra-left left in the form of Nicholai (Nicholas) Lagutin, an Ipswich waiter and anarchist who had arrived in Australia in August 1913. Lagutin’s open advocacy of extreme physical force - including political assassination, in the style of the Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party - was clearly disquieting to Simonoff, whilst his succession to the secretaryship of the URW, after Simonoff became Consul-General, indicates a significant leaven of support for his zealous methods within the movement. Subsequently, Lagutin’s editorship of Knowledge and Unity, the new Russian workers’ newspaper, would be successfully challenged by A.M. Zuzenko, a leading ally of Simonoff who would arrive in Brisbane from cane-cutting activities in Halifax, North Queensland, in late 1917. In addition, the Simonoff/Zuzenko ascendancy over the Russian radical movement was to be further questioned by a “revolutionary Maximalist”, Herman Bykov (alias Resanoff), who had only recently arrived in Australia as a fireman aboard the SS Mallina in March 1916. Upon Simonoff’s appointment as Bolshevik representative in February 1918, Bykov broke with the URW and attempted to establish a rival Russian Group of Workers at Ipswich, complete with its own newspaper, entitled The Torch. When the attempt floundered, Bykov then abandoned his secretaryship of the new group, rejoining Zuzenko and the Knowledge and Unity collective. Similar dissension and vacillation may also be charted within the Melbourne Russian Association. Though not as militant as the Brisbane URW, distinct factions could still be discerned within its ranks centred around the “Liberal”, A.N. d’Abaza, the Mensheviks, N. Leonard
Kanevsky and V. Petrachenya [V. Petrochini], and the “thorough-going Bolshevik”, John Maruschak. Thus, although the main phalanx of radical Russians was decidedly Bolshevik by the time of the October Revolution, the solidity of that “nucleus” is somewhat open to question, given an apparent, internal tendency towards substantial factionalism, in terms of both personality and ideological commitment.7

Yet to Anglo-Australian war supporters and Empire loyalists, externally viewing the Russian community, whether in Brisbane, Sydney or Melbourne, the movement increasingly appeared as a formidable union of like-minded militants, insidiously linked to both the internal “war enemy” the German-Australian minority - as well as to the burgeoning anti-war campaign. An alleged German/Russian conspiracy had been publicly mooted as early as February 1916, when Truth newspaper published “Hun Intrigues in Queensland: Russian Political Refugees as Defenders of German Culture” a sensational article which induced an angry reaction from the URW executive. By mid 1916, Queensland police were receiving reports that the URW was really a subversive front organisation for German intrigue and that Gray, Cook and Skvirsky were all German agents. At the same time, the Queensland censor, university lecturer J.J. Stable, noted worriedly that many Germans were passing themselves off “as Swedes, Dutchmen or Russians” to gain employment. His guarded conclusion was that no non-Britisher could apparently be trusted. Assessing this situation from an opposite perspective, the Swiss Consul to Australia would later record from Melbourne:

... Anyone with a German sounding name is treated as a German, who are looked upon as worse than criminals ... My office has never seen so many bayonets and prisoners as two years ago, and I would rather have got out of the country. The Australian people are too lazy to study the difference between the Nations.

Thus, between 1916 and the Armistice, a climate of war-enhanced xenophobia encouraged a consistent blending of anti-Hun hysteria with Russophobia. Echoing the predilections of Truth’s 1916 report, the returned soldiers’ newspaper, National Leader, continued in early 1918:

... Who are the Bolsheviks of Australia? Supporters of treachery, murder and incoherence ... working splendidly for Germany ... [They should be] treated in a hospital instituted for the politically unsound ...

Similarly, the revolutionary potential per se of the Russian migrants
had been suspected and feared well in advance of the October Revolution. As early as June 1915, according to *Direct Action*, "a minion of the Government" had warned Jack Burke, secretary of the fledgling IWW local in Brisbane, "not to let those Nihilists from barbarous Russia lead the IWW astray, for those fellows are only here for murderous purposes.” During 1916, Australian military censors maintained close surveillance over all Russian correspondence, intercepting hundreds of mailed items, including postcards, letters, pamphlets and books from such far flung centres as the United States and Brazil, France and Switzerland, Japan, China and Manchuria. In particular, radical newspapers such as *Novyy Mir*, *Golos Truda* and *The Free Word* from New York, *Solidarnost* from Chicago, *Russian Life* from Detroit, *Pracia* from Brazil, *En Avant* and *Bibliotheque Russe* from Geneva, as well as *The Social Democrat* from Bern a number of which were written in Russian were seized and confiscated. Following complaints from d’Abaza about its “vile” and “disloyalist” tone, the URW’s own newspaper *Izvestiya* was suppressed by the Minister for Defence in late February 1916, only to be superceded rapidly by a new production, entitled *Rabochaya Zhizn* [Workers’ Life].

Despite such official interference, Russian radical mobilisation developed swiftly from 1916, especially in North Queensland where links were forged with the expanding IWW organisation. Early that year, the Russian Labour Group of Cairns became a Russian IWW local, under the leadership of J. Zaremba, W. Yudaiff and M. Panfiloff. By November, Alexander Petroff, a dismissed railway worker, was reporting the IWW progressing well among Russians at Innisfail, whilst at Townsville, Max Baranoff and B. Radchance were involved with a Russian Workers’ Group, in direct contact with the Sydney IWW local. Such organisations quickly fell under police and intelligence surveillance, as attempts to outlaw the IWW in Australia escalated during 1917. For instance, several police accounts from the Townsville district, reporting substantial numbers of young Russian meat and sugar workers attending open-air IWW meetings, prompted the new Commissioner of Police, Frederick Charles Urquhart, to issue his first request that action be taken “to decrease the influx of an undesirable class of Russians into this State”. The Commonwealth Government should be encouraged “to deal with this matter under the Aliens Immigration Restriction Act [sic]”, the Chief Under Secretary responded - alluding to legislation conventionally used since 1901 to debar non-whites from entering Australia.

Thus, the welter of Anglo-Australian resentment, progressively unleashed against local Russians following the Bolshevik Revolution of 25 October 1917, had already been well rehearsed before that date. Rather
than originating as a reaction to external Russian events, its initial impetus arose from such internal disturbances as the Australia-wide anti-conscription struggle and the 1917 New South Wales General Strike, as well as the nagging fear of local German or syndicalist uprisings. The October Revolution, however, cast these events and prospects into the shade, providing the surge of post-revolutionary antagonism with a vehemence and persistence which could hardly have been anticipated. Still reflecting domestic preoccupations, the *Lone Hand* in December 1917 compared Australians with the “ignorant and selfish Bolsheviks of Russia”, after military conscription was again rejected, whilst the Rockhampton *Morning Bulletin* blamed dramatic declines in voluntary enlistment upon Russian “anarchists”. Yet more forceful instances of anti-Russian hostility now began to be recorded. For instance, at Halifax, North Queensland in mid December, a Russian interpreter, Andrew Konchiz, was beaten by police in a lock-up cell and his arm broken. This sparked a protest meeting of thirty-two local Russians, led by Zuzenko, who argued:

... we cannot get justice here as they will not allow us to speak... give us justice otherwise we will be driven to make our own... We cannot stand it any longer...

In support, Peter Simonoff commented pointedly from Brisbane in early January 1918:

Lately in North Queensland, a good few cases have occurred in which Russians have been somewhat specially treated with enmity because, whenever arrested, Russians are punished heavily... They are the same Russians and probably did the same drinking, but they are not now treated like they were before.

The main reaction from the Queensland Labor Government to Simonoff’s complaint was an unsympathetic silence. Several days previously, the Commonwealth Defence Department had also suppressed *Workers’ Life*, of which Simonoff had been editor. At Zuzenko’s instigation, thirty-six Halifax Russians again met to protest the banning of “the only sole Russian newspaper in Australia”. But the official State response was once more dismissive - a reaction which would be duplicated by Federal authorities when they ignored Simonoff’s appointment by Leon Trotsky in February as Soviet Consul-General, after d’Abaza’s resignation on 26 January.11
The signing of the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty on 3 March 1918, heralding Russia’s official withdrawal from the war, was received with new outbreaks of Russophobia in Australia. For instance, successive Queensland State election riots against Nationalist candidates at Townsville on 13 and 16 March were blamed specifically upon local Russians. Soon afterwards, public denunciations of Russian “parasites” holding jobs at the Ipswich railway workshops began. Yet the main upsurge of loyalist passion at this time was provoked by a URW inspired International May Day celebration, held at the Centennial Hall, Brisbane, on 1 May 1918. Chaired by Nicholai Lagutin, the meeting of four hundred radicals was composed of forty per cent Russian men, women and children, as well as other “comrades” from the Finnish, Polish, Greek, Belgian, German and Anglo-Australian communities. In microcosm, therefore, this gathering represented a public display of the pro-British war loyalists’ worst fears: a spirited interplay of revolutionary symbolism, international sentiment and unabashed cultural pluralism.

Red flags framed the stage as Russian women walked among the audience “pinning red bows to the clothing of the persons present”. After the “Internationale” was sung in Russian, Lagutin introduced “Comrade” Sargent, who spoke on behalf of the “Greek Red singlet” movement and “Comrade” Holken, a Belgian, who delivered a speech in Esperanto about “International Brotherhood”. Representing Anglo-Australian radical interests, labour organiser Joseph Silver Collings spoke as a member of the militant Brisbane Industrial Council (BIC) welcoming any German man or woman present as a “comrade”. He was followed by Gordon Brown and Ted Stewart, recently arrived from Sydney, on behalf of the syndicalist Universal Freedom League (UFL) - a front organisation for the outlawed Brisbane IWW local - as well as Kathleen Hotson and Jennie Scott Griffiths, appearing for the pacifist/socialist Queensland Peace Alliance (QPA). After further recitations, songs and the performance of a revolutionary tableau, speeches were delivered in French, Polish and Finnish. The meeting was then brought to a close by a rousing rendition of “The Red Flag” from the standing audience.

“What are the authorities doing when this sort of thing is permitted to go on under their noses?” the editor of the conservative Brisbane Courier demanded angrily the following morning: “A polyglot gathering” had expressed and “heartily applauded socialistic, anti-capitalistic, anti-militaristic and, indeed, disloyal sentiments” in a “babel of tongues”, brogues and accents! The Federal “authorities” had covertly attended the meeting, however, in considerable numbers, and their summaries re-echoed the same tones of distaste as the Courier report. “Speeches were
delivered by . . . foreigners . . . in their own tongues . . . at a gathering of the Red Raggers of the community,” one Military Intelligence officer wrote: “I regard it as quite the most ludicrous gathering I have ever attended.” Much of this scorn was reserved for the Russian tableau, entitled “Breaking the Chains of Bondage”, performed by “comrade Ruski”. “The lights were turned out and the premature explosion of a flashlight powder caused many to think for a moment, that a Bolshevik had dropped something,” the Courier jibed. The Federal agent disdainfully added:

A Russian rushed about the stage reciting and gesticulating close to a group of three - one of whom was manacled and another held an upraised hammer. At the conclusion of the aforesaid Russian’s gyrations, the hammer came down and the chains fell to the floor. Limelight . . . slow curtain . . . (loud and unrestrained applause).

Conservative ridicule soon turned to rage, however, at the apparent success and crude effectiveness of the gathering. Major Carter, President of the Brisbane Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League of Australia (RSSILA), tendered an “emphatic protest” to the Defence Department and called for a loyalist “indignation” meeting to be held. Brisbane’s Mayor, Alderman McMaster, expressed “great disgust” and amazement that “a meeting . . . by a number of animals in the shape of men . . . could take place in the city”. The matter was also urgently raised by the Chairman of Committees in the Federal House of Representatives.14

Such loyalist unease over Russian activism is indicative not only of a local sense of betrayal concerning the war effort, but also of mounting anxiety about the dissemination of a viable revolutionary message within Australia. Conservatives watched the commingling of aliens and dissenters with escalating alarm as, in the absence of dependable press accounts of the Bolshevik revolt, the Russian émigrés came to be seen by the Australian left as a crucial medium for conveying the significance of this towering, though clouded historical episode. Local radicals - in accord with global left-wing reactions - responded to the Revolution as though it were some fiery beacon, gleaming at the end of the long, dismal corridor of total warfare, and beckoning them forward, while yet eluding their grasp. Their eager endorsement of its presence was both unreservedly visceral and chiliastic, as when the Australian Socialist Party called from Sydney for the formation of southern “Soviets” of workers in mid May 1918. “May what happened in Russia be not so far
off in all the world,” a group of Sydney Christian Socialists calling themselves The Free Australians Association wrote emotively to the Queensland Premier in May 1918: “what answer shall you give to Humanity or to your Maker for your part? Answer, Mr Ryan!” Percy Mandeno, a New Zealand IWW member active in Brisbane since the 1913 Free Speech campaign and reputedly “of Russian nationality”, told a crowd at the Domain in June: “The workers in Russia had awakened. They had not gone to the Czar with a cap in hand . . . They had taken the matter into their own hands, and were now working everything for their own benefit.” Romantic expectations ran high, as in the Railway Union’s journal, *Solidarity*, which proclaimed, in the full flush of utopian anticipation:

All workers must learn to act when the hour comes. Then we shall be able to free ourselves of . . . the millions . . . of parasites who at present keep the working class in slavery . . . Russia today is in a state of revolution and already is seeing gleams of light dispelling her mists. Russia’s lead may possibly produce a state of unrest throughout the other nations. Are you, Australians, ready for the advance?^{15}

Yet, although numerous Australian radicals and revolutionaries heeded the “Russian . . . Maximalist” message of Herman Bykov to “unite together for the class revolutionary struggle against international capitalism and militarism”, this image of “insurrection on the horizon” was by no means the only interpretation which local Russians were offering. In contrast with the unqualified excitement of committed Bolsheviks, other Russian residents exhibited diffidence and confusion, as well as anger at and even overt opposition to recent events in their homeland. A Russian worker at Selwyn, a western Queensland mining community, wrote despondently to Zuzenko in late 1918:

. . . the comrades are taking very little interest in social life here and are mostly spending their time behind the card tables. Times are becoming difficult and dangerous for our Russian colony; darkness hangs over our grey Russia, [and] a great deal is demanded of our strength and energy.

Concurrently, another Selwyn Russian, W. Komaroff, confronted the *Knowledge and Unity* collective more provocatively, demanding “a true version” of Bolshevism from its columns. “We do not want to go on killing all the time,” he complained:
Russians are looked upon as I.W.W. which has been all through your doing... How can we have a man like Simonoff to represent us? ... Has he ever occupied an official position in Russia? Does he know what we Russians really want and what ideals of labour are?...

Accompanying such criticism came more open resistance. In the Cairns district, for instance, a farmer named Nillin, reputed formerly to have been a Russian magistrate, organised a petition among Russian selectors condemning Bolshevism, which was forwarded to d'Abaza in Melbourne in late 1917. Following this, Nillin attacked certain clauses of the Brest-Litovsk treaty in an article sent to Knowledge and Unity, only to be counter-attacked by Simonoff. Then, in October 1918, he composed an emotive piece for the Cairns Post, entitled "A Russian on Russia", charging the Bolsheviks with "barbarous conduct" in killing the Tsar. According to another Cairns Russian, S. Tokaroff, the outcome was further incitement of Anglo-Australian hostility against his countrymen, and he wrote indignantly to Zuzenko, urging him to give Nillin "a hiding" for producing such "astounding rubbish".16

Even among those departing émigrés who had returned expectantly to their homeland in 1917, there were clear indications of both equivocation and disillusionment. John Paul Gray, former secretary of the URW, wrote to a friend at Kingaroy in December 1917 that his father, Paul, had been appointed by the Bolshevik Central Executive Committee as Chief Commissar of the Transbaikal. Although conditions had deteriorated since the October Revolution, Gray was still hopeful of "prosperity". By September 1918, however, after this unstable eastern region had been assailed by British, Czech, Japanese and US military interventions and the notorious anti-Soviet Cossack raider, Ataman Semenov, had become its new Commander-in-Chief, Gray wrote despairingly from Vladivostok - by then an Allied military base - to a firm of Brisbane solicitors:

... to tell you the truth, I am quite sick with ... Russian affairs and am anxious to return to our sunny Queensland ... local affairs ... are so mixed up ... there is hardly any chance for me to be able to express my opinion or to state numerous facts in a letter.

In December, Gray appealed for help from John Hunter, a State Labor Minister, to return to Queensland - a plea which induced Premier Ryan to cable the British Consul at Vladivostok directly on his behalf. After the interception of this cable by the censor - who believed that Gray's return was "connected with the Bolshevik International movement" - Federal
authorities contacted the British Colonial Office about the “irregularity” of Ryan’s action. The Defence Department called for cancellation of Gray’s British naturalisation and even the British Foreign Office intervened in the matter. Yet Gray eventually managed to return quietly to Brisbane, where in late 1919 he was instrumental in establishing an “apolitical” Russian school at Woolloongabba - portraying himself at this time as “a loyal British subject”.17

Russian repatriation had also been unfortunate for Michael Zadorsky, a selector from Queensland’s Chadford district, who described himself as a “Liberal” landowner. Soon after resuming ownership of a Russian estate, Zadorsky’s life and property had been placed in jeopardy by the Bolshevik Revolution. As he wrote bitterly to a contact in Roma:

> I ought not to have left Australia . . . As an exile I should be hunted if the old Government i.e. Tsarist came into power, but as a landowner I am dogged by Socialists. Liberals and landowners have been proclaimed outlaws in our parts. I came only to see homesteads robbed and burned, woods confiscated and demolished, officers bayonnetted and torn to pieces, and Liberals slaughtered like cattle.

Fearing arrest or summary execution, Zadorsky eventually fled the property and drifted once more “towards Harbin from where I could get to Australia”. Upon his return in 1918, he began a campaign to help Australians escape what he sarcastically termed “the blessings of socialism” by preparing a series of graphic and sensational articles about Russia, firstly in *The Queensland Farmers’ Union Journal* and then in the columns of the *Brisbane Courier*. Additionally, he presented damning anti-Soviet material to G.F. Pearce, the Minister for Defence.18

Thus, Anglo-Australians were made privy to the interpretations of some quite discordant Russian voices during 1918-19, each one claiming to convey the essence of the revolutionary experience. Some would heed the words of Peter Simonoff as he spoke to the third Queensland Trade Union Congress in August 1918, informing working class delegates:

> The Russian workers . . . had . . . complete . . . political and industrial control . . . and the Soviet had laid it down that robbery and profiteering were the highest crimes . . . It is quite evident that military intervention is wanted only by the captains of finance, unscrupulous politicians and all kinds of parasites . . .
Yet many more, it seems, believed the interpretations provided by Russian selectors like Nillin, or Zadorsky, writing instead of “The Russian Nightmare” - of people tortured and thrown down mine shafts, and of the pathetic funerals of butchered clergy and other “peaceful” citizens.19

Such highly seasoned accounts, ironically, carried the greater plausibility, for they simply added “authentic” Russian voices to the welter of anti-Bolshevik propaganda already reaching Australia via the United-Reuter-Times cable service, before being disseminated internally by a predominantly conservative press. “Bolshevik swine are mere blood-thirsty cutthroats,” reported the Brisbane Courier, as its column headlines blared:

BOLSHEVIK ATROCITIES
WOMEN AND CHILDREN KILLED
CHINESE EXECUTIONERS USED

“The Bolsheviks have no pity on the wounded,” reported returned soldier Leo Berk to the Daily Mail in November 1918:

Most of them had their skin pulled off their necks and face [sic], and hung loosely, with frightful bloody taters [sic]. Some with their tongues cut out . . . The Japanese army find their wounded killed with their eyes picked out and their stomachs turned out.

Significantly, Berk was himself of Russian origin and was, at this time, acting as an informant to the Commonwealth police on local Bolshevik activities.20

Clearly, the atrocity propaganda machine which had reshaped the German war enemy into “the Bestial Hun” had now been turned upon a new target. And, in a very real sense, the Russophobic, antirevolutionary rhetoric it brought forth signified a fresh process of enemy denigration. For, after February 1918, interventionist Allied forces (including some Australian troops) were operating upon a war footing against the Soviet regime. As a Russian settler at Canungra in south-eastern Queensland noted astutely in October 1918:

... the Bolsheviks are openly at war with the Allies and therefore people here are beginning to look upon us as enemies ... If they do not actually flaunt their hostility before our faces, they discuss it amongst themselves in unflattering terms.
One potent strand of this enemy stereotyping was the depiction of Russians as purveyors of “repulsive bestiality, lawlessness and lust”, based upon the false assertion - later traced to the concoctions of Britain’s Major-General Poole at Archangel (Arkhangel’sk) - that throughout eastern Russia all women were to be given forcibly as “breeding animals . . . to the use of the whole nation”. As the Courier reported authoritatively on 8 November 1918, “a system of promiscuity or free love had been officially set up, with a scale of penalties for its non-observance.” A credulous wave of “horror and disgust” greeted such news.21

In an atmosphere of mounting hysteria over the alleged universality of Bolshevik fanaticism, savagery and licentiousness, calls for counteractive measures against local Russians grew more widespread and insistent. “Cannot you do something to rid the country of these parasites?” a concerned Britisher of North Ipswich asked the Acting Prime Minister, W.A. Watt, in early January 1919:

Are we to be allowed to drift, with our eyes open, into a state of savagery? Why, even a savage will [stand] up for the morals of the female whom he claims as his partner in life. I have a growing family, so you cannot be surprised at my anxiety . . .

Echoing such concerns about the continuing Russian presence, a perplexed Federal agent demanded of the Governor-General on 17 January, “why are these people not allowed to go? To my mind every facility should be given them to get out of the country and none should be permitted to come in.” Thus, with loyalists urgently seeking their removal and Bolshevik Russians themselves in many cases anxious to be repatriated, an immediate answer to these exhortations might simply have been Federal encouragement of such migration processes - but this was not to be. For, in accord with Britain’s anti-Soviet policies, particularly its various naval and military forays into Soviet territory and the renewal of Allied “zones of operation” there in late December 1918, Russian Bolsheviks in Australia were actually to be restrained by passport refusals rather than encouraged to depart.22

Furthermore, while Commonwealth authorities refused “to allow the Russians to leave Australia”, control over their internal activities began to tighten, and, from late 1918, gradually escalated beyond the former bounds of covert censorship and surveillance. On 19 September, a Federal prohibition against any public display of Sinn Fein colours,
issued in March, was extended to include the "Red Flag", which was now depicted as the emblem of an "enemy country". Consequently, after vigorous loyalist protests to the Minister for Defence, a red flag which had flown from the Brisbane Trades Hall since July was hauled down on 2 October by two Commonwealth Intelligence officers, whilst trade union officials "looked glumly on". Observing that Brisbane workers had recently taken "immediate action" over an increase in the price of beer, yet had not raised "a single voice of protest" over this red flag confiscation, a local Russian lectured them in the *Daily Standard*:

> If the rank and file do not realise the real meaning . . . which . . . in Russia is protected by Bolsheviks at any price . . . then the time is not ripe yet for its hoisting on the Trades Hall . . .

With the revolutionary symbol grounded, however, Russian voices were the next to be suppressed.  

In late September 1918, Peter Simonoff was prevented, under section 17 (c) of the Aliens Restriction Order from further public speaking in Queensland, despite his appeals for recognition of diplomatic immunity. Circumventing the prohibition, he embarked on a lecture tour of Newcastle, Sydney and Melbourne, where he spoke throughout October to enthusiastic, capacity audiences of socialists, trade unionists and pacifists on the latest Russian developments. Although he complained bitterly of financial duress as well as Federal "spirits at my heels", he reacted buoyantly to his eager reception by leftists at every venue. "Let them accept me as I am - extreme revolutionist," he wrote theatrically to Norman Freeberg of the Brisbane *Worker*, whilst to Zuzenko he confided:

> Tell the little ones that the slaves here [in Sydney] are alive and not sleeping. I simply can't get away . . . I wanted to go yesterday but . . . I was invited by the Labor Council to read a lecture . . . I met the public again . . . and they proposed to me that I should stay on another fortnight, so as to hold two or three more meetings.

Yet the "spirits" at his heels were closing in. The Brisbane censor, intercepting all Simonoff's correspondence, expressed mounting concern over the "tremendous reception" he reported receiving. "Simonoff's vanity has been tickled," Stable wrote sourly on 29 October, "and he will - given the opportunity - be more aggressive and dangerous than hitherto. If he is anxious to join the ranks of internees, he certainly is going the
right way about it.” In rapid succession, new restraining orders were placed upon both Simonoff and Zuzenko, preventing them “from taking part in any meeting or engaging in any propaganda whatever”. Simonoff remained undaunted. He had already informed Freeberg, “I would prefer to hang myself on the first lamp-post than to stop my work, which is my duty to mankind.” And following the dual suppression, he wrote defiantly to Zuzenko:

I congratulate you on the high honour of being picked out by the “democratic authorities” of this country as one of the most dangerous personages . . . Well, well! We shall live to see. I am not going to write much, as this, of course will be read through by one of the Russian turncoats serving in the interests of plutocracy [i.e. a Russian translator]. But their festival will soon be over.

Simonoff attempted to continue his lecture tour, but on Sunday, 3 November, after addressing another Melbourne gathering, he was arrested in the street and taken into custody.24

Zuzenko’s restraining order was also issued because of escalating fears about his political effectiveness. In the censor’s grudging estimation, Zuzenko seemed “very earnest” and “a very fine artistic writer”. “At first one would put him down as a morose Russian serf, brooding over some trouble,” Stable observed in early October, “but when he talks, he loses the repellent feature and one recognises the reader and thinker quite capable of leading men - a more dangerous man than Simonoff.” Such qualified praise for a radical activist from the normally scornful Captain Stable was a rare tribute indeed. When Zuzenko approached him in mid October for “permission to publish a monthly magazine in Russian”, this was rapidly denied. Simultaneously, the censor learned that Zuzenko was promoting a scheme, entitled “Federation of Russian Groups”, with the aim of uniting factions throughout Australia into one grand organisation - the Federated Union of Unions. In this pursuit, Zuzenko had met the rival Russian bodies at Ipswich, led by Kemmer and Matveichik in early October, as well as approaching associations in Sydney, Melbourne and North Queensland. “The Federation of Russian Groups is a step towards the One Big Union,” Stable announced dramatically. Blithely confusing the revolutionary tactics of Syndicalism and Bolshevism, he added authoritatively:

... the Russians are the real I.W.W. ... its real live agents ... they never permit anything to take prior place in their thoughts to
I.W.W.ism they live and move and have their being in its revolutionary atmosphere it is their very being.

Zuzenko's consequent muzzling - a sort of ideological "house arrest" - also prohibited his "contributing to any newspaper columns". So, although continuing his "behind the scenes" activities, he publicly deferred to the order by surrendering his editor's position on Knowledge and Unity, as well as his secretaryship of the URW, to Civa ("Fanny") Rosenberg, a remarkable young woman in her late teens whom Zuzenko was later to marry. Under the pseudonym of "Cane Mamena", meanwhile, Zuzenko still contributed articles to Knowledge and Unity and during December 1918 even launched a new Russian newspaper entitled Devyatyy Val [Ninth Wave]. With the help of a Russian informant, Dolzenko, the Commonwealth police soon succeeded in having both newspapers suppressed. In January 1919, however Knowledge and Unity resurfaced and from this time onward would be printed in English under Civa Rosenberg's apparent editorship.25

The gaoling of Simonoff and the gagging of Zuzenko were soon followed by a more widescale suppression of Russians' civil liberties. Indeed, the decision to include Zuzenko with Simonoff in the restraining order of 1 November may well have been prompted by a final straw of defiance. For, in late October, Zuzenko had issued invitations to a range of labour organisations, summoning them to an evening's "celebration of the anniversary of the Russian Revolution" to be held at Brisbane's Centennial Hall on 8 November. On the day following Simonoff's arrest, the attraction was publicly revealed in labour's Daily Standard in an advertisement urging "all wage workers" to "roll up in style" to this "great rally", where "Russian music, songs and dances" would be heard. The appeal at first took Brisbane's Anglophile and largely middle class loyalists by surprise. Yet, enlivened by warnings from the Daily Mail that "some kind of madness" was about to be unleashed, they were soon petitioning State and Federal authorities to have this "enemy celebration" suppressed. Although Premier Ryan turned a deaf ear to their demands, the Commonwealth Government proved more understanding, and at the eleventh hour, the Minister for Defence prohibited the gathering as "prejudicial to the public safety". Additionally, he cautioned the local Military Commandant that if the Russian celebration was "transferred to any other building, take possession of that building." Concurrently, the State Government, anticipating serious trouble, mobilised more than eighty foot-police for street duty, with its entire force of mounted troopers placed on standby. 26

When Russian and Anglo-Australian radicals arrived at Centennial
Hall that evening, they found themselves confronting instead a “wonderful demonstration of loyalty” which had been spontaneously mounted in place of their own. With “God Save the King” ringing in their ears, they retreated in dismay from an angry and violent loyalist audience within the hall. Yet they quickly rallied and in marching ranks moved off through the city, with the Russian men and women at their head, singing “The Red Flag” and “Join the Army of the Toilers”. At North Quay, they clashed briefly with returned soldiers congregating there, before finally assembling upon a vacant council allotment in South Brisbane. As the crowd, by now swollen to over one thousand, listened to speakers demanding freedom of speech and praising the “Russian peasants” who had “overthrown Capitalism”, news that returned soldiers were coming to break up the meeting led to confusion and alarm. William Jackson, an IWW propagandist who held the platform, asked those present “to hold firm and close round the speakers; that they were there as orderly citizens . . . but if force was shown to them, force would have to be shown in return.” According to a police report, some two hundred returned men marched into the reserve and began singing patriotic songs. Kate Sauer, a member of the Women’s Peace Army, claimed, however, that although they sounded like two thousand, there were really “about 25 all told (mere boys at that)”. The crowd countered the soldiers’ singing with a rendition of “The Red Flag” and this vocal duel continued for another twenty minutes. Finally, someone poured “Asafoedita” on the ground and the strong garlic stench dispersed the entire crowd. Back at Centennial Hall, a returned soldier announced from the gallery, to sounds of loyalist cheering, that his comrades had broken up the Bolshevik meeting in South Brisbane.

The following morning, the Brisbane Courier reported gleefully how “Brisbane Bolshevism” had sustained its “first memorable defeat”. Yet members of the URW remained unbowed. In a strong letter of protest to the State Government signed by Civa Rosenberg and Michael Wishnevsky, Simonoff’s arrest, Zuzenko’s suppression and their own hounding by loyalists were all instanced. The statement continued:

> Our meetings have been broken up by force with the benevolent permission of the military authorities. The lying Press pours out upon us its dirt and there is no right to freely reply to our misrepresenters . . . We desire to propagate our economic ideas legally in Australia, and express our indignation to those who would take away . . . this faith by brute force.
Addressing *Knowledge and Unity* readers on 12 November, Rosenberg's editorial message was even more strident:

Peace has been declared so do not sleep brothers . . . It is time to get ready . . . They have been trying all the time to publish false rumours about Bolshevism and . . . the most gallant of men, Lenin and Trotsky. Why should we be living here imprisoned in Australia? We are all brothers fighting one enemy "Capitalism" . . . fighting for liberty and for the "Red Flag" . . .

The censor deleted more than half of this statement, before publication, from the galley proofs submitted to him. 28

These November humiliations were compounded in early December by the sentencing in Sydney of Simonoff, under the clauses of an extended War Precautions Act, to a fine of £100, accompanied by a surety of £200 against his re-engaging in any propagandist activities. Punishment in default of this payment (which Simonoff refused to make) was a year's imprisonment. As Simonoff pointed out, notwithstanding the Commonwealth's refusal to recognise his diplomatic status, he was still the accredited Australian representative of 150,000,000 Russian people, and his sentencing, therefore, was an intolerable international affront. No other consular representative, anywhere in the world, had been "subjected to the same indignities and persecution that I have suffered at the hands of the Federal Authorities," he complained. Yet, although the Australian Labor Party attempted to intervene on his behalf, communicating information about his imprisonment to both Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson, his incarceration at Long Bay Gaol went ahead. He was not released until late July 1919, suffering badly from pneumonic influenza. 29

Before he was sentenced, Simonoff protested to Zuzenko that his Brisbane "comrades, whose interests he was serving" had given him insufficient backing. "If they at present refuse to support me, I will know what to think about them," he concluded curtly. In response to both his predicament and reprimand, therefore, Russian activists and their sympathisers next attempted to move onto the offensive, mounting a campaign for the abolition of the War Precautions Act in peacetime. As a Brisbane agent reported, after infiltrating meetings in the Russian club rooms during January, a major protest was being planned at Zuzenko's instigation, based upon a general consensus among members that: "Things are ripe for immediate action and fight." On January, therefore, Police Commissioner Urquhart conveyed "reliable information" to the Under Home Secretary that in ten days' time, certain Russians intended:
... to hold a demonstration by marching in procession from various points in the city to William St., carrying red flags and ... [then] hold a Meeting to demonstrate against the War Precautions Act and the Aliens Registration Regulations. They ... intend to do this without Permits from me ... 

Although Urquhart exerted maximum pressure upon Acting Premier Theodore to suppress the procession, it went ahead as planned, albeit in a somewhat different form than the Commissioner had anticipated. Instead of a number of small processions converging on William Street, more than one thousand persons marched in a single parade from Trades Hall to the Domain, singing “polyglot socialist songs” and accompanied by the Labour Band playing “Keep the Red Flag Flying”. Instead of an exclusively Russian demonstration occurring, members of the Brisbane Industrial Council (BIC), the Queensland Socialist League and the Women’s Peace Army swelled the Russian ranks. After inspecting this cosmopolitan crowd, the Courier reporter stressed:

The dominating note in the procession was the splashes of red to be seen throughout the length of the line patches of red on the dresses of the women, on the coats of the men, sashes of red worn by the children, several red flags and a number of large red banners, bearing socialist inscriptions.

At the Domain, among other speakers condemning censorship, internment, deportation and military intervention, eighty-year old Monte Miller, the celebrated Eureka veteran and syndicalist from Western Australia, spoke on behalf of the Russians present, supporting internationalism and praising Lenin and Trotsky. At the conclusion of the speeches, the demonstrators again marched to Queen Street, where they quietly dispersed.

On the surface of events, it seemed as though the January protesters had successfully flouted the regulations, displayed the Red Flag and boldly proclaimed their revolutionary message without interference. Indeed, their cavalcade was more than twice the size of the later, notorious “Red Flag” demonstration of March 1919, but on this first occasion it failed to unleash the feverish level of loyalist outrage and violence which that latter event would precipitate. For one thing, demonstrators had somewhat circumvented the War Precautions prohibition by placing white lettering across their red flags, which bore such slogans as “Down with Allied Intervention in Russia”. More importantly, however, in mid January, the various loyalist bodies were not yet poised for counter-attack.
as they would be by March. Consequently, if the undercurrent of loyalist mobilisation, both private and official, which this initial rally provoked is considered, the Russians' January "victory" must clearly be viewed as no more than a Pyrrhic one.\textsuperscript{32}

In attempting to stop the demonstration, the Police Commissioner had forcefully informed the Home Secretary:

The presence of these Russians . . . in view of their anarchical doctrines and revolutionary sentiments constitutes a menace to the peace and well-being of this city. I should be glad if steps could be taken, . . . for the deportation or internment of these dangerous people.

Such extreme recommendations seem to have been made in collusion with a leading Federal "secret agent", Major H. E. Jones, dispatched from Melbourne to Brisbane during late November 1918 to monitor the "revolutionary situation" there by the Special Intelligence Bureau (SIB). After "several chats" and an exchange of classified information with Urquhart, Jones similarly recommended "deportation of the most active" and "undesirable" Russians. In this respect, both Urquhart and Jones were simply reiterating conclusions already drawn by George Steward, the Governor-General's private secretary and covert head of the SIB. As Steward had informed the Acting Prime Minister as early as 22 November 1918:

... steps should be taken for deporting the Bolshevik ringleaders at the earliest possible moment. Nothing short of action on these lines will be sufficient . . . in meeting what is really becoming a grave situation.\textsuperscript{33}

Thus, as State police and Federal bureaux gathered names and particulars of such "dangerous Russians", the convenient occasion to begin deporting them was all they seemingly awaited. During October, an initial "list of disloyalists in Brisbane", collected with the cooperation of the Queensland Loyalty League, contained only four Russian names and addresses among the forty-one persons enumerated. By 23 January, however, the number of "dangerous Russians" in another list sent by the Governor-General to London had grown to seven. Then, in the aftermath of the January protest march, successive military raids upon the Russian headquarters added significantly to evidence already gleaned by infiltration, with confiscated revolutionary literature, banners and printing materials, as well as "firearms and a powerful microscope". In another sense, these seizures began providing the necessary occasion for deportations to
commence. As Russian sympathiser and radical returned soldier George Cuthbert Taylor testified, "the Military Authorities illegally raided . . . and seized and destroyed property belonging to myself and other British Subjects. This was the main cause of the Second Demonstration being held on the 23/3/19." In a brash response to the Intelligence raids, the URW also reconstituted itself as a fully-fledged "Soviet" on 22 February.34

Matching this sharp escalation of Federal intervention into local Russian affairs, private loyalist groups conducted a massive anti-Bolshevist mobilisation between January and March 1919. At the parliamentary level, anti-labour forces under the leadership of E.H. MacCartney, a solicitor and company director, were reconstituted as a "strong and undivided front . . . opposed to Socialism and Bolshevism." Beyond this sphere, Dr Ernest Sandford Jackson, a leading physician and former president of the Queensland Club, rapidly coordinated more than sixty local patriotic societies under the umbrella of a United Loyalist Executive (ULE), a massive federated organisation eventually boasting more than seventy thousand members statewide by March 1919. These loyalist bodies maintained an effective though unofficial contact with Federal bureaux most dramatically, perhaps, via the agency of the Queensland Commissioner of Police himself. Urquhart, a man with a pronounced military and Imperial background, reported favourably of a meeting with the grand organisers of the ULE during February 1919:

". . . three of the leaders came along to ask my advice about joining problems and . . . expressed a wish that I might like to take a hand in the business . . ."

Without evincing any caution at the distinct prospect of illegality and vigilantism which these arrangements implied, Queensland's official upholder of "law and order" then added, "They wish to go pretty far - not only to uphold the Constitution by peaceful means but to have a formidable striking force ready if required." This "force" in turn was to be culled largely from the thriving ranks of the conservative, quasi-military organisations, the Returned Soldiers and Citizens Political Federation (RSCPF) and the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League of Australia (RSSILA, later RSL). 35

As these right-wing forces arranged their counter-offensive, Russian and Australian radicals resolutely maintained themselves on a strict collision course. On 20 March 1919, Bob Carroll, radical union organiser and Daily Standard board director, wrote to R.S. Ross, the
Victorian socialist, confirming that "at all future demonstrations held under the auspices of . . . [the BIC], the red flag [will] be flown." Somewhat prophetically, he concluded:

... the first demonstration since the motion was carried is set down for next Sunday afternoon 23rd. When we . . . protest against the continuance of the WPA and will then give THE FLAG an airing. Subsequent events should be interesting . . .

Simultaneously, Peter Kreslin, acting now as secretary of the "Soviet of Souse [sic] of Russian Workers", wired Acting Prime Minister Watt demanding once more "our release from here". Kreslin, who argued that passport refusals amounted to detaining one thousand Russians who wished to leave "almost as war prisoners", also approached Frank Tudor, Federal Labor leader, on 21 March, urging him to cable the European peace conference concerning "our illegal detention". Consequently, when contacting compatriots at Townsville, Cairns, Broken Hill and Sydney a week after the Sunday demonstration, Kreslin would assess street action as "successful" in stirring up "a stagnant pool" and starting "an agitation for the deportation of the Bolsheviks". Commenting upon Kreslin's interpretation, Captain Stable concluded, "The Soviet look upon [this] . . . as a lucky incident, hastening as they expect it will do, their deportation."26

If Stable's judgment is to be trusted, and Kreslin's views accepted as representative, a monumentally ironic convergence of design seems inescapable here. Those sworn enemies, the anti-Bolshevik loyalists and the exiled members of the Brisbane Soviet, even as they moved towards opposing battle positions, were seemingly intent upon a roughly identical outcome to this struggle. The desire to initiate deportation proceedings, viewed by one side as sweet purgation and the other as painful release, was a tenuous bond they were both about to seal in blood as well as fury. Stirring in an added ingredient of provocation, already so apparent in the conservative press, Civa Rosenberg exhorted Knowledge and Unity readers on the day prior to the fateful Red Flag march:

Our capitalist masters eat too much, are lazy and have no liking for trouble. Let us worry them by ceaseless agitation. And let the rumblings come from the side streets as well as from the main street and the domains . . . Let there be agitation, ceaseless agitation . . .
Loyalists, however, were anxiously awaiting the onset of any such “trouble”, and the eagerly solicited “agitation” was rapidly to give way to havoc, terror and suffering. In the balance of events, the deportation of some was to be “a release” very dearly bought by the entire Russian community of Queensland, and indeed, throughout Australia.

Had it not been for Russian insistence, supported by members of the One Big Union Propaganda League (OBUPL) - the refurbished IWW front organisation in Brisbane - the Red Flag would undoubtedly not have been carried in the civil liberties procession, from Trades Hall to the Domain that Sunday afternoon, 23 March. In return for a permit from the Police Commissioner, the Brisbane Industrial Council (BIC) had promised that the prohibited symbol would not be displayed and, thus, few police were initially in attendance. Yet angry disputation greeted the announcement and, finally, Zuzenko and Bykov together tore the paper wrappings from the three furled banners they carried. The large red flags were “raised on high and shaken out in glorious sunlight”, as approximately one hundred other red pennants, handkerchiefs, ribbons and insignia materialised among the 300-400 protesters still prepared to march. As the eight police present moved forward to block the procession, a BIC representative dissociated Trades Hall from any further proceedings. Yet this man’s cry of “The procession is off, boys!” went unheeded as the marchers pressed forward upon the police line. With little difficulty, Zuzenko and Bykov, wielding their flagstaffs like lances and followed by a large body of Russian women and children, broke through the tiny police cordon.

A constable was told “to run to Roma Street and order the Mounted Men on reserve to come at once”, as the procession moved jubilantly towards Edward Street singing “Solidarity Forever” and “Hold the Fort”. Reinforced by four troopers, the foot-police made several unsuccessful attempts to halt the parade during its progress towards the Domain. Scuffles occurred and the mounted police charged again and again into the protestors’ ranks, only to find their horses rearing away from the billowing red flags and the swinging banner poles of Bykov and Zuzenko. A final attempt to thwart the demonstrations by locking the Domain gates came to nothing, when an impromptu meeting began in the street outside. Sensing the mood of the crowd, Inspector Ferguson judiciously opened the gates, through which the throng passed, loudly taunting the police.

Within the Domain, numbers rose to more than one thousand as speakers ventilated those well-primed themes of militarism, civil rights and revolution. Skirmishes broke out between radical listeners and jeering returned soldiers as, all the while, Zuzenko stood resolutely
before the podium, "holding aloft the Red Banner". That gnarled old veteran, Monte Miller, with a faded 1856 Miner’s Right pinned to his lapel by a red rosette and sporting a red "kerchief as hatband", again lent the best perspective to the meeting as he recalled "the numerous fights" he and "the Red Flag . . . he wore around his hat had been through during the past forty years, and the number of times it had been torn". Even as Miller spoke, however, loyalists had begun organising counteraction, circulating directives among returned soldiers and other spectators to attend the weekly North Quay meeting of the OBUPL that evening "for the purpose of breaking it up." Within a couple of hours, an unruly mob of several thousand had virtually swamped this radical gathering. As both Zuzenko and Bykov attempted in halting English to address this noisy crowd, soldiers calling, "Let us clear this scum out of Brisbane," charged the rally from across the street, knocking the speakers to the ground and singling out Russians in the crowd for particularly violent attention. The large OBU platform was hurled into the river and Bykov almost followed it, being only narrowly rescued by police. Nevertheless, he sustained a knife wound and injuries to his head and spine during the mêlée. Other assaulted radicals were dragged away and bundled unceremoniously on to a tramcar by the constables. Zuzenko, however, managed to evade pursuers on Victoria Bridge and made for the South Brisbane Russian Association rooms to alert members there.40

With the North Quay meeting put to rout, a raid on the "Bolshevist headquarters" was next proposed with the stated intention of "burning it down and assaulting the Russians connected with it". A crowd of "about 2000", singing patriotic songs, was very soon marching across Victoria Bridge and, as they approached the Russian rooms in Merivale Street, the leaders, crying, "Come on Diggers!" broke into a fast run. Within thirty yards of the Russian Hall, however, Zuzenko, accompanied by several others, emerged from a side lane and fired three shots in quick succession at the rioters, scattering them in panic. It was not until the soldiers had retreated some two hundred yards that the State police actually began to interfere, by holding back the crowd. Commonwealth Intelligence officers and Military police who observed the action did nothing. Approaching the Hall, two constables attempted to intercede with "thirty, or forty Russians lined up inside a wooden gate", several of them armed with "small calibre rifles and revolvers". The police were unequivocally told, "Send the mob away . . . [or] we intend to fight here until our bodies are lying on the ground." At this news, the rioters were advised to "go home like good chaps . . . if these men use firearms in defence of their home . . . you will have no redress." Returned soldiers
took little notice of the police, however, and it was not until heavy rain began falling and one of their number, Acting Sergeant Coman, suggested they retreat to the YMCA hut to seek reinforcements that they began to disband. When this plan collapsed, a further loyalist meeting at North Quay vowed to return “in full strength” the following evening to determine “who owns Australia - Australians or the Bolsheviks”.

The next morning, the conservative press with a flurry of sensational headlines like “QUEEN STREET RUSSIANIZED” considerably escalated social alarm and indignation, as that evening’s mammoth loyalist rally was also offered free publicity. During the day, returned soldiers of the RSSILA, while organising their assault, were told to bring “whatever kind of weapons they had” that night “to put down Bolshevism in Brisbane for good and all” with “the utmost force the could command”. That afternoon, individual assaults upon Russian citizens by ex-soldiers were reported from South Brisbane. At the same time, Police Commissioner Urquhart, perhaps with a growing sense of private unease about controlling the vigilante ferment he had helped to unleash, learned that while the demonstration was in progress, a covert “force of 40 Returned Soldiers . . . armed with rifles would attack the Russian Association Hall”. Consequently, all police leave in Brisbane was cancelled and the Enoggera military guard was placed on stand-by, equipped with machine guns and ammunition. Commonwealth agents also raided the Russian premises, virtually wrecking their library of “1,000 precious volumes”, and interrogating fifteen Russians present. Many Russians from surrounding boarding houses, homes and shops had already taken flight.

On the evening of Monday, 24 March, a clamorous “sea” of seven thousand persons packed into North Quay, spilling back onto Queen and William Streets. Speakers could hardly be heard above the tumult, as they vowed “to take the law into our own hands” and to “clear out of Queensland all the dirty Russian mongrels”. Other calls for restraint were ignored, as the impatient crowd rapidly created its own incentives and momentum, with cries of “Burn their meeting place down . . . Hang them!” Suddenly, a large segment of it, possibly in train of the armed group of returned soldiers, broke away from the jostling mass. Flying a large Australian flag before them, they again rushed across Victoria Bridge, singing that militant anthem of more optimistic days, “Australia Will Be There”. At Merivale Street, they were once more checked - not this time by Russian gunfire, but by a double row of sixty police, drawn up in military formation - rifles loaded with ball cartridges and bayonets drawn. Even as they breasted this bayonet line, the vexed crowd was attacked from behind by ten mounted troopers who charged into their
ranks, trampling some to the ground, and, using their whips freely, scattering others “like chaff” into surrounding streets. As these mounted police wheeled to charge again, enraged loyalists began tearing hundreds of palings from surrounding fences which they then hurled at the horses, galloping back towards them. From this point onwards, revolver shots continually rang out, as bricks, bottles and fence-pickets flew through the air, striking the rearing horses, bringing one of them down and sending three others plunging in panic into the lines of the foot-police, knocking several officers and men to the street. As the soldiers later complained, the mounted police charges were “carried out without the reading of the Riot Act” and had thus evoked such a savage reaction. 43

Several groups tried now to penetrate the wandering police cordon at various points, backed by a “fierce fusillade of missiles, bolts and rocks,” and were subjected, in return, to indiscriminate bayonet thrusts. A “thunder of stones and palings” fell against the walls of the Russian Hall, shattering windows and reducing the premises to “a wreck”. Throughout this pandemonium, the “fumes of liquor” hung heavily in the night air, which was punctuated continually by shotgun blasts, cracking whips, the clatter of hooves, breaking of glass, the thud of cudgels and rifle butts, the frightened cries of horses and the “yells, groans and curses” of the men. Several such charges by the returned soldiers apparently occurred over the next two hours, until a truce was called by the exhausted combatants, and a deputation of ex-soldiers led by W.A. Fisher, Queensland Secretary of the RSSILA, was allowed to inspect the damaged Russian quarters to “satisfy themselves there were no Russians there.” The building had been internally gutted and nearby residences seriously defaced. 44

As the rioters started back towards the city, seven more premises were damaged in Stanley Street including two boarding houses, three shops and a refreshment room, mostly owned by “foreigners”. Nineteen police had been injured in the fracas (although the press would list only fourteen of these), some seriously. Three troop-horses, one ironically named “Czar”, also suffered bullet wounds, one fatally. Civilian injuries are almost impossible to enumerate. The Brisbane Courier, in attempting to understate the severity of loyalist violence, listed merely five civilian casualties, only one of whom had suffered “cuts” which might be associated with a bayonet thrust. The official police summary of the damage was even more peremptory, mentioning only two rioters injured, neither seemingly by deliberate police action. Yet, this hardly accords with the exuberant letter written by one of the bayonet-wielding policemen, who informed his brother that during the soldiers’ “bonzer stunt”, as they pressed “time after time” into the police lines, “there
must have been over a hundred stabbed with the bayonets . . . I know for certain I prodded 6 myself . . .”

Ironically enough, one of these casualties was Police Commissioner Urquhart, bayonetted in the left shoulder and taken in a weak condition to hospital, his uniform saturated with blood. The following day, he wrote with mounting alarm to Acting Premier Theodore that further loyalist attacks were anticipated that evening. The Merivale Street Russian quarter had once more been targeted, as well as Deshon Street, where a considerable number of Eastern Jews resided in the vicinity of their synagogue, the Russian shul. The Daily Standard newspaper office, which had criticised the returned soldiers’ excesses, was to be attacked and even, it was rumoured, the Roma Street police barracks placed under siege. In this dispatch, the wounded Police Commissioner seemed even less enamoured with vigilante action than twenty-four hours earlier, referring disparagingly to “the returned soldiers with their attendant rabble [who] number many thousands”. Yet he continued to direct his main barrage against the alien radicals. “Until this plague spot of pestilent Russian revolutionaries is eliminated in Brisbane,” he warned, “there can be no peace or safety for this community.” Fearing more violence on the evening of 25 March, he secured the closure of hotels and, recalling a precedent from the Brisbane General Strike of 1912, requested Commonwealth “military help in preserving the King’s peace.”

That night at Deshon street, police and apprehensive Russian residents, armed with “dynamite and shotguns”, waited to defend their homes and synagogue from a threatening loyalist mob of returned soldiers, “hoodlums and larrikins”. But the main action occurred in the city centre where, despite a driving rain, a vast concourse of twelve thousand assembled in Albert Square to hear RSSILA and other loyalist representatives denounce the “dirty, greasy Russians”, and their Bolshevik doctrine as a “microbe”, a “cancer” and a “noxious weed”. As members of the crowd once more approached a pitch of excitement and fury during a call for “a revolution of loyalty” to begin, large numbers commenced a wild rush through city streets towards the Daily Standard office in Bowman House, Edward Street. Despite the presence of more than fifty police, windows were smashed with rocks, revolver shots fired and an attempt made to rush the doors, until the Fire Brigade arrived with hoses ready to turn on the rioters.

During this assault and dispersal, various hapless individuals were singled out by sections of the crowd for special treatment as “Bolshevist sympathisers” and roughly manhandled, until police intervened. This form of individual physical harassment appears to have become
commonplace over subsequent days and evenings, as huge loyalty demonstrations continued and spread statewide. "WE WARN THE GOVERNMENT that unless [deportation] action is taken immediately RETURNED SOLDIERS WILL ARM and carry out the work we demand the Government shall perform," announced officials of the RSSILA brazenly. Supporting the veterans' unabashed vigilantism, the conservative press fulminated:

Our Russians are anything but peaceful and . . . the dread of these undesirable people is daily becoming more apparent . . . The soldiers . . . will stand no more nonsense from Russians . . . and if the Slavs are well advised they will cease flag flapping . . . and . . . make for home via Vladivostok and the Siberian railway. This would not be the first time they have deserted us . . .

Thus, during the ensuing days of agitation, as Russians were indiscriminately branded as "foreign scum" and "vermin" who stole Britishers' jobs, these victimised residents made themselves as inconspicuous as they could. Yet, even a hint of the Russian language could betray them and provoke violent retaliation. As one Russian wrote to a compatriot in hospital:

Many Russians were beaten . . . I met a Russian . . . and started to speak to him . . . I was nearly beaten for speaking Russian by Englishmen. We must be as far from Russia as we possibly can. There is danger for the Russians on every step and corner.

Even hospitalised Russians were searched for weaponry, whilst a Russian engaged in mining Kuridala caused a stir when he ordered more explosives for blasting. A Russian workers' library at Selwyn in northwestern Queensland was suppressed and Russian sellers of Knowledge and Unity, operating as far afield as Newcastle, Cobar and Broken Hill in New South Wales, were raided by Commonwealth police. It is again difficult to assess the degree of hostility unleashed upon individual Russians. According to one Russian, Charlie Galchin, the feverish Brisbane reactions seemed in the nature of "a pogrom", similar to the waves of anti-Semitic pogroms which had swept large areas of Russia up to 1917, and had been particularly virulent in the townships of the Pale of Settlement after the failed uprising of 1905. "Yes," Galchin wrote, almost matter-of-factly:
... it was a formal pogrom, exactly like the pogroms of Jews, organised during the reign of Czar ... all the Russians are in a state of panic ... They are being dismissed everywhere from work. The soldiers thrash the Russians in the streets. They ... have all run away like rats ...

Significantly, Vere Gordon Childe, then residing in Brisbane and later to earn world renown as a classical scholar, was also to chronicle these incidents as “Riots and Pogrom by Soldiers” in his contemporary publication, How Labor Governs. 49

Accompanying this indiscriminate mayhem, concerted campaigns of job dismissal, boycott and eviction bit deeply into the Russians’ precarious economic security, and brought more prolonged hardship. As Percy Brookfield, the radical Labor MLA, summarised their generally distressed condition from Sydney in May 1919:

... the injustice meted out to these people was surprising. There had been enough talk about what was happening in Russia ... but this was in Australia. These poor people had been turned down by their former friends and employers ... and were not allowed to leave the country. Looked at with suspicion by everybody ... as soon as they said they were Russians or their tongue betrayed them, they found themselves unemployed ... They had no official representation, their Consul being imprisoned ... 50

Job dismissals of local Russians followed a pattern already foreshadowed by the mass sacking of German “enemy alien” workers during the war years. Reprisal efforts, both great and small, conspired to confront the Russian worker with desperate prospects. For instance, while the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce contributed to the “laudable work in rooting out Bolshevism” by promising only future “jobs for the boys” on 27 March, Pinkenba sewerage workers, that same day, did their bit by securing the dismissal of three Russian wage-earners who laboured alongside them. Reports of Russian dismissals at the Cannon Hill meatworks, at Darra, the Rocklea railway yards and the Ipswich railway workshops tended to complete the local picture of economic gloom. Anglo-Australian workers, however, did not always co-operate with employer initiatives in this regard. For instance, when the Brisbane furniture emporium, W.A. Hislop Ltd., advertised in storefront window,
To Returned Soldiers:

... This shop does not and Never has stocked Russian made furniture. All our furniture is made by Britishers ... the General Secretary of the Furnishing Trade Society protested vigorously:

... We have members ... who are Russians working in the various factories throughout Brisbane and ... unless this is stopped at once, trouble of a serious nature will arise ... already Russian members have been payed [sic] off ... and we cannot place them in jobs. WHY?

BECAUSE THEY ARE BEING VICTIMIZED ...

In a similar vein, the BIC in early April protested that four Russian workers "registered at the Government Labor Bureau whose turn it was to get a chance to work on a job where 95 men were required" had been passed over "under instruction from the Government". Yet, such protests seemed largely in vain as, across Queensland, the boycott became virtually total. At the Bingera Plains, near Bundaberg, the Russian community of forty-one souls complained bitterly in May 1919 of job discrimination and general destitution. Calling for passports, the community's spokesman, P. Boormakin, pleaded with the Acting Prime Minister:

... hasten our departure without driving us to despair ... Soon there will be no other course left for us but to go to Local Authorities and ask them to gaol us ... let us go from this Babylon prison. We will spend our last money and very soon face family starvation ... Let us go from Australia to the old contry [sic].

At Townsville, in an atmosphere of increasing tension over clashes with returned soldiers, unemployment and burgeoning industrial conflict at the local meatworks, some twenty Russians, led by Max Baranoff, protested against the censorship of Russian mail and the refusal of repatriation. According to an Intelligence report of a beach meeting held on 12 May 1919, the Russians further decided:

... unanimously ... to do all in their power to further the propaganda of Bolshevik principles and encourage ... the strikers to use force against the police ... hoping thereby to overthrow the present form of Government and form a Soviet. The meeting closed with the singing of revolutionary songs ...
At the peace celebrations in July 1919, it was rumoured that Townsville's Russians would again display red flags in an attempt to encourage deportation proceedings against themselves. Large numbers of police, present at a march which most unionists boycotted, seem to have deterred the display, however, as only a few Russians were detected "with large pieces of red ribbon flying from their coats." By mid August, Townsville's Russian "element" was depicted as "getting very desperate, as they have been out of work for some time and no-one will employ them. Their sole subsistence is the Government ration of 10/- per week." A reckless resort to firearms was even anticipated.52

The refusal to repatriate Russians en masse stood in stark contrast to official eagerness to imprison and deport individual Russian leaders in the aftermath of the riots. In a series of biased and expedient legal encounters held between 31 March and 7 July 1919, sixteen men accused of displaying the Red Flag were tried at the Brisbane Magistrate's Court, painfully presided over by Police Magistrate Archdall (bayonetted in the groin during the "battle of Merivale Street"). Only one of these, a Labor MLA, Edgar Free, escaped with a fine. The rest without the benefit of any defence counsel, were sentenced to various periods of imprisonment - three for seven months, ten for six months, one for two months, and the last for one month. Similar offences in southern states were merely resulting in £10 fines, but the occasion was readily seized upon to punish members of the camouflaged Brisbane IWW local, the OBUPL. In effect, these showcase trials represent a climax to the State's suppression of the IWW in Australia which had begun so spectacularly in New South Wales and Western Australia during 1916-17. Aware that the verdict was virtually a foregone conclusion, most of the defendants struggled to turn a political trial into a political forum to air their radical beliefs, with mixed results. Five of the accused were Russians and typical of their defence were the words of Herman Bykov, as he stated in halting English, amidst peals of derisive laughter from the body of the court:

As a Russian Maximalist . . . I consider I am not a criminal, but merely a political prisoner of Australian capitalists. I was stabbed and beaten with sticks by some ignorant and probably drunken soldiers who do not realise what Bolshevism really is . . . I spent seven years in Tzar's dungeons and in exile in Siberia . . . I am glad to come in prison again for the victory of the Red Flag . . . As the dungeon door will be closed, I am going to declare a hunger strike as my last protest against the starvation of Russian citizens in Hughes' land.

During May, the other four Russians Mark Ostapenko, Steve
Tolstobroff, Paul Leischmann and Louis Roslan - joined Bykov in a hunger strike over gaol conditions which eventually won them the right to be treated as political prisoners. Due to untiring efforts by a Red Flag Prisoners Defence League, organised among concerned socialists and pacifists, as well as the intercession of Premier Ryan, who was greatly troubled by the civil liberties infringements embodied in the War Precautions regulations, the release of ten of the fifteen was secured as an amnesty provision of the peace celebrations in July. The other five were gradually released during August and September, on each occasion to a welcoming committee of supporters. Herman Bykov, however, came through the prison gates only to be apprehended a few days later by Commonwealth agents for deportation.\ footnote{53}

Deportation, unlike imprisonment, was not an easy option during 1919, due to the continuing opposition from British authorities to the repatriation of “dangerous” Russians. Yet deportation, utilised as an extreme technique of punishment and exclusion, operated quite differently from repatriation, and could proceed to countries like Egypt or Ceylon - or even Chile and the Dutch East Indies - rather than to the place of origin of the deportee. Although various Russians seemed prepared to take the risk, the point of disembarkation could conceivably present the deportee with a greater obstacle in achieving effective repatriation than the problem of Australian isolation itself. Amidst a cacophony of demands from leading establishment figures, chambers of commerce and primary producer organisations, as well as utterly unveiled threats from the RSSILA to continue their “drastic” actions until all Russian “traitors” were removed, Federal authorities moved rapidly, from 26 March 1919, to compile deportation lists of “undesirables”. Following a telegram from Acting Prime Minister Watt on 27 March for expatriation processes to begin, A.M. Zuzenko was swiftly taken. On 28 March, he was conveyed to Sydney for deportation, and some ten days later he departed for Colombo on the SS Bakara. His pregnant wife, Civa Rosenberg, was left with no information as to his fate, as he was bundled away. Subsequently, her persistent attempts to rejoin Zuzenko led to her own deportation on 5 June 1919. She left Australia “in a state of distraction”, having been given little idea of her ship’s destination and, indeed, was eventually off-loaded at Alexandria, in Egypt, with her new-born infant, and thrown into prison there.\ footnote{54}

A deportation list of seven other “confirmed Bolsheviks” Michael Wishnevsky, Herman Bykov, Konstantin Klushin, Peter Kreslin (alias Orlov), Frank Madorsky (actually Wolf Weinberg), Walter Markin and Michael Rosenberg (Civa’s father) was forwarded by the Queensland Military Commandant to Melbourne for Cabinet approval on 29 March.
Three days later - “before soldiers’ meeting tomorrow” - the remaining members of the Brisbane “Russian Soviet” were expeditiously arrested, testimony to the effective pressure the RSSILA was exerting upon the Commonwealth concerning this matter. Simultaneously, the Governor-General contacted the Secretary of the State for the Colonies in London to ascertain that Britain’s recent deportation of one hundred “Russian Jew Bolshevik Propagandists” could serve as a precedent for Australian deportations to proceed. Thus, on the morning of 2 April, the seven arrests began. They were announced as “completed” two days later. Six of the men (for Bykov was already in State custody) were forwarded for military detention in Sydney where, it was later alleged, they were:

...compelled to sleep on the cement floor of the cells with a few dirty undisinfected “blankets” to cover them. The food they received is NOT FIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION, and the men are debarred from BUYING FOOD at their own expense. Any PROTEST IS ANSWERED BY SOLITARY CONFINEMENT...

When the seven began a hunger strike in protest over such conditions, a “little forced feeding” was rapidly recommended.55

Protest against vigilantism and repression in Brisbane by Russian groups located in Melbourne or Sydney proved either ineffectual or counter-productive. After the Melbourne Russian Association protested to the Acting Prime Minister in April, the leader John Maruschak was recommended for deportation. Meanwhile, in Sydney, an alleged plan to hold a sympathetic Red Flag demonstration at the Domain led to demands from Major-General Lee that these five Russians be interned and deported. This would strike their organisation “a blow from which it will with difficulty recover, if indeed it ever does,” predicted Lee confidently. In the upshot, however, only one man, the revolutionary Peter Timms, was seized. Timms, who had already served extensive sentences under the Tsar between 1907 and 1913 at Riga, Vologda, Yaroslavl and Krasnoyarsk prisons for making explosives, joined the other interned Bolsheviks at Darlinghurst in early April.56

In the interim, a renewed drive for “aliens” to be expelled from Queensland led Brigadier-General Irving to prepare a new listing of seventeen Russians, whom the censor had named as activists in centres as widely spread as Cairns (where Eric Karro had formed the Moolaba “Soviet”), Townsville, Ingham, Innisfail and Ayr in the north, Selwyn and Cloncurry in the west, as well as Brisbane and Ipswich in the south. When, on 4 April, the depleted ranks of Brisbane Bolsheviks rallied around a new “Soviet Executive” of nine, including the radical
Dutchman Barend Meyer, recklessly calling for "future demonstrations and . . . more drastic measures of revolt," this "Vigilance Committee" was targeted for "immediate deportation" also. All those listed, Irving commented, were "undesirables of the worst type and very clever propagandists." Various military raids on Russian residences had proven they were "working hand in hand with the I.W.W. movement." Irving added:

They have conjointly done everything possible to bring about a Revolution here and have so taught their fellow workers through their untiring efforts . . . that Bolshevism is the only means of gaining their object . . .

Yet more moderate counsel seems to have prevailed at this point, and Irving's later lists were not acted upon for expulsion purposes. Perhaps an unsigned secret report prepared by Captain Ainsworth of the SIB after a series of raids on Russian homes on 30 March holds a clue here, for it observed, with an uncommonly blunt tone of realism:

The Russians as an entity do not threaten the disruption of Australia from any point of view. Suppress their paper and where are they? They have no money, no influence in the community whilst in supposing them to be sufficiently extreme to resort to armed force, their numbers and cohesion are so ridiculous that they could do nothing . . . if you dealt with a . . . dozen . . . the Russian menace would cease to exist.

Perhaps with fifteen men imprisoned for extended sentences, a further nine males and one female interned or deported and the entire Russian community generally intimidated and terrorised, it was simply considered timely and appropriate to call a halt.57

Furthermore, on 1 May 1919, the first Queensland death from influenza pandemic was reported, and less than a fortnight later, almost seven hundred cases had been recorded. All public gatherings, whether for purposes of politics or entertainment, were prohibited and the anti-Bolshevik agitation temporarily waned. Yet populist mobilisations against aliens and radicals had received enormous impetus from the campaign. Dr Sanford Jackson's massive ULE reconstituted itself as the King and Empire Alliance in late April 1919 on a platform of fighting Bolshevism "to the bitter end". By mid 1920, the same organisation was operating in New South Wales. As governments were reluctant to deal with Bolsheviks, the Brisbane Courier editorialised:
An organisation such as this Alliance is needed to counteract... the mischievous labours of those... busily striving to undermine... loyalty... To the claptrap propaganda of Bolshevism and Anarchy, let the Alliance oppose the corrective of convincing exposure of their fallacies, their promptings to evil and the inevitable ruin and misery they lead to.

The Queensland King and Empire Alliance thus provided the prototype for the New South Wales league of the same name which was to provide inspiration for D.H. Lawrence's *Kangaroo*, written in mid 1922. The "secret army" appurtenances of this organisation, which Robert Darroch has carefully traced, and of Melbourne's "White Guard" of 1923, perceptively studied by Andrew Moore, similarly owe their inspiration to an "Army to Fight Bolshevism", formed among more than two thousand RSSILA members at the Brisbane Exhibition Grounds on Sunday afternoon, 6 April - an exact fortnight after the Red Flag march.\textsuperscript{58}

The RSSILA's key role in this peacetime "call up", culminating out of two weeks of riots, rallies and loyalist ceremonies, gave a tremendous fillip to this organisation's growth and internal strength. Certainly, the entire anti-Bolshevik agitation was heralded as "the means of uniting the returned soldiers throughout the State". Sixty-eight sub-branches "fearlessly" endorsed the League's campaign, whilst more ex-soldiers enrolled in the next three months than during the previous year. As nearly 3,700 joined - almost doubling the RSSILA's size in Queensland - its President, Pearce Douglas, jovially complained that expansion was so rapid, "badges cannot be supplied in sufficient quantity". Thus hatreds aroused against the Red Flag as a revolutionary symbol left an abiding legacy. In November 1920, seven thousand RSSILA members protested against any Queensland celebrations of the Russian Revolution, while, as late as November 1924, another such commemoration was suppressed by Brisbane police on the grounds that "a riot might ensue".\textsuperscript{59}

Australian Russians during 1919 had effectively been caught in a loyalist crossfire, at a point in time marked by the convergence of Australia's first full-blown anti-communist scare with one of its latter-day xenophobic riots. Anti-Bolshevism and Russophobia had together inflamed popular prejudices, consuming for a time extant minority tendencies towards internationalism, working-class solidarity and revolutionary zeal. Yet it would be insufficient to conclude that the Russians were merely a sacrifice in this loyalist conflagration, although, clearly, they had become scapegoats, persecuted and punished in dramatic ways. For certain Russians were also very much activists in promoting social unrest and encouraging the deportations they hoped would release
them from Australian thraldom. The fate of most of the ten deported is presently unknown, although it may be assumed that they all resolutely made their way back to Russia, usually via Odessa, from the various ports of call where deportation vessels abandoned them. Of the four about whom something is sketchily known, only one, Peter Kreslin, on his original Bolshevik enthusiasm, and found employment as an interpreter at the American Consulate in Vladivostok. A.M. Zuzenko, the central Russian figure in the Red Flag disturbances, became the captain of a Soviet cargo vessel, plying between Leningrad and London, but was also embroiled in Comintern activities overseas, returning as a courier to Australia during 1920, disguised as a Scandinavian seaman. In his capacity as a Comintern agent, he doubtlessly continued to liaise with Peter Simonoff who, upon returning to Soviet Russia, became controller of Comintern activities throughout the British Empire. Michael Rosenberg, too, carried out tasks abroad for Moscow. Finally and tragically, Rosenberg, Simonoff and Zuzenko, it would seem, were all liquidated in the Stalinist purges of the thirties. Yet Rosenberg’s daughter and Zuzenko’s wife - the only female Russian activist to be deported - Civa Rosenberg, is still alive in the USSR at the time of writing.60

Russians remaining in Australia pleading to be repatriated, had longer to wait and, arguably, a harder time returning home than the deportees. In late July 1919, the Governor-General suggested that Russians “not of Bolshevik leanings” might be released, but this proved impracticable, as only those accepted for Russian service by Allied Military Command were to be offered passports. Again, in March 1920, with Allied intervention in Russia drawing to a close, it was agreed that Russians might leave if in possession of a military permit, as well as having a return passage arranged via “a neutral country”. This plan, however, merely resulted in various groups of Russians becoming stranded, in severe destitution, at Singapore, Shanghai and Hong Kong, as British and Chinese authorities complained of their presence, and the Japanese refused to accept them. The policy, in turn, affected only Russians with sufficient funds to leave and, as Nicholai Lagutin and John Paul Gray complained in February 1920, “workless and poor Russians unable to pay their own fares” were virtually marooned in Australia. In August 1920, Australian authorities candidly admitted there was “at present . . . absolutely no means” of securing repatriations and, six months later, there were some seven hundred Russians, mostly without travelling expenses, still waiting to depart.61

Meanwhile, the local Russians’ campaigns to publicise their revolution, to celebrate its successes and, along with other radicals and workers, to struggle against their political and industrial “bosses” and a
“lying Tory press” continued to be energetically waged. After the March riots, no Domain gathering of the “red raggers” was held until 8 June 1919. Yet, despite poor publicity, “quite the average crowd came - between 3 and 4 hundred.” One of the speakers, Jennie Scott Griffiths, wrote to her nephew, Jerry Cahill, in Boggo Road Gaol:

The meeting was alive; alert among those present were . . . quite a few Russian comrades - and pretty well all of our usual lot - as well as some new faces - and some returned soldiers who never said a word . . . So the ball is started once more - “on with the dance, let joy be unconfined” . . .

Renewed publication of *Knowledge and Unity* did not begin until 26 July, but it contained a spirited examination of “‘Red’ Sunday: Its History and Consequences” within its columns. Everything possible had been done by large organisations of “jingoes”, the paper charged, “to make a small group of Russians the butt of their typically capitalistic and clumsily carried out schemes”. Most indicative of continuing conflict, however, was a communication from the King and Empire Alliance to the Department of Defence in March 1920 - a year after the disturbances - claiming that a “very large number” of Russians was still active “in the dissemination of disloyalty all over the State” a matter still causing the Alliance “much anxiety”. “In some cases, the place is getting very hot for these disloyalists,” the report stated: “Yet . . . the contamination of these Russians with British workers is carried on largely and in most insidious ways.”

In the meantime, details of the Third International (Comintern) had begun to spread in Australia, and Simonoff had commenced initiatives for the formation of the Communist Party of Australia (CPA). Indeed, as early as August 1919, Simonoff’s close associate, John Maruschak of Melbourne, became the first person in Australia formally to submit proposals for the establishment of an indigenous Communist Party. Writing to the editor of *Knowledge and Unity*, he appealed:

> to all socialists to sink all petty and minor differences and organise into one solid body to be called the Communist Party of Australia, based on the Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and Engels. Let us join the 3rd International and have one Party, one Policy and one Paper, a daily if possible, to be called the “Australian Communist”.

In August 1920, the first issue of a new monthly magazine, *The Communist*, appeared in Brisbane, preaching the “inevitability of violent
revolution”. It was edited by Russian sympathiser and ex-Red Flag prisoner, George Taylor, under the auspices of the Australian Socialist Party. Following a divisive Sydney conference in October 1920 to form a CPA, Simonoff’s “Trades Hall” group became dominant in Brisbane, with branches rapidly appearing in Townsville, Cairns, Childers and Innisfail. *Knowledge and Unity* soon became the party’s official Queensland organ. An undercover, propagandist cadre, “the Secret Seven”, which had emerged from meetings originated by Zuzenko as early as January 1919, and which was revamped by Simonoff in September 1920, became particularly active; meanwhile, by November 1921, Lagutin had formed an “Inner Communist Group” in Brisbane, consisting largely of Russians opposed to any cooperative action with the extant “political machine”. By this time, regular Intelligence summaries of communist activities were being compiled by Major H.E. Jones, “Australia’s master spy”, and their substance conveyed monthly to MI5 at Scotland Yard. In these reports, Communism was invariably depicted as “spreading rapidly”, particularly in North Queensland, where it was even suggested “whole districts have ‘gone Communist’”. J. Ostaschanco, farming near Innisfail, and K. Chuganoff of Mourilyan were named as local Russian communist leaders, while the various “settlements of Russians” statewide were depicted as “almost solidly Communist” in their political affiliations.

The Red Flag riots, imprisonments and deportations had hardly succeeded, therefore, in suppressing Russian militancy and resolve, despite their vehemence. Queensland’s Russian émigrés, who were certainly no strangers to persecution and suffering, had somehow managed to weather the storm unleashed upon them by violent Anglo-Australian conservatives. For some, their revolutionary idealism would sustain them in the face of a protracted scare campaign conducted against both foreigners and radicals throughout Australia well into the 1920s. For others, a simple, dogged capacity for survival continued to preserve them, much as it had previously done, against the Okhrana and Black Hundreds in Tsarist Russia.
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The Establishment of the First Australian Diplomatic Mission in the USSR: Outstanding Landmark or Great Embarrassment?

Thomas Poole

On the 13th of January, 1943, a small ceremony took place in the Kremlin. The Honourable William Slater, His Majesty’s Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary for the Commonwealth of Australia, presented his credentials to M.I Kalinin, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. The two men, along with their aides, exchanged pleasantries for about thirty-five minutes. This low-key engagement marked the commencement of full diplomatic relations between the Commonwealth of Australia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Great hopes were held in Canberra for this fledgling relationship. Prime Minister Curtin, in a special statement prepared for the British Ally, a weekly published in wartime Russia, took pride in the establishment of a formal link between the two countries after many false starts and a series of frustrating delays. The Australian Prime Minister informed his readers that “All Australians regard this exchange of diplomatic representatives as an outstanding landmark in their history.” He added that, “Australia has much in common in its outlook and problems with Russia, and the Australian people have the greatest admiration for the modern and progressive state which has been built up in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.”

But this breakthrough in mutual relations suffered a setback almost immediately, with Slater leaving his post for medical reasons a mere 103 days after arriving in the Soviet Union. Such a short stay was “embarrassing”, in the words of the distinguished Australian diplomat, Sir Alan Watt, but it was only the first in a series of major and minor convulsions that have marked the evolving relations between the Soviet colossus and Australia, a “middling” power in the South Pacific emerging from the shadow of British dominion and attempting to create independent links with the great powers of the world.

Slater’s misadventures in the USSR, as we shall see, had more to do
with personal problems than with great issues of state, but they also were a reflection of inadequate policy deliberations at the highest level in Canberra. If the initial results of establishing formal ties with the Soviet Union were disappointing, the new Labor Government must bear much of the responsibility: it did not fully consider the possible benefits which might flow from appointing an Australian Minister to Moscow, nor did it adequately weigh the personal qualifications which would be required by any diplomatic representative in such a difficult posting. But false steps of this kind could be expected as Australia embarked on the uncharted course of creating its own diplomatic corps and formulating an independent foreign policy. In truth, a "landmark" of sorts was achieved with the arrival in Soviet Russia of the first Australian Minister, no matter how fleeting his stay.

Relations between Russia and Australia have seesawed dramatically over the past 180 years, at times being rather friendly, at others quite belligerent. When the first Russian vessel visited Port Jackson in 1807, Great Britain (and her colonies) were preoccupied with the audacious schemes of Napoleon Bonaparte, as was Tsarist Russia. Thus the Russian seafarers received a cordial welcome from Captain Bligh, the Governor of New South Wales. By 1825 another ten ships had dropped anchor in Australian waters, their crews being well-received by colonial authorities, but in the following twenty-eight years only four additional vessels arrived from Russia. Glynn Barratt attributes this decline in visits primarily to adverse British reactions to the Russian suppression of the 1830-31 insurrection in Poland and to worry over the Russian-Turkish treaty of 1833, but changing sailing patterns also had their effect, making Sydney a less desirable port of call for Russian ships on their way to the Hawaiian Islands, Russian North America and Kamchatka. Such visits became a total impossibility after March 1854, with the beginning of British-Russian hostilities in the Crimea region. In fact, the British authorities gave Russian ships just thirty days to depart colonial ports.

The cessation of hostilities in 1856 paved the way in the following year for Imperial vice-consuls to be appointed in Sydney (Edmund Monson Paul) and Melbourne (James Damyon). Both men loyally served St Petersburg well into the 1880s. Damyon, in particular, was a good choice as he had conducted business in Russia and had a good command of Russian, besides speaking French. Neither vice-consul found his work overly taxing, as visits by Russian vessels of any kind were few and far between. Paul's report for 1858 stated that "No Russian Vessels have visited the Colony during the year".
But the reappearance of Russian naval ships in Australian waters, beginning in 1862, disturbed this tranquil existence, especially in the case of Damyon. The unexpected call of the frigate Svetlana to Melbourne in 1862, followed in the next year by the corvette Bogatyr', caused Victorian officials to question the preparedness of the colony's defences in the event of hostile warships descending on Melbourne, and led to the first Russian "war scare". Another alarm was raised in 1878 but a political storm of major proportions broke out in 1882 on the occasion of Admiral Aslanbegov leading a squadron of three Russian naval vessels in calls on Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide. Damyon was accused of sending a ciphered message through the post which foreshadowed Russian warships making a "darting raid" on Melbourne in the event of war. But such tumult was the exception, and few Russian ships of any kind paid visits to the Australian colonies after 1882, thus reducing even further the already light workload of the Russian consular officials.

With the formation of the Commonwealth of Australia, the Russian government decided to raise the status of its representative in Melbourne to that of Consul-General. The first appointee was Mr Michael Oustinoff at the beginning of 1903. Soon new honorary or vice-consuls appeared in Sydney, Brisbane, Darwin, Hobart, Newcastle, Perth and Port Pirie. The good relations of those years, however, were threatened by various political complications, such as the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05; Britain tilted toward the Japanese side and subsequently "outrage" was expressed in Australia at the Russians' unprovoked attack on unarmed British trawlers fishing the Dogger Bank. No less difficult were the political problems growing out of World War I, even though Great Britain, Tsarist Russia and Australia fought on the same side. The Russian Consul-General at the time, Count A.N. d'Abaza, had the difficult task of registering Russians resident in Australia for war service. He also attempted to combat the anti-war propaganda which was featured prominently in the Russian-language press. In this endeavour he often appealed for assistance to the Commonwealth authorities or to local police officials.

D'Abaza's position in Australia was eventually undermined totally by the revolutionary events at home. With the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II in March 1917, the new Provisional Government instructed its Consul-General in Melbourne to raise money so that Russian radicals, if they so wished, could return to the homeland. But this no doubt unpleasant duty was probably less disagreeable than representing a Russian Government intent on completely shattering wartime accords. The Bolshevik triumph in October placed d'Abaza in an impossible situation. He wrote Prime Minister Hughes in late 1917 that he emphatically
dissociated himself from “the band of traitors and anarchists” who seemed
to have gained control of his unhappy land. He would only represent
those Russians “absolutely faithful to the Allies” and would resign
instantly if a separate peace - “God forbid” - was signed. But a Russian
contingent from Melbourne wanted to hasten d’Abaza’s departure and
petitioned the Commonwealth to have a “qualified” consul replace him.
Finally, on 26 January 1918, Consul-General d’Abaza conceded defeat and
officially informed the Commonwealth that he had resigned his
commission. This signified the cessation of de jure relations between
Australia and Russia, not to be resumed until February 1924.

Into the breach stepped Peter Simonoff. A sometime political
agitator and sympathiser of the “Wobblies” (Industrial Workers of the
World), this Russian journalist was the surprise nomination of Leon
Trotsky and Maxim Litvinov (Lenin’s man in London) to succeed
d’Abaza. But he was much too flamboyant a character for the Hughes
Government, which refused to grant him full recognition as the Soviet
representative in Australia. From his appointment in February 1918
until his final departure from Australia in June 1921, Simonoff played
a skillful cat-and-mouse game which enraged Commonwealth authorities.
At one time or another he dared the Government to allow him to leave
Australia; embarrassed the Labor Party by appointing as his “successor”
one M.P. Considine, a left-wing member of Parliament; inflamed public
opinion with fiery political addresses and bellicose editorials in his
publication, Soviet Russia; and chose to spend three months in jail
rather than pay a fine for contravening the War Precautions Act. It
was all too much for the Commonwealth, which looked repeatedly for
a painless way to rid itself of this unwanted “Bolshevik Consul-General”.
But before leaving finally in 1921 to take up Comintern duties, Simonoff
addressed an open letter to Acting Prime Minister Watt in which
he challenged the Government’s authority to deny him diplomatic
recognition: “You know, Sir, or should know, that according to inter­
national diplomatic customs and usages, my non-recognition by your
Government does not alter my position as being the representative of my
people and its Government, as long as that Government does not recall
me.”

Diplomatic relations of any kind lay in abeyance until February 1924
when the MacDonald Government in Britain decided to recognise Soviet
Russia as the de jure ruler of those territories of the former Empire which
accepted its authority. By extension, this meant that the Australian
Commonwealth also recognised the Soviet State. A later memorandum
stated that with the resumption of British-Soviet relations, and “in the
absence of any declaration to the contrary, relations were established
between the Commonwealth and the U.S.S.R.". Although Prime Minister Bruce in 1924, and Minister for External Affairs Hughes in 1938, were unhappy with this "distinct breach" of established practice in conducting diplomacy within the Empire, neither leader made a great issue of the British démarche which totally ignored Australian sensibilities. Perhaps Australia's leading politicians were content to wash their hands of the Russian imbroglio, and allow the Foreign Office to act as their first line of defence in all matters involving the Soviet Union.

Such a complacent attitude no longer commanded universal support by 1941, however. Too many political developments, fraught with dire consequences for Australia, had occurred in the intervening years. At the centre of these events was the diplomatic revolution which followed from the German attack on the Soviet Union. On the very day of the invasion, 22 June 1941, the United Kingdom promised all aid to its newly found friend, the former helpmate of Hitler; a mutual assistance agreement was concluded on 12 July. Although not directly consulted, Canberra saw the wisdom of Churchill's overtures to Stalin.

But the Soviet Union's new position in global affairs remained unclear, particularly in the Pacific, an area of vital interest to Australia. Thus it was only prudent that Sir Fredrick Stewart, Minister for External Affairs in the Menzies Government, raised the issue of direct Australian-Soviet relations in a memorandum dated 24 July 1941. Presented to the Economic and Industrial Committee of the Cabinet, this document reviewed the course of British-Soviet relations, which were becoming increasingly close, and concluded, in woolly prose, that "there is undoubtedly much force in the contention that the Commonwealth Government ought not to be behind-hand in signalising so far as it can the importance of the association of the U.S.S.R. in the war against Germany." Stewart, therefore, proposed to seize the diplomatic initiative by requesting the British Ambassador in Moscow "to invite the Soviet Government, on behalf of the Commonwealth Government, to establish a Soviet Consulate-General in Australia."

Sometimes described as a political "lightweight", Stewart did not break with all precedent at this point and urge that an Australian legation be established in the USSR, but even raising the possibility of permitting a Soviet consulate-general in Australia was an important first step nevertheless, and the underlying reasoning for such a proposal requires examination. The first, and perhaps the most important consideration was the chance of influencing Soviet policy towards Japan. As the political situation deteriorated in mid 1941, and British and American assurances of support became more and more suspect, the Commonwealth looked for some countervailing power in the Pacific...
any power - which might restrain Japanese adventurism. If Tokyo were to be unsure of Moscow’s intentions, then possibly it might modify its aggressive designs in Asia.

Such a consideration had been central to Australian foreign policy since August 1939 when Prime Minister Menzies, with much foresight, advised his representative in London, S.M. Bruce: “our impression is very strongly that nothing should be done to cut off diplomatic relations with Russia at present.” At first Menzies feared that Stalin’s Government might ally itself with Japan in an aggressive pact directed at the Allies; later he held out the hope that a Soviet-Japanese conflict in the Pacific might take some of the pressure off Australia. No matter how cold-blooded the proposition, Canberra would have felt immeasurably safer if the Russians and Japanese had been engaged in a fracas somewhere in faraway Siberia. This was a highly unrealistic position as the Soviets had already concluded a Neutrality Pact with Japan in April 1941, and the Japanese had decided that everyone, save the USSR, was its enemy, but the Russian card was crucial to Australian security in the Pacific, or so believed Canberra in mid 1941.

The playing of this diplomatic card would also help relieve pressure on the home front. In his memorandum of 24 July 1941, Stewart admitted that it was difficult to give satisfactory replies to domestic representations in the absence of diplomatic links with the Soviet Union. He warned that “a continued negative attitude on the part of the Commonwealth Government might lead to political embarrassment”. Without being specific, the Minister clearly had in mind the many queries on the recognition issue, which were to exceed a hundred by September of that year. Not only did many trade unions and ALP branches urge that direct ties be established with the beleaguered Soviet regime, but so did the public spirited citizens of such communities as Punchbowl and Kurri Kurri in New South Wales. Popular support was running high for the Soviets in their struggle against the German invaders, as witnessed by the gathering of more than 40,000 people on 29 July at Sydney’s Domain. Direct diplomatic links with the Soviets could conceivably help placate this public pressure and remove the anomaly of the Commonwealth strongly supporting the Soviet cause but not granting diplomatic recognition.

Official recognition of the USSR would also assist in resolving an even more acute domestic problem: what to do with the Communist Party of Australia. In June 1940 the conservative coalition of Menzies and Archie Cameron had banned the Communist Party. This came against almost a decade of “hysteria” over the communist issue and the Party’s campaign to impede wartime production in light of its defence of
the de facto Soviet-German alliance and its denunciation of the Australian war effort. Thus there was some logic to considering the CPA a subversive body, argues David Carmen, as the Party "supported a country [Soviet Union] in alliance with the enemy [Nazi Germany] and used the war to pursue its revolutionary goals".42

This anti-war posture changed dramatically after the German army invaded the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941. With the conviction and enthusiasm of a recent convert, the Party enlisted in the "just war" against the common foe, Nazism. Henceforth the Communist Party of Australia and the Commonwealth of Australia would be uneasy and unacknowledged allies in the paramount task of defeating the forces of Fascism. But a price was involved, however. Representatives from communist-dominated unions approached John Curtin in September 1941, just before his accession to power, with a deal: guaranteed continuity of production in exchange for legalising the Party and establishing full relations with the Soviet Union. Such crude "blackmail" was rejected at the time, but conservatives and labor politicians alike would be relieved if the communist demands could be met in some face-saving manner.43 It was time to forgive and forget past misdemeanours, at least for a while.

In his July 1941 submission to Cabinet, Stewart had also stressed the "political importance of Australian-Russian trade". Perhaps the Minister for External Affairs had his gaze fixed on the distant future, for there was a wistful quality to imagining a brisk trade in Australian wool, wheat, sugar and other products during difficult wartime conditions. However, H.V. Evatt later turned to the same theme, well aware of the long-term economic benefits that might flow from closer Soviet-Australian ties.44

Unstated by Stewart, but implicit in his memorandum, was the urgent need to provide opportunities for Australia's growing corps of professional diplomats to observe, report and participate in great world events. A pronounced Australian presence abroad would complement and confirm her claims to autarchy. This course of action, however, was not universally popular. Even though the Department of External Affairs had been reconstituted in 1935, there was still great resistance to dispatching separate missions abroad which might destroy the diplomatic "unity" of the Empire. But it was no longer good enough to be simply "98 per cent British": Australia must protect her own interests. As a result, diplomatic missions were opened in Washington, Ottawa and Tokyo in 1940, and Sir Frederic Eggleston had already been nominated for the post in Chungking when Stewart raised the possibility of a formal link with the Soviet Union.45 If Australia felt the need for direct and
independent ties with the United States, Japan and China in mid 1941, why not also with the Soviet Union?

All of these arguments together - the possibility of influencing Soviet policy towards Japan, relieving domestic political pressure, establishing the basis for a fruitful trading partnership and helping to underpin an independent foreign policy - would appear to have had an excellent chance of swaying Cabinet in Stewart’s favour, but it was not to be: the forces of caution prevailed. Rather than being purposeful and directly proposing to the Soviets that a diplomatic representative be named, Australia’s High Commissioner in London was instructed to approach “informally” the Soviet Ambassador and mention that the Commonwealth would welcome the appointment of a consul-general in Australia. Progress was being made ever so slowly.

This indirect, and exceedingly cautious approach, perhaps occasioned by the conservatives’ distaste for any direct intercourse with the Soviets, was put in the capable hands of Australia’s other “Foreign Minister”, S.M. Bruce. From his vantage point in London, the urbane and experienced Australian representative performed diverse roles and counselled Australian and British leaders alike - whether they appreciated his advice or found it irritating. On this occasion Bruce advised Menzies that the Soviets would probably interpret the Australian move as a tentative approach to exchange ministers or they might take offence at being offered a consulate-general in Sydney when the Netherlands and China were setting up legations in Canberra: “In this case the Soviet will either take offence at our communication or, pocketing their pride, will ask for an exchange of Ministers.” To Bruce’s request for a decision on exchanging ministers before he approached Ambassador Maisky, Menzies replied two days later on 31 July that the government was “not prepared to accept exchange of Ministers with Russia”, but left it to Bruce’s discretion to raise the subject with Maisky if a likely opportunity should occur. It was not until 7 October that the surprisingly circumspect High Commissioner, who possibly let slip an early opportunity to open negotiations on mutual relations, cabled the Prime Minister that he now had the “impression” that Maisky would be content with just a consul-general in Australia, and asked for advice. But by this time there was a different Prime Minister in Canberra, John Curtin, and a very different Minister for External Affairs in the person of Dr H.V. Evatt.

Nothing if not assertive and eager to make his mark on Australian diplomacy, Evatt submitted to the War Cabinet on 14 October, or just two weeks after taking office, a comprehensive memorandum on “Australian Representation Abroad”, which included a brief review of Australian-Soviet relations. When the War Cabinet finally took up the
Russian issue on 4 November, the ground had shifted somewhat, and Evatt’s new proposal had a different thrust, envisaging a “Delegation to Russia”. As Stewart had done before him, Evatt cited the numerous individuals, trade unions and public bodies which were urging the establishment of direct trade and diplomatic relations with the USSR, and reviewed the reasons advanced for such a course of action. But the new Labor Minister went beyond a political-economic justification for this initiative and showed warm sympathy for Australia’s new ally in arguing for a mission to be sent to the Soviet Union:

It is presumed that the visit of a delegation from Australia would be for the promotion of understanding between the two countries, encouragement of the Russian morale and as an earnest of our desire to cooperate and assist in the common cause.

What Evatt meant by the “common cause” was left tantalisingly imprecise. The proposed delegation, in any event, would include a member of parliament, along with military, commercial, supply and trade union personnel. The War Cabinet concurred, and it was decided to send a cable to the High Commissioner in London with the claim that “a considerable body of public opinion” in Australia supported sending a delegation to the USSR. Bruce was instructed to contact Maisky and British Ambassador Cripps on the issue, without raising the question of appointing a consul.50

Thus politicians and technocrats, not diplomats, were the preferred instruments in forcing an opening to Russia. Once again Bruce was given the task of gaining Soviet approval, and once again he was hesitant in taking a strong line. Given a choice of first contacting Maisky in London or Cripps at his post in the Soviet Union, Bruce turned to C. Warner of the Foreign Office for advice. Warner thought that the Soviets might welcome the project, but pointed out that the proposed delegation could have trouble reaching Moscow or gathering first-hand information. Worse, the Soviets might use the occasion for propaganda purposes in Australia by raising certain “awkward subjects” such as when a second front could be expected. Bruce promised to warn his Government, which apparently had not considered these possible complications, while London solicited Cripps’ views on the subject.51

If Bruce expected Cripps to favour such an expedition, he was to be sadly disappointed. Back from Moscow came a sharply worded cable. The prickly luminary of the British Labour Party found little to commend the idea. “I feel the strongest misgivings about this proposal,” he advised the Foreign Office. It is possible that Cripps felt that he alone was adequate
to convey "Admiration for Russian resistance" without the assistance of a motley Australian delegation, but his reservations were well taken and should have occurred to the Cabinet back in Canberra. The Kuibyshev region, where the diplomatic missions had been hastily relocated after a sudden evacuation from besieged Moscow, was short of almost everything but the barest necessities, cabled Cripps, but the Soviets would feel bound to entertain generously this delegation, visiting Russia "for no very practical or well defined purpose". Besides, the Soviets at this moment were not in a "particularly responsive frame of mind" and might prefer practical forms of assistance rather than "expression of admiration for Russian resistance". Cripps noted that accommodation and travelling were very difficult, and that the delegation would see little of the country and nothing of the Moscow front. This testy cable concluded: "For these reasons I hope the proposal will not be made to the Soviet Ambassador who like his government would find it embarrassing to turn it down."52

Alexander Cadogan of the Foreign Office passed on Cripps' objections to Bruce, and expressed the hope that Bruce would defer any visit to Maisky, but the High Commissioner cabled Curtin that it still was possible to have an informal talk with Maisky that would not "embarrass" him. Before Canberra could reply, questions were asked in the Australian Parliament about the proposed delegation to the USSR. After a few days' delay, Evatt informed the House that the mission had been deferred, on the advice of His Majesty's Ambassador, and owing to the intense concentration of the Soviets in their mortal struggle.53 The deferral must have been galling to Evatt, who had backed the proposal with his personal prestige. The untried Minister for External Affairs had received a gentle lesson in the arts of diplomacy.

For a second time the establishment of mutual relations with the Soviets had floundered due to a lack of mature reflection, political timidity and bureaucratic hesitancy, but the new Government in Canberra was stubbornly determined to pursue the issue, and soon tried a new approach, prompted by initiatives from two unlikely sources - China and New Zealand.

The Australian Minister to Chungking was (Sir) Frederic Eggleston, a man of broad experience and much sagacity, who enjoyed Evatt's confidence, though holding non-Labor views.54 From his vantage point in China, Eggleston became perturbed at the lack of movement in British-Soviet relations, and cabled Evatt in early February 1942, that an Australian diplomatic mission might be of some use, since "Australian prestige high in Russia, and Australia besides having a Labour Government is less open to stigma". In fact, he had already made a
“casual reference” about a possible mission to A.S. Panyushkin, the Soviet Ambassador, with whom he enjoyed the “friendliest possible relations”, and Eggleston was convinced that an unofficial approach, if authorised, would yield results. Quite clearly Evatt was enamoured with the idea, and cabled his representative in Chungking that the “important suggestion” had been noted. For Eggleston’s benefit, he reviewed the situation to that point in time, and encouraged him to make a tentative sounding: “We can appreciate your initiative because military position in China and ultimately in Pacific will be dependent to substantial extent upon Russian intervention.” Once again Canberra was looking to Moscow to pull its chestnuts out of the fire.

If Evatt appreciated the initiative coming from China, his Prime Minister was less than pleased by another one emanating from New Zealand. Canberra was aware that both Canada and South Africa were contemplating exchanging consular representatives with the Soviets, but news that New Zealand was also considering the possibility clearly rankled Curtin. According to a cable from the New Zealand Prime Minister on 17 February 1942, the Soviet Ambassador in London had suggested such an agreement, and was willing to arrange its signing at once. This, of course, was the very same Soviet Ambassador Maisky whom Bruce had been afraid to approach directly on the identical matter for fear of his reaction. Fortunately for Australian diplomacy and pride, the New Zealand Prime Minister, P. Fraser, courteously requested Curtin’s response before proceeding further. An agreement was made for Mr. Sullivan, a New Zealand emissary, to discuss “personally” with Curtin the possible exchange.

At this point Curtin took charge, perhaps displeased by Evatt’s handling of the issue or stung into action by the unwelcome move from across the Tasman. Even before he could discuss consular exchanges with the New Zealand envoy, the Prime Minister cabled fresh instructions to Bruce. He reviewed Eggleston’s initiative and the New Zealand inquiry and then informed his High Commissioner in London that it was “desired you approach Maisky immediately with a view to general agreement by Russia for exchange of accredited representatives”. Bruce was to put forth the proposition that “Bruce will be accredited by Australia to Russia and Maisky to Australia from Russia and direct contact between Ministers will take place in London”. This would only be an interim measure, but it would establish the principle of reciprocal exchange. Curtin then added, perhaps out of a sense of pique: “As we were the Dominion which took the lead in these exchanges, we would like to get the agreement approved before New Zealand acts.”

This time Bruce made haste to carry out his precise and imaginative
instructions. Twice within two days he saw Maisky, and cabled the Prime Minister that the Soviet envoy was "most responsive" and thought that Curtin's proposed arrangement "would be both practical and effective". In a minute of the second meeting with the Russian, Bruce reported telling Maisky of the Prime Minister's "somewhat novel suggestion" and let him read a copy of the cable, in itself a novel practice not encouraged in Soviet diplomacy. The Soviet Ambassador was "personally" strongly in favour of the proposition and was, in Bruce's opinion, "very pleased that Australia had made suggestion for the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet".58

Evatt also appeared galvanised into renewed action by his leader's intervention into the issue: he embarked on a frantic effort to speed up negotiations on several fronts. The Chinese angle came in for attention when Eggleston reported that his informal approach to Soviet Ambassador Panyushkin had received a "most favourable" response, with the Russian offering to get an opinion from Moscow on the question. Evatt informed his representative in China about current moves in London, but admitted that no news had been received from Bruce, even though Canberra was "anxious to achieve some finality". Then Evatt renewed the pressure on London by repeating Eggleston's cable of 24 February and inserting an admonition: "I will be glad if you treat this matter as one of urgency and let us know position without delay."59

Even more peremptory was Evatt's extraordinary cable to Bruce of 27 February, conveying precise instructions on points to be made in renewed talks with Maisky. The High Commissioner was to impress on the Soviet that Australian "initiative and persistence contributed largely" to Britain's declaration of war against Finland, Hungary and Rumania. Furthermore, Bruce was to point out that before war broke out in the Pacific, the Commonwealth had on two occasions "strongly suggested" an Anglo-Russian alliance, with the aim to counter jointly any Japanese action and "thus to protect Russia as well as ourselves", a somewhat disingenuous suggestion given earlier hopes in Canberra that a Soviet-Japanese conflict might be on the cards. But Evatt was willing to use even more convoluted arguments in an effort to impress the Soviets, such as the claim that the Labor governments of Australia and New Zealand were "most sympathetic" to Russia and "our social systems are more progressive and our economic systems more egalitarian than any other country with the possible exception of prewar Sweden". If that was not enough, the Soviet representative should be reminded that Australia had sent rolling stock to Iran, had taken an active part in the Lend-Lease Agreement and was willing to discuss post-war matters, the last possibly an oblique reference to Australia's willingness
to recognise the Soviet Union’s contested border along the Polish frontier. Even more astounding was this proposal:

> With these facts in mind it occurs to me that after talking to Maisky along these lines it may be possible to suggest to him that a leading Soviet statesman might issue something in the nature of a warning or threat against any further attacks whatever against Australia or New Zealand by Japan.

As a way of offering an encouraging word, Evatt inserted the final delphic statement that if Bruce “could bring this off other pending problems might be easier of settlement”.

There is no evidence that Bruce ever made to the Soviet Ambassador these artless and transparent points which reeked of desperation, but then these were desperate times for both the Soviet Union and Australia. The Red Army had just managed, barely, to save Moscow from being overrun by German troops, but a possible Japanese invasion of Australia was never far from the thoughts of Curtin and Evatt. Following the Japanese attacks on British and American territories in late 1941, Hong Kong, Manila, Rabaul and Singapore fell in quick succession, the last named on 15 February, only a fortnight before Evatt dispatched his panicky cable to Bruce in London. The Australian 8th Division had already been taken captive in Singapore, and another Australian battalion had surrendered in the Netherlands East Indies. Then the Japanese bombed Darwin on 19 February. This was also precisely the time when a furious argument broke out between Curtin and Churchill over diverting the Australian 7th Division to Rangoon, instead of bringing it home to stave off a possible Japanese invasion. Australia seemed almost defenceless. Aid would be accepted from almost any quarter. Thus, if Bruce could bring off a diplomatic miracle and obtain a Soviet statement threatening unspecified action against Japan, there is little doubt that “other pending problems might [have been] easier of settlement,” as Evatt wistfully suggested in his egregious message to Bruce.

Quite possibly Evatt was also alluding to the home front, where pressure for recognising the Soviet Union, providing material aid to the Red Army and lifting the ban on the CPA was gathering momentum. Beginning in mid 1941, the Government was deluged with individual and corporate requests for information on how to send assistance to the Soviets. None was more vexing than the Russian Medical Aid and Comforts Committee, led by the formidable Jessie Street, and supported by a long list of prominent churchmen, academics and other personages.
This committee wanted the assistance of the Commonwealth in arranging to transport tangible supplies to the USSR, such as ambulances. Eventually the tireless group sponsored the "Sheep Skins for Russia Fund", and proposed sending 30,000 dressed skins to Russia, a practical gift in the wartime circumstances. Marshall Timoshenko was even to be the recipient of a special sheepskin rug, autographed by Australian well-wishers. The Commonwealth was not unsympathetic to these requests, but found itself floundering in a bureaucratic quagmire, sending cables hither and yon to help determine the Soviets' most pressing needs, the best way to transport goods and the availability of scarce medical supplies and other requirements. As sub-committee after sub-committee wrestled with the problem, and no firm policy emerged, left-wing political activists and banned members of the CPA joined the Russian aid campaign and exploited genuine popular support for the USSR to further their own political interests. An early decision to exchange envoys would materially lighten the pressure on the Labor Government, a prospect even more agreeable to Labor in 1942 than in the previous year.

But from London, Bruce counselled restraint and patience, advice that may have been little appreciated in Canberra. Not until 10 March did the High Commissioner reply to Evatt's feverish message of 27 February, and then to state that he had "daily" been expecting to hear from Maisky about the exchange, but the delay was "not altogether surprising as experience has shown that matters involving reference to Moscow proceed very slowly". Bruce also expressed his opinion that it would be "unwise" to press for a reply and "equally unwise" to seek a special interview about the points raised in Evatt's communication of two weeks before. If an opportunity did not arise to discuss these issues, the High Commissioner would go to Maisky on some other matter. This was really a professional rebuke for Evatt on Bruce's part. Moreover, Bruce had seen in *The Times* that Evatt might be coming to London at an early date: "I trust this is correct as a visit from you would be of the utmost value." Left unsaid was that the High Commissioner might have been given the courtesy of a private and early notification of the visit by his Minister.

Within a few weeks Evatt appeared in London to discuss the creation of Pacific war councils and other germane matters. Fortuitously, Vyacheslav Molotov was also in London on diplomatic business, and thus Evatt was able directly to press the Soviet Foreign Commissar for his views on an exchange of ministers. Molotov told Evatt that he was "personally most sympathetic" to the idea, but that it must be referred to Moscow, i.e. to Stalin, a line formerly taken by Maisky. The impatient Australian Minister concluded that Molotov was "stalling", and seemed to lose interest in the subject. Bruce was mystified by the change of
heart on Evatt’s part. Nor could the High Commissioner obtain much satisfaction on another issue, the possible completion of a post-war boundary treaty: “I failed to arouse any interest in him on this subject and he appears to have gone remarkably cold with regard to Russia notwithstanding his previous attitude.” After fruitlessly attempting to discuss Australian representation on economic planning panels with Evatt, Bruce wrote in scathing terms of his Minister: “There is little use in recording the conversation as it showed, to my mind, the most astounding lack of clear thinking on the part of a man who has a legal mind and who has held high judicial office.” The lack of mutual respect and confidence appeared almost complete.

There the whole affair languished until early July, with Evatt apparently blaming Bruce for the lack of movement on the proposed exchange. When the Minister for External Affairs did turn his attention again to the recognition issue, he attempted to bypass his High Commissioner, who reported directly to the Prime Minister, and use Alfred Stirling, the External Affairs Officer in London, who owed his official loyalty to Evatt.

Perhaps stung into action by renewed criticism at home and the Soviet-Canadian agreement to exchange envoys in principle, the mercurial Evatt sent almost identical messages to Maisky and Molotov on 2 July, using Stirling and the current British Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Clark Kerr, as conduits. Evatt expressed the opinion to his Soviet counterpart that it was time to announce an agreement in principle, following the example of Canada, and leave the question of appointments until later: “I hope you will treat this as an earnest of our desire for continuance of present cordial relationships between our countries.” Evatt went on to add that it was many months since the exchange had first been suggested, and any further delay would be a “matter of regret”. Appealing to Molotov directly, he trusted that “Your Excellency would be good enough to regard this matter as one deserving of your early consideration”. Not content with this, Evatt asked Stirling on 15 July to inform the British Ambassador in Russia that prompt attention would be appreciated as “delay is causing considerable criticism”. When Canberra received no reply to either cable, Colonel Hodgson, the Department’s Secretary, telegraphed Stirling that the Department wanted assurances that the messages had actually reached their intended destinations: “Matter is regarded by Government as one of urgency.”

Hodgson’s cable of 24 July crossed, however, one from Bruce (not from Stirling), dated 23 July, in which he conveyed the happy tidings that the Soviet Government had agreed “in principle”, on 19 July, to an
exchange of diplomatic representatives, but this agreeable news was tempered by the Russian caution that it would be "expedient" to make the announcement at a later date, once the appointment of envoys had been determined. This request, or demand, from the Soviet camp was not to Evatt's liking, as it robbed him of immediate glory and did nothing to alleviate political pressure in Australia. In a message to Molotov welcoming the Soviet decision to establish diplomatic ties, Evatt also attempted to shift the Russian position:

We appreciate greatly your acceptance in principle of exchange. With respect, however, I would suggest that you agree to immediate announcement of this, as in practice it has been found there is always some appreciable and inevitable delay between time of acceptance of principle and agreement as to names.

Perhaps regretting the tone of this little homily, Evatt ended his cablegram of 24 July with the assurance that Australians were following "with the deepest attention and admiration the heroic resistance of your gallant sons and we have no doubt in your ultimate triumph".\(^6^7\)

This communication, combining gentle rebuke with lavish praise, apparently made little or no impression on the Soviet Commissar, who was known in later years as "Iron Bottom" for his singular ability to withstand intense diplomatic pressure. As for the Australian Minister, still without any reply by 10 August, he sent a pointed message to Stirling in London, asking what steps had been taken to pass on his suggestion. When a reply from the Soviets finally reached Evatt on 22 August, it brought disappointing news. The British Ambassador had spoken to Molotov three days earlier and found him "unwilling" to make an interim announcement, as he wanted to avoid a "hiatus between the idea and its materialisation", which had occurred with the Canadians. In this case, the Soviets had nominated a representative and sent him on his way, whereas the Canadian Government had shown no urgency and had not even sought approval from Moscow for its nominee. According to Clark Kerr, Molotov "did not want this to recur for the Soviet Government did not relish it".\(^6^8\)

Evatt had no choice but to accept Molotov's decision. Using the same communications procedure as before, the Australian Minister for External Affairs replied that after carefully considering the Soviet position, the Commonwealth Government was "in substantial agreement with it and will avoid anything like the embarrassment caused in the case of Canada". Perhaps Evatt believed that by gracefully acquiescing in the Soviet position, Australia would stand higher in the eyes of the Russians
than the maladroit Canadians. But he still informed Molotov that the Government would nominate within a few days an “outstanding man” as Australian Minister in the USSR. The full Cabinet discussed the pending appointment on 26 August, with Evatt stating that it would be “very desirable” to announce the name of the Australian nominee at the same time as news of the exchange was released, and so the names of suitable candidates were solicited. Significantly, Cabinet also discussed lifting the ban on the Communist Party when the appointment of ministers was “carried into effect”.

But Evatt already had a man in mind - Frederic Eggleston. The day before the full Cabinet met, Evatt cabled his Minister in Chungking with news of the exchange and asked for an expression of interest: “We have not yet considered actual names but I would like your frank views as to how you would personally regard such an appointment and if you would be prepared to accept the post if in fact it were offered to you.” But no reply was immediately forthcoming from China (Eggleston was away from Chungking) and so Canberra cabled Keith Waller, Eggleston’s deputy on 29 August, stating that Evatt was “most anxious to have immediate reply desires you contact Minister forthwith and obtain his views as matter is most urgent”. When Eggleston finally responded on 2 September, repeating a mutilated, unnumbered cable of 30 August, he revealed that he was prepared to accept the post “as it would be opportunity for important work”, but he “personally” did not desire the change, citing his familiarity with China’s most important problems, and the possibility of aggravating his arthritic condition in Soviet Russia. The Minister for External Affairs graciously replied that, in view of his cable and his “excellent work” at a central post, he had decided that Eggleston should remain in Chungking for the time being. But he though that his Minister to China would be “pleased” with the nominee to Russia, and closed by stating how much he valued Eggleston’s dispatches.

Whether Eggleston would have received the nod if he had been able to respond immediately will never be known, but the War Cabinet had already decided on 31 August, or two days before Eggleston’s cable was received, to put forth the name of William Slater, the Speaker of Victoria’s Legislative Assembly, as the Minister to the USSR; Evatt was asked to ascertain if Slater were agreeable to this nomination. At the same time the War Cabinet “decided that the ban on the Communist Society [sic] be lifted simultaneously with the announcement of the appointment”. The linkage of the two issues could not have been clearer.

Evatt wasted no time in instructing Bruce to gain the King’s
"informal" approval of Slater's nomination and, if acceptable, to contact Molotov once again through the British Ambassador, stressing to the latter the "necessity of most urgent dispatch and reply". For Molotov's benefit, Slater was described in cryptic terms as a "very distinguished Australian" and leader of the "Australian Labour Movement" who had long been associated with trade unionism and bodies providing voluntary aid to Russia. Having established Slater's leftist credentials, Evatt requested that a Soviet Minister also be named: "The moment you do, Mr. Slater will leave to take up his appointment as we agree with you that delay in these matters is unsatisfactory."73

The King's informal approval was speedily obtained, but not so Molotov's agreement to the appointment. This delay increasingly irritated Evatt and led him into some questionable actions. When nothing was heard for a fortnight, Hodgson sent a personal cable to Stirling in London stating he should inform Bruce, his Chief, that the "Minister is concerned at delay, is anxious to finalise matter of exchange and asks him kindly to expedite reply". In response to this thinly veiled reprimand, Bruce cabled that he had asked the Foreign Office to send another message to the British Ambassador. But this assurance was not sufficient. On 18 September Evatt sent a confidential cablegram to Stirling, for deciphering by him alone, with a message to be delivered to Anthony Eden in person, and "to no one else". He requested that the Foreign Secretary personally communicate with his Ambassador in Russia on completing the exchange agreement. Evatt then confessed to his British counterpart: "I am in great difficulty as to means of personal communication with Molotov and it would help if you would also send personal wire to him on my behalf."74 In just a few words Evatt managed to expose his own sense of helplessness, to put his External Affairs Officer in London in a very delicate position and to indicate his lack of confidence in the High Commissioner as an effective diplomatic channel. Such behaviour was decidedly foreign to a practised diplomat like Eden, and could have given rise to a few sniggers in the upper echelons of the Foreign Office.

Then followed a flurry of messages between Bruce, Stirling, Eden, Evatt and Ambassador Clark Kerr in the USSR. Finally, on 22 September, Bruce was able to relay a communication from Molotov which stated that Slater had been approved but that the Soviet Government wanted a few more days before naming its own man. It was not until 7 October that Bruce could inform Canberra that the Soviets had selected Andrey Petrovich Vlasov as their Minister to Australia; he had been active in trade union work and had lectured in the Institute of Steel before transferring to the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs. Then on 12 October, at long last, Bruce was finally able to give his
Minister the happy news that he had desired for so long: Soviet agreement to announce the diplomatic exchange in both the Soviet Union and in Australia on the following day, 13 October.\textsuperscript{75} The deal had finally been struck.

Before considering the appointment of Slater, it is worth noting that after the Soviets had initially agreed to an exchange on 22 September, Evatt used Stirling - not Bruce - to pass on another personal message to Eden: “Many thanks your valued assistance”. Eden, in turn, cabled Evatt his regrets at the delay, “but the Soviet Government in our experience often move slowly in handling such matters”.\textsuperscript{76} This truism of Soviet diplomatic behaviour should have been obvious to the Minister for External Affairs. Moreover, no Australian representative - whether it be Evatt or Bruce - could materially affect the decision-making process in the Soviet Union. Bruce, then, was a largely innocent victim and target of Evatt’s petulance.

The Minister, however, was not slow in claiming much of the credit for the exchange of envoys. In the official press release of 13 October, announcing the Soviet-Australian agreement, Evatt stated that negotiations had begun with Molotov in May, “during the course of my Mission to London”, a contention which conveniently overlooked several earlier efforts, but in fairness to Evatt, it must be conceded that his dynamism and persistence were prime factors in the negotiations finally reaching a successful conclusion. In any event, Evatt declared that the Commonwealth was “gratified” at the arrangement, attached “importance” to this striking evidence of unity and comradeship amongst the United Nations and believed it would “signalise a special friendship” between the two Pacific countries. In his view, it was fitting that the announcement was being made when “the valour, endurance and self-sacrifice of the soldiers and people of Russia are once again the admiration of the world”.\textsuperscript{77}

The decision to send an Australian diplomatic representative to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was clearly more significant than the appointment of any particular individual: the deed was more important than the person. But the envoy himself was not without interest, even if he spent less than four months at his post. Who was William Slater, described in the King’s letter of credentials as “Our Trusty and Well-beloved” Envoy, and how was he selected for this exchange of representatives that had proven so arduous to arrange?

According to the official announcement of his appointment, Slater, a well-known political figure in Victoria, was noted for “his liberal and progressive views, his broad culture, and his quiet and attractive personality”. Other governmental and journalistic sources reveal that he
had once received some legal training from the “South Yarra Try Society” in Melbourne before being elected to the Victorian Legislative Assembly in 1917, at the age of twenty-seven, while recovering from war wounds in an English hospital. By 1924 he had become Attorney-General in the Prendergast Labor Government and served in a number of other ministries before being elected the Speaker of the Assembly in 1940.78

Slater had the reputation in some circles of being a “Leftist” and one of the “more socialist Laborites in the Victorian Socialist party tradition”, but he was far from being a political extremist. During the furious internal debates within the Australian Civil Liberties League in the 1930s, for instance, Slater, a prominent member of the legal panel, supported the more moderate position of J.B. Barry against the doctrinaire Brian Fitzpatrick. In a similar fashion, Slater took a middle position between militant left-wingers and fervent Catholic activists during the fierce sectarian dispute that split the Victorian ALP in 1937-38, a stance which perhaps made him barely acceptable to a suspicious Catholic hierarchy when he was nominated as envoy to “atheistic” Russia a few years later. Perhaps more significantly, Slater was a “long-standing political friend” of Premier John Cain; he was a witness to Cain’s marriage in 1926 and he shared a holiday home with the Premier on Magnetic Island in North Queensland.79

In other words, Slater may have been the happy exception in the State ALP: a man acceptable to all factions. He certainly was politically well-connected, and it is possible that his selection as Australian envoy to the Soviet Union repaid a political debt within the Australian Labor Party. It is also conceivable that his departure for the USSR resolved an internal political difficulty and paved the way for other party figures to be rewarded with plum positions.80 What is certain, however, is that Slater lacked all foreign policy experience or training, had an unexceptional knowledge of Russia - and no knowledge of Russian - and was not particularly well versed in the nuances of Marxism-Leninism. If the unspoken premise behind his appointment was that “Left speaks to Left”, then he was going to be a rather silent advocate of the Commonwealth’s position and a lack-lustre interpreter of Australian socialism in the undisputed homeland of international socialism, the Soviet Union.81

After Slater’s somewhat hasty selection for the “high honour” of being sent to the USSR, and before he departed on 4 November, he figured prominently in a number of public testimonials, each more “memorable” than the last. The Labor Government in Canberra made the most of Slater’s popularity with the press and public alike, using him to placate its critics on the left. The new Australian Minister to the USSR made the expected comments about hoping the exchange of
representatives would lead to “a deepening of friendship between the two nations” and confessed that he was “a warm admirer of the U.S.S.R”, but he also revealed his respect for the Soviet leader: “I admire Stalin. He ranks as one of the greatest figures of the age.” At times he admitted that he was “extremely nervous” about being able to carry out his assigned task, but he was determined to give all his “energy, vitality, and enthusiasm” to the job facing him. And so the novice diplomat packed his 30’ x 15’ Australian flag for presentation to Stalin (embroidered with the Eureka message) and set off for the other side of the world.

The trip was anything but an easy excursion, and would have taxed the energies of a much younger man than Slater, who was fifty-two years old at the time. On the flight from Brisbane to San Francisco aboard a Flying Fortress, Slater sat on a bomb bay door for part of the exacting trip. Then he took a train to New York and Washington. After a few days’ break in the nation’s capital, where he met Soviet Ambassador Maxim Litvinov among other dignitaries, Slater took another train to Miami. On 6 December he boarded a Pan American clipper and began an exotic flight that took him to Trinidad, Natal, Accra, Khartoum, Cairo, Jerusalem and Teheran. On the last day of 1942 a Soviet Douglas flew him to Baku and Astrakhahn. On 2 January, or 25,000 miles and 59 days later, Slater finally reached Kuibyshev, his new home on the upper Volga. The Australian envoy was well pleased: “I will find a great deal to interest me here as well as elsewhere in the Soviet.”

But Kuibyshev, the scene of Slater’s diplomatic efforts, was a far cry from Moscow. Most of the governmental apparatus (not including Stalin or his chief advisers) had been moved in late 1941 to this provincial backwater, the former Samara, which was known as “Europe’s backdoor to Asia” and had once welcomed camel trains from the East. In this teeming city the “haut monde” of the Soviet artistic world rubbed elbows with Mongolian officers dressed in long blue kimonos while Allied representatives strove to ignore the presence of neutral Japanese emissaries at diplomatic receptions. Kuibyshev was a wartime menagerie which demanded great personal reserves of patience, tolerance and humour from its involuntary foreign colony. It was hardly the ideal place for Slater’s first diplomatic assignment.

The Australian Minister and his staff found reasonable quarters and set about their diplomatic business. Besides making the rounds of various embassies, Slater filed his dispatches to Canberra and attempted to visit schools, factories and farms, though not with great success. On four occasions he managed to visit Moscow and the Kremlin, seeing such Soviet leaders as Kalinin and Molotov, but never Stalin. Yet Slater counted himself lucky - “I haven’t done too badly” - and he later wrote
that the leadership of the country inspired confidence: "They were obviously men of strength, power and intelligence." Molotov, in particular, adopted a "friendly attitude" toward the Australian envoy, even though he did not accede to Slater's request that an Australian military mission be received in Moscow, nor did he commit himself on the issue of trade. But the Minister from Australia was permitted to make a radio broadcast to his homeland, something of a coup for him.86

But the cold, hard fact was that Salter had little to do in Soviet Russia, particularly in Kuibyshev. He recognised that this "provincial centre" was isolated from the real centre of interest, Moscow, where the officials with real power still resided. His chief contacts in Kuibyshev - Andrey Vyshinsky ("a warm friendly person") and Solomon Lozovsky ("courteous" if not "expansive") - were simply "conduits" who had to refer all questions of note to Moscow. If Slater had made a real attempt to learn Russian, or taken a keen interest in the complexities of the Soviet system, he might not have complained of it being "almost impossible" to make contacts with Russians, of the "very limited opportunities for work" and of the "almost complete inactivity" in Kuibyshev, but this complaint was also voiced by experienced diplomats in the American and British embassies.87 The inactivity experienced in Kuibyshev eventually became debilitating.

With an immoderate amount of free time on his hands, the Australian diplomat sampled Russian literature and attempted to learn ice-skating, but his greatest joy was attending the opera and ballet. Kuibyshev was also the temporary residence of the Bolshoi Theatre; its stars tried to brighten the lives of the refugee population with regular performances of the Russian classics. Not only did Salter find time to see the ballet "Swan Lake" six times in three months, but he also saw "Vain Precautions" four times, plus the "Nutcracker", "Don Quixote", and different operatic productions. Salter felt privileged to attend these "splendid" performances which he found provided an insight into Soviet life:

The vivacity, the humour, the intensity of the work of the stage to me mirrored the general life of a people neither oppressed by a regime, nor doubtful of the future of the new civilisation, the new order and the new culture that perhaps through blood and sweat and tears has within the space of a single generation become a reality.88

This identification of the life of the stage with the life of the people does not bear serious analysis, but Salter was never able to gain a deeper appreciation of Soviet reality, as his health deteriorated rapidly in the
early months of 1943. Slater complained of being “off colour” and of a loss of weight: he also noted in his diary sleepless nights and heart palpitations. The Soviet doctors whom he consulted about this “general weakness” were bemused by their foreign patient, finally attributing his condition to a “functional nervous disorder”. At first they prescribed a restful daily routine - morning showers (“neither too hot nor too cold”), short walks, light reading, a few hours in the office, and frequent periods of rest. When Slater’s health showed little improvement, his “good friend Dr Pavlov” recommended thirty injections of a substance obtained from “horns of a deer” which was supposedly a time-honoured nerve tonic. But Slater only experienced “recurrent waves of depression” and so the injections were stopped, to be replaced by a nightly massage with a mixture consisting of vodka, water and salt. Nothing seemed to help, however. By early April Slater, his staff at the Legation, the concerned Soviet physicians and American doctors consulted in Moscow were of one accord: he should leave Kuibyshev. According to Slater, the Americans believed that “my physical and mental structure was such that I was unable to adapt myself to the climate and the general conditions of life in Russia”, which was probably a fair summation of the situation.

The initial plan was for Slater to recuperate in Cairo’s more salubrious environment for a few weeks and to seek medical advice, but it is clear from Slater’s diary that he had already decided in Kuibyshev to relinquish his post for good, “cruel blow” though he considered the move, and proceed home through the United States. He cabled the Prime Minister to this effect, but apparently Evatt was unaware of Slater’s firm decision to resign. Once an American plane had deposited the ill diplomat in Cairo on 18 April, and he had undergone a brief medical examination, the resolute patient insisted almost immediately on taking another American aircraft to Washington. And so Slater retraced the steps of his earlier trip, only this time in the opposite direction, arriving in Washington on 23 April, less than five months after he had originally left the American capital for his great odyssey to Russia. By coincidence, Evatt was also in Washington at the time and the welcome was “rather cold”, in Slater’s opinion, for his Chief implied Slater’s abandonment of his post was an “embarrassment” to the Government. “I very much fear that Bert [Evatt] has become somewhat hostile,” confided the chastened Slater to his diary.

But Evatt soon had a change of heart. After an initial talk with Slater, he detected foul play. In a personal cable to Hodgson in Canberra, the Minister made a startling charge against two senior staffers in the Kuibyshev Legation: “From what I can gather Officer and Heydon
gave so little help to Slater that the case is almost one of sabotage.” He had decided to ask a third member of the Legation, R.M. Crawford, for a full personal report. How Evatt arrived at this rash conclusion is unclear, given Slater’s written support for his loyal staff, but Keith Officer was considered a protégé of Bruce, and Peter Heydon had once been Menzies’ secretary, hardly gilt-edged recommendations in the view of the testy Minister, ever ready to detect opposition from the “Old Boys” in the Department.

Whatever the case, Evatt warmed to his obviously distressed colleague and reported on 30 April that medical reports and loss of weight corroborated Slater’s account: “The fact seems to be clear that his constitution did not permit of any ready adjustment to the severe rigours of the winter climate in Russia.” Concerned for Slater’s well-being, Evatt advised the Prime Minister that the ill diplomat would travel home by easy stages, perhaps by surface vessel. But the Minister for External Affairs was also concerned about the possible repercussions if Slater’s resignation became known prematurely and so suggested that “a severe bout of sickness” be cited as the reason for the return home; the resumption of duties would depend upon “the rapidity of his recovery”. Evatt was anxious to have a successor ready in the wings when the resignation took effect, as he wanted to avoid a deluge of applications from every quarter. To Curtin, in short, Evatt reported that Slater had already improved, “but I am satisfied that it is in the interest of all that he should return home”.

This cable of 30 April alluded to another delicate point: Slater’s alleged “disillusionment” with the Soviet regime. As Evatt correctly stated, his former Minister in Kuibyshev was “indignant” at reports that he had given up his post because of severe disenchantment with the Soviet form of socialism. Evatt was not stating the case too strongly. When Slater was informed of the report emanating from Cairo that he had left Russia with “the same feelings as a prisoner out of gaol”, he was simply amazed at the canard and immediately took steps to quash the rumour. He was particularly upset that Prime Minister Curtin apparently shared this view and forcibly corrected the record in a later communication to Curtin:

I have at no time been disillusioned about the Russian regime, its leaders or people and the very strong feelings of sympathy I have always entertained for the regime, its leaders and people was [sic] decidedly stimulated and strengthened by my going to Russia and by my experiences in the country . . . I had been consistently treated with courtesy and consideration by the Soviet leaders and had no
occasion whatever to express any unfavourable view concerning them or their people or their country.

Slater wanted everyone to know that he was a “warm admirer” of the Soviet Union.95

Despite the disclaimers, a number of diplomats repeated the tale of Slater’s “disillusionment” with Soviet Russia, a view which has gained a certain credence. American Ambassador Standley wrote of Slater leaving the USSR a “completely disillusioned partisan”, a claim echoed by Polish Ambassador Rosmer who told Bruce of the Australian’s “disappointment and disillusionment”. Alfred Stirling, in London, described Slater as “a man of great courage and high ideals” who, however, was almost “broken-hearted by his disillusionment with Russia”. From Washington Alan Watt gained the impression that the novice envoy had been unable to establish contacts with Soviet officials, leaving him “disappointed and frustrated”. And from Kuibyshev, Officer, perhaps the original source of this rumour, wrote as early as 8 April that his former Chief had just departed “a sick man - to a great extent through disillusionment”, but held out the hope that Slater would return to Australia with a “much truer picture” of the Soviet Union than he had held before taking up his position.96

All of these surprisingly consistent reports were wide of the mark, however. Once Slater’s Swedish freighter reached Sydney on 17 June, he wrote the Prime Minister on at least two occasions and formally requested that his resignation be accepted. But he also provided Curtin with an unambiguous statement of how he regarded his brief stint as Australian Minister to the USSR:

I conclude by again expressing a sense of disappointment in having to submit my resignation as I am fully conscious both of the great honour done me in appointing me as first Australian Minister to the Soviet Union and of the tremendous importance of your Government’s action in establishing diplomatic relations between Australia and Russia.97

For Slater, his mission to Russia had helped mark “an epoch in Australian foreign policy”, a matter of great pride and importance to him.98

Even before a decision had been taken to dispatch Slater to the USSR, a businessman with extensive experience in the Soviet Union had written to the Government and questioned the whole point of the exercise. “The whole question of prestige,” wrote H. Hollingworth, who also argued that without consular staff stationed at ports it was a “fallacy” to
expect an increase in trade. Moreover, Hollingworth bluntly claimed that, "To have a Staff of say 7 or 8 persons marooned in Kuibyscheff [sic] or wherever the Provisional Capital is, means nothing at all." 99

"Means nothing at all" is perhaps too strong a comment on the Australian presence in Kuibyshev, but the exigencies of the wartime situation meant that the mission was primarily a "reporting post", as Keith Officer had always believed, with little opportunity to affect matters of state.100 If the Australian Legation could not be realistically expected to expand trade with the Soviets or convince them to enter the war against Japan, it did serve as a valuable training ground for a small nucleus of Australian diplomats who were unexpectedly called upon in mid 1943 to handle the fall-out from a rupture in Polish-Soviet relations. The Australians earned the respect of all sides in this exceedingly delicate undertaking.101

In truth, the establishment of formal relations with the USSR was more a domestic triumph than a foreign success, at least for the time being. The sense of urgency which Evatt brought to the negotiations was as much a product of domestic pressure as it was of complications associated with the war. Thus he made the most of Slater's appointment in October 1942 to disarm critics on the left. More to the point, the other issue indivisibly linked with recognition - the fate of the Communist Party - was resolved in December 1942 when the ban was lifted, and Slater was on the last legs of his lengthy journey to the USSR.102 Recognition of the USSR and removal of the banning order on the CPA were two sides of the same stratagem to improve the Government's position with an important constituency on the left.

As for Evatt, he appeared to enjoy stirring the pot during the protracted negotiations. Without his dynamism and personal initiative, it is doubtful that Soviet-Australian diplomatic relations would have been established for another year, at least. However, the Minister for External Affairs never examined realistically or in any detail the possible benefits that might result from an Australian diplomatic presence in the Soviet Union. But he was ready to see treachery at every turn and treated Bruce, in particular, in a shabby fashion.

This leaves Slater, something of a novice and victim of the complicated proceedings. By all accounts a decent, pleasant and well-meaning individual, he simply lacked the intellectual and physical resources to exploit the opportunities in Kuibyshev. The Government should have taken greater care in appointing the first Australian Minister to the USSR.

In conclusion, one may question whether the initial mission to Russia was either an outstanding "landmark" or a great "embarrassment"
in the history of Australian diplomacy, but it was not devoid of all significance. After all, a start had to be made at some point in time, and Soviet-Australian relations have been maintained - off and on - for almost half a century, an achievement worthy of some recognition.
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Literary Contacts: Australian Literature in Russia and the Soviet Union

A.S. Petrikovskaya

Literary contacts are one of the most important indicators of the cultural development of different peoples and countries, of their mutual relations, their understanding of each other and the extent to which they have enriched each other's artistic heritage.

The achievements of Russian and Soviet literary scholarship in studying the relationships between the literatures of different countries and peoples have done much to reveal both the endless variety and the unity of the universal literary process. It goes without saying that those instances of the phenomenon where it is Russian and Soviet literature and culture which function as transmitter or receiver of the "cultural signal" have always had, and will continue to have, particular interest for us.

Literary contacts include the translation and publication of foreign literature, artistic influences and, finally, direct personal contacts between writers. My aim in this article, as will be clear from the title, is to examine not all, but some of the most important aspects of the reception of Australian literature by Russian and Soviet readers. The reverse process in the two-way phenomenon - the dissemination and influence of Russian and Soviet literature in Australia must remain a subject for future study, although there is no shortage of relevant material. Marcus Clarke, for example, recalls one of the friends of his youth (perhaps of Russian extraction), who would read Russian novels to him, translating them then and there into English. The young Vance Palmer discovered the Russian classics on the shelves of the library of the Brisbane School of Arts, and was so carried away by Turgenev, that for some time he read no one else, "looking for hints of Turgenev's characters in the streets, and searching the journals of the Goncourt brothers for references to the slow Russian giant." Tolstoy, and later Chekhov, were also decisive influences on the Australian writer. Writers like Barbara Baynton and Henry Handel Richardson, and particularly Katharine Susannah Prichard, shared his keen interest in Russian and Soviet literature. Prichard was
also a great admirer of Gorky, and wrote the preface for *Creative Labour and Culture*, a collection of articles by Gorky published in Sydney in 1945. Gorky too was an inspiration to the young Alan Marshall who in later years acknowledged his sense of kinship with the Soviet writer:

When I read Maxim Gorky, I see that the people he portrays are just like me. I recognise them. I love his Grandmother, who told him such wonderful stories, I understand his Chelkash in the story of that name. I can quite easily imagine myself in his place. There is in him something I like. There is some kind of bond between the people he met and the people I met when I first come to work in the city. In his play *The Lower Depths* he writes of the most unfortunate people with amazing sympathy, yet he is never vulgar and never humiliates his characters.3

Such examples of the impact of Russian and Soviet literature on the Australian literary movement could be continued indefinitely to include all kinds of literary phenomena - Aileen Palmer’s translations of Pushkin, the influence of Dostoevsky on Patrick White or Manning Clark, the literary lineage of Judah Waten, which he traced back to the colourful and richly talented literary world of Odessa, the attitude of David Williamson to Chekhov’s drama - and much else besides.

The first step in the study of literary contacts between the two countries was the gathering of information about the publication of works by Australian authors in Russian and the other languages of the USSR. This exercise in bibliographical research was undertaken in the late fifties and sixties by L.M. Kasatkina and the present author, and produced results in the form of theses, bibliographical appendices and the first catalogue of Australian literature compiled in the Lenin State Library in Moscow. Since then, thanks to the painstaking and tireless researches of E.V. Govor,4 Russian literary Australiana has been supplemented by much valuable material and has become generally accessible in its full extent.

Few translations of Australian authors were published in prerevolutionary Russia, but that is hardly surprising when we remember that the literature of the distant and newly colonised continent was only just coming into being. Accounts of the discovery and initial settlement of *Terra australis incognita* had become available to the Russian reader already in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.5 Some of these autobiographical sketches and travel notes contained an element of invention, tending towards the kind of travel-novel typical of the literature of the Enlightenment and Sentimentalism; they can thus be
seen as a definite contribution to the artistic tradition of Australian writing. There is some basis, therefore, for claiming that the first landmark in Russian literary Australiana is the memoirs of the convict George Barrington, strolling player, prince of the London pickpockets and, by the grace of the prison authorities, superintendent of the convict settlement at Parramatta. His *Voyage to Botany Bay*, published in London in 1794, and afterwards in France, appeared in Russian in 1803, and was issued as a separate volume in 1804. The translation was prepared from the French edition by Aleksey Ivanovich Golitsyn (1765-1807), a retired colonel in the Izmaylov regiment of Life Guards and *littérature* of some note. He was the author of various odes, idylls and epigrams, and translated French and German authors. It seems likely that what attracted him to Barrington's memoirs was their wealth of factual information about a little known part of the world, as well as the extraordinary life of the principal character. The figure of Barrington must have impressed him - as it impressed the French translator whose preface he includes - with the "audacity" and "cunning" of his rascally schemes and, at the same time, the homesick effusions of the repentant criminal.

Charles Rowcroft's *Tales of the Colonies, or the Adventure of an Emigrant* (1843) aroused great interest in Russia; unlike the autobiographical accounts of transported convicts, this described the colonial experience of a free settler and advocate of planned colonisation as a sure remedy for poverty and social unrest. Immediately after its publication in London, the novel attracted the attention of the St Petersburg journal *Notes of the Fatherland [Otechestvennye zapiski]*, which hastened to bring it to the notice of the Russian reader. Praising the novel for the fascinating and authentic nature of its contents, the reviewer was (quite understandably) in no position to distinguish between reliable factual information and the embellishments of a novel of colonial adventure. "One thinks one is reading some imaginary tale, but here everything is true - the natural setting, the people - and how alive and absorbing this reality is!" Rowcroft's *Tales* were published anonymously in the monthly *The Contemporary [Sovremennik]* in 1850, and in *The Reading Library [Biblioteka dlya chteniya]* in 1852.

Various adaptions of the novel - for children, for "the people" - testify to its popularity. Almost forty years after its first appearance in Russian translation, A.V. Arkhange'lskaya, known for her adaptations of several foreign authors (notably Dickens), published *The First Farm on the Clyde River: A Tale from the Life of Australian Settlers*. This was very successful, as can be judged from its reissue in two later editions (in 1899 and 1905). M.V. Sobolev, a noted bibliographer of children's literature, praises the book, finding that it contains ample information
about local history and daily life and is well written. But at the same
time, he makes one criticism which sheds light on the evolution of
public opinion. Whereas the reviewer in Notes of the Fatherland had
cited the natives' attack on Thomley's cabin as "one of the most terrible
scenes in his life in the colonies", Sobolev considers that, in her adaption
of the text, Arkhangel'skaya might first have "given some thought to the
question: are the Europeans right in taking the land away from the
original inhabitants?"

Around the turn of the century, we notice some increase in the
number of literary publications relating to Australia, a fact which attests
both to the awakening of Australian literary life and to a growing interest
in the "Fifth Continent" in Russian society at large. Books and articles
of various kinds - geographic, historical, ethnographic, socio-economic -
written by Russian authors or published in Russian translation, appear
with increasing frequency. Of special interest to us are the translations of
Mrs K. Langloh-Parker's collection Australian Legendary Tales (1903)
and Fifty Years in the Making of Australian History (1894), the
memoirs of the New South Wales parliamentarian and premier Sir Henry
Parkes, who in his youth at least had some connection with literature and
literary circles. Nor should we forget the remarkable expeditions of
Mikloukho-Maclay to New Guinea and to Australia, where he married
and lived and worked for several years. The echo of his scientific
achievements resounded throughout Russia, and incidentally inspired the
historian and geographer A.L. Yashchenko to embark on his journey to
Australia in 1903 and compile some graphic travel sketches which were
published only fifty or so years afterwards.

The appeal of the exotic and distant continent for the Russian
imagination at this time can be judged from Ivan Bunin's autobiogra­
phical novel The Life of Arsenyev, where it is "the world of oceans
and tropics" which, after Don Quixote and medieval casUes, entrances the
young man growing up in Orel province in the heart of Russia: "the
pictures in Robinson Crusoe and The Universal Traveller, and also a
large, yellowing map of the world, with the vast empty spaces of the
south seas and the tiny dots of the Polynesian islands captivated me for
the rest of my life."

Anton Chekhov was amazed by writers who languished in the confines of the capital city and for years on end saw
from the windows of their St Petersburg studies "nothing but the blank
fireproof wall next door"; Aleksandr Kuprin in his reminiscences recalls
how he would tell them: "I don't understand why you, a healthy young
man with no commitments, don't take yourself off to Australia, say
(Australia for some reason was his favourite part of the globe) or to
Siberia." Australian motifs reverberate too in the poetry of Russian
symbolism, in the verse of Konstantin Bal'mont and Valery Bryusov.

Among the many novels translated into Russian during these years we find the works of Marcus Clarke, Tasma and Rosa Campbell Praed, the forerunners of a national Australian literature. Both of the women writers referred to, whatever their individual differences, remained within the framework of the Victorian "romance", the novel of romantic intrigue set against the background of domestic life, with a strong element of romantic interest and, more often than not, a happy ending; yet their works are not without some interesting features of Australian reality and not devoid of lively characterisation. Four of Tasma's six novels were published in *The Russian Messenger* ([Russkiy Vestnik]) between 1890 and 1894, including her best work, *Uncle Piper of Piper's Hill*, as well as *In Her Early Youth, The Penance of Portia James* and *A Knight of the White Feather*. (The Russian titles are respectively *Uncle, In Youth, Mary James* and *The White Feather.*) The prolific Campbell Praed was less fortunate; during the late eighties there appeared in the Russian periodic press her *Zero: a story of Monte Carlo* (in the *Citizen*) and two works written by her in collaboration with Justin McCarthy - *The Right Honourable* and *The Ladies' Gallery* (both in *The Northern Messenger* [Severnyy vestnik]). Marcus Clarke's *For the Term of his Natural Life* (1870-72), one of the most important works of Australian literature of the colonial period, appeared in book form in 1903, under the title *English Penal Servitude.* This novel of adventure, mystery and melodrama, betraying the influence of Dickens as well as of Dumas and Victor Hugo, was published as part of a series of historical novels under the editorship of A. Trachevsky, a prominent liberal historian. He provided notes and an introduction, while the foreword was written by the translator, the lawyer P.I. Lyublinsky. The moral and legal aspects of the story, and its "message" of social criticism, were what received most attention. (Clarke's novel has since been published in a new Russian translation in 1986.)

In Russian Australiana before 1917 we find some reflection of the first flourishing of the Australian short story, the leading genre of the new national realist school that came into being in the last years of the nineteenth century. Two small collections were published in Russian in 1910 and 1912, while the great Ukrainian writer Ivan Franko was responsible for a selection published in Ukrainian, and individual items appeared in various journals. Among the Australian authors whose stories found their way to Russia, albeit in this haphazard way, were Edward Dyson and Steele Rudd, Louis Becke and Henry Fletcher, Albert Dorrington and J.A. Barry. Some of these writers are now all but forgotten, their names to be found, if at all, only in histories of
Australian literature and anthologies, but in their time they enjoyed wide popularity. This is certainly the case with Dorrington, as Katharine Susannah Prichard confirmed to me in a letter of 8 December 1964. Nevertheless, the absence of Henry Lawson may seem inexplicable until we compare the two Russian collections and the Ukrainian edition with the anthology Geschichten aus Australien, compiled in 1909 by the German writer Stefan von Kotze. It is clear that Kotze's volume, from which Franko selected stories for translation, was also the source for the Russian collections - two slim volumes, both entitled Australian Stories and translated, and we must assume selected, by R.M. Markovich. (Further corroboration of this conclusion is the appearance in 1909 of translations of two of Kotze's own novels, both set in Australia; the fact that Markovich did most of her translations from French and German; and the incorrect attribution to Kotze of a short story by Edward Dyson in the journal The Universe.)

It is possible that Ivan Franko's tendency to underestimate Lawson in his remarks on the Australian short story springs from the inadequacies of the German translation. Kotze, who in his collection did include "The Drover's Wife", complained about the difficulties of Australian English (the title page of his book reads: "Collected and revised by . . . "). In all fairness, we should point out that, for the most part, pre-revolutionary translations were done directly from the language of the original.

There are other interesting titles among these early translations from Australian or Anglo-Australian authors. John Lang's story "Remarkable Convicts" appeared in the Compendium of Foreign Novels, Stories and Tales for 1859, the same year that Lang, the first Australian-born writer of fiction, published in London his Botany Bay, or True Stories of Early Australia. In 1889, the novel The Mystery of a Hansom Cab by Fergus Hume, one of the pioneers of detective fiction, was published in Moscow. Russian readers became aware too of two popular Australian works for young people - Ethel Turner's Seven Little Australians (1894) (in Russian adaptation Young Australians, 1904) and Edward Dyson's The Gold Stealers, 1901 (in Russian translation Who Stole the Gold?, 1906, and On the Goldfields, 1907).

It may be that the further efforts of bibliographers and literary historians will unearth further translations of Australian literature in pre-revolutionary Russia, but the corpus that has now been established is sufficient to permit us to attempt some conclusions.

The early editions of Australian literature reflected the natural interest of Russian society in the great, distant continent and in the social and historical evolution of a British colonial settlement developing into nationhood. Throughout the nineteenth, and in the early years of the
twentieth centuries, we find translations of a number of works of some significance for Australian literature, and at all events attracting the attention of the press of the time (e.g. the memoirs of Barrington and the novels of Rowcroft, Tasma and Marcus Clarke). Australian novels and stories were published in Russian periodicals and reviews of many ideological persuasions and differing aesthetic positions - in the *Contemporary*, the champion of democratic ideas and realist art, in conservative organs like the *Russian Messenger* and *The Citizen* (Grazhdanin), and in the *Northern Messenger*, which during the eighties was known for its progressive views. But all these were journals playing an active role in the literary process, and it was in them that many of the great Russian classics - the works of Turgenev, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and Chekhov - appeared for the first time.

As a rule, information about Australian literature came from more accessible British sources, or from yet more accessible and more familiar French or German ones, rather than from Australian sources. Accordingly - as we have seen - the translations were made from European editions (for example, the Heinemann Continental Library), a fact which restricted the choice of works. But at that time the publication of Australian literature in Australia itself took place only on a modest scale.

The picture of Australian literature which emerges from these early translations is of course by no means a full one: Rolf Boldrewood, Henry Lawson, Joseph Furphy, nineteenth-century romantic poetry, the ballad-writers and much else remained beyond its scope. And of course, Australian literature was not immediately perceived as an original artistic phenomenon: even from the changes made to titles, we can conclude that it was the factual and informative aspect of these works that was of most interest, especially in works of the colonial period. The reader was finding out about this unknown land with its unique and extraordinary landscape and wildlife, about the life-style of its inhabitants. But one should not belittle what was achieved, particularly in view of the remoteness of Australia, the difficulties of travel, the scarcity of information and the non-existent or rudimentary official relations that obtained between Russia and Australia during the colonial and post-colonial periods.

We should therefore give full credit to those critics who first saw in the early stirrings of Australian literature some signs of an independent artistic phenomenon. In 1896 Vsevolod Cheshikhin in a short article in one of the journals not only took note of the upsurge in national Australian poetry and the presence of "outstanding talents" among Australian poets (he included also New Zealanders, no doubt under the
impression that Australasia was a single geographic entity), but also reproached the English critics who had so unjustly passed the Australians by in silence and even regarded their work with a hint of disdain.

In another, much more detailed article by "Dioneo" (I.V. Shklovsky) on "the literature of the young democracies", which appeared in the first decade of the new century, we find appreciations of the work of Adam Lindsay Gordon and Victor Daley, and of the fiction of Henry Kingsley, Marcus Clarke, Rolf Boldrewood, Tasma, Rosa Campbell Praed and other writers. Dioneo, writing in the spirit of democratic populism, seeks in the Australian novel a reflection of Australian history; and while he makes no mention of Furphy, one senses in his comments on Kingsley's idealised squatters a solidarity with the author of *Such is Life*.

One further sign of the recognition of this new literature was a critical sketch in the illustrated journal *Seven Days* in 1911. Australia according to this author, "has grown into an independent country", developing its own national character, its distinctive social institutions and its own literature. True, this has not yet managed to acquire "its own language", it has no "great novel" and no drama of interest, but the songs and prose sketches that exist in abundance are extremely interesting: they "smell of the land and the lush grass, of the fresh air and the forest, of the sea brine." In these "infant features" the critic claims to discern "the handsome face of the grown man of the future". As for "the faint aroma of Decadent beauty" he detects, it is hard to agree with his assertion that this is a "frequent" element; there is little enough trace of it in the ballads and stories of the bush.  

A good starting-place for a survey of Soviet-Australian literary relations is perhaps the little-known, though not entirely forgotten name of Robert Brady an Australian who fought in the First World War and was a member of the expeditionary force which landed at Archangel in 1918 to give assistance to the White armies. His poetry expresses solidarity with the people of revolutionary Russia and calls on his comrades-in-arms to abandon their shameful role in the Intervention. However, the first Australian authors to become familiar to Soviet readers were Henry Lawson and Katharine Susannah Prichard. Naturally enough, the Revolution singled out from the whole spectrum of world literature those works that were close to it in thought and feeling, that affirmed the notion of the fundamental transformation of society in the interests of humanity. It is therefore significant that the first work of Australian literature translated in the Soviet Union after the Revolution was *Working Bullocks* by K.S. Prichard, an artist of great subtlety who was at the same time one of the leading figures of the Australian Communist
Working Bullocks is an innovative work for Australian literature in that it depicts life with an understanding of revolutionary ideas and with a sense of the indomitable strength that lies concealed in ordinary Australian men and women, the children of the people.

Prichard's visit to the Soviet Union in 1933 had great significance for the further development of Soviet-Australian literary relations. She travelled the whole country, meeting workers, peasants, engineers, doctors and, of course, writers. Back in Australia, she published her travel sketch The Real Russia (1934), and also became permanent correspondent of the journal International Literature [Mezhdu­narodnaya literatura], published in Moscow between 1933 and 1943 in English, French, German and Spanish. The central organ of the International Association of Revolutionary Writers, this was indeed an international forum: progressive writers from all over the world combined forces to try to halt the advance of Fascism and avert the holocaust of another world war. Johannes Becher, Thomas and Heinrich Mann, Bertolt Brecht, Rafael Alberti, Julius Fucik, Michael Gold, Ralph Fox, John Cornford and many others all published in its columns. Critical articles and news items surveyed literary life in various countries, and Prichard was a window on Australia. Her article on Bernard O'Dowd presents a portrait of the utopian socialist, the champion of "poetry militant" and author of the famous manifesto which was enthusiastically received at a meeting of the Australian Literature Society in 1909. In an essay entitled "Antifascist Literature in Australia", Prichard discussed Jean Devanny's working-class novel Sugar Heaven, Alan Marshall's The Factory, published many years later under the title How Beautiful are Thy Feet, Brian Penton's historical chronicles and Xavier Herbert's monumental Capricornia. These works, rooted in Australian reality, might seem to have little direct connection with the struggle that absorbed the writers of France, Germany or Czechoslovakia at that time, yet in its attack on racism, rampant exploitation and "the right of might", Australian literature became part of that movement in world literature opposed to the bloody dictatorship of Fascism. And Jean Devanny's Sugar Heaven, with its portraits of Italian immigrant workers, was unequivocal in its attitude to Fascism, seeing in its representatives the storm troops of world reaction.

During the darkest days of the war, Australian writers expressed in the pages of International Literature their sense of unity with the Soviet people. In a letter to the editor dated 4 August 1941, Prichard wrote: "I remain firm in the belief that the Soviet people will vanquish and destroy Nazism." And in November of that same year - a particularly hard one for us - there arrived the manuscript of Bartlett Adamson's poem "This
Monster of Fascism”:

But man was born to freedom. Progress leaps
Vibrant along his blood. Hope knows no death.
Reason fights on where even the foulest breath
Of Fascist evil creeps.\textsuperscript{25}

Witnessing the struggle and the sufferings of the Soviet people, artists of all kinds, from all over the world, whose works were inspired above all by the values of humanism, felt more keenly than ever before the bond that united them all. It is therefore perhaps symbolic that the influx of Australian writers into Russia after the war was led by Henry Lawson, the bard of good fellowship and mateship.

The slim and modest volume which appeared in the last year of the war was called \textit{Send Round the Hat}, a title which in itself explains its immediate popularity. In 1954 there was a second, enlarged edition, and in 1956 some new translations from Lawson were published in \textit{Australian Short Stories}. Altogether, about one hundred of his prose works have been translated into Russian, the fullest collection being the \textit{Stories} of 1961. Fifty of Lawson's poems were included in his \textit{Selected Verse} (1959), with translations by Mikhail Kudinov and Nikita Razgorov. The dust-cover features a flaming torch, an emblem of the revolutionary vision and struggle, and of the ardent spirit embodied in such fine examples of proletarian lyric poetry as “Faces in the Street”, “My Army O My Army”, “One Hundred and Three”, “Second Class Wait Here”, “Shearer's Song”, “Too Old to Rat” and “Mayday in Europe”. Lawson appears in his other guise too, as the poet of the Australian bush, the author of “Reedy River”, “Outback” and many other poems. The Soviet music publishing house has produced an album of sheet-music, \textit{Australian Songs to Words by Henry Lawson} (1961), and in the archives of Moscow Radio there is probably still a recording of “Andy's Gone with Cattle” sung by the children's choir of the Isaak Dunayevsky Music School in Moscow.

Lawson and Prichard are both represented in the Australian volume\textsuperscript{26} in the unique 200-volume series \textit{The Library of International Literature}, published from the 1950s to the 1970s by State Literary Publishers in Moscow. It is worth noting that the choice of the editors coincides with the views of such Australian authorities as Henry Green, who in his standard \textit{History of Australian Literature} (1961) states that, despite all the changes in society and literature, Lawson remains the most Australian of writers and poets; and Walter Murdoch, who called Prichard
the Member for Australia in the Parliament of World Literature.

For many Soviet readers, it was Prichard who, quite as much as Lawson, put Australia on the literary map. When the documentary film "Faraway Australia" was showing in our cinemas, and the camera came to rest on the slender, grey-haired woman with resolute features and hazel eyes, there was invariably a murmur of recognition from the audience. In Russian alone, the gold-field trilogy has been published four times (first in 1949-53, most recently in 1982-86). The relationship between publishers and the reading public in the Soviet Union is not limited to the commercial law of supply and demand; readers send in a constant stream of letters full of praise, criticism, suggestions and wishes. When in 1983 Pravda Publishers issued *The Roaring Nineties*, they were inundated with requests for a new edition of the other volumes of the trilogy as well. *Working Bullocks, Coonardoo, Subtle Flame*, the autobiographical *Child of the Hurricane*, the short stories - all these have become the property of the Soviet reader. After the writer's death, the journal *Foreign Literature* [*Inostrannaya literatura*] (founded in 1955, and successor to *International Literature*) published Prichard's story of childhood, "The Wild Oats of Han", 27 and there are plans to publish others of her works.

In the second half of this century, against the background of a sustained expansion in international and intercultural links generally, the Soviet-Australian literary connection has become a constant factor in literary life. Translations of works by Australian authors are no longer isolated events, and their number increases with every year. The discovery of Australian literature - including both contemporary writers and the works of past generations - continues apace.

A number of compendium volumes now exists. The short story, the genre that has played the decisive role in shaping the national Australian literary tradition, has provided material for five collections, four in Russian and one in English: *Forty Australian Novellas* (1957), *Australian Short Stories* (1958, in English: 1975) and *The Modern Australian Novella* (1980). Altogether, these give a reasonably comprehensive picture of the short story writers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, from John Lang, Marcus Clarke, Steele Rudd, Price Warung and Louis Becke to John Morrison, Judah Waten, Patrick White, Hal Porter, Elizabeth Jolley and young contemporary writers.

Similar in scope and comprehensiveness is the anthology *The Poetry of Australia* (1967) from folk ballads to Henry Kendall, Adam Lindsay Gordon, Barcroft Boake and Banjo Patterson to Christopher Brennan, John Shaw Nielson and Mary Gilmore to John Manifold,
Chris Wallace-Crabbe, Rodney Hall and Thomas Shapcott. The collection *From Modern Australian Poetry* (1972) features selections from the works of four poets - R.D. FitzGerald, Ian Mudie, Judith Wright and David Campbell.

The "arrival" in the 1960s of Aboriginal writers did not go unnoticed either. Even before Kath Walker's first collection, *We are going* (1964), was published in Australia, several of her poems had appeared in the Soviet press, while the Russian artist Leonid Vladimirsy had painted her portrait during a visit to Australia. The first novel by an Aboriginal, Colin Johnson's *Wild Cat Falling*, was included in *New Stories from The South Seas* (1980), a collection of prose by native writers from Australasia and the Pacific. An article entitled "The Aborigine Speaks" (1983) examined the poetry of Kath Walker, Jack Davis, Kevin Gilbert and Gerald Bostock, as well as Johnson's novels - all works in which black Australians have expressed their desire for freedom and their claims on society. The article stresses the importance of the problem of cultural and historical survival common to all native peoples of the South Pacific area.

The past four decades have seen the translation of dozens of works by Australian authors, and there have been separate editions in book forms of the writings of Vance Palmer, Alan Marshall, John Morrison, Patrick White, Judah Waten, Jean Devanny, Dymphna Cusack, Bert Vickers, Ralph de Boissiere, Robert Close, Mona Brand, Ray Lawler, Donald Crick, Mena Calthorpe, Betty Collins, D'Arcy Niland and others. In addition, like other foreign authors, Australian writers are also translated into the other languages of the USSR. Lawson's stories can be read in Georgian, Azerbaidjani and Ukrainian, Prichard's *Child of the Hurricane* in Belorussian, Alan Marshall's *I Can Jump Puddles* in Lithuanian. And Donald Stuart's story *Ilbarana* has so far appeared only in Ukrainian, in the collection *The Contemporary Australian Story*, published in Kiev. Another Kiev publication, the journal *The World Wide*, is devoted to foreign literature, but usually selects for translation works that are not already available in Russian - e.g. Neville Shute's *Requiem for a Wren*, Noel Philipson's *As Other Men* and Trish Sheppard's *Children of Blindness*.

Australian authors are also published in English in the USSR, in editions intended for those who speak or study English, primarily university students. These contain linguistic commentaries which give help with idiomatic expressions and other vocabulary problems. *Australian Short Stories*, edited by Lyudmila Kasatkina, Katharine Prichard's *Coonardoo* and *The Roaring Nineties* and Dymphna Cusack's *Say No to Death* have all appeared in this form. Then there is the
special category of English-language editions adapted for students at various levels, intended principally for schoolchildren or first-year undergraduates. The stories of Henry Lawson and Alan Marshall have been adapted in this way to help students cope with the vagaries of Australian English - a subject to which, incidentally, Soviet linguists have devoted almost one hundred specialist studies, mainly articles.

Our survey would not be complete without some mention of the huge area of children's literature. Various publishing houses specialise in this field, among them the Moscow-based Children's Literature /Detskaya Literatura/, which has published Alan Marshall's *I Can Jump Puddles*, as well as works written expressly for children - Ivan Southall's stories "Ash Road", "What About Tomorrow?" and "Matt and Jo", Nan Chauncy's "Tiger in the Bush", Leslie Rees' "Korrowingi the Emu" and Two-thumb the Koala, Shy the Platypus and Others", and "The Storm-boy" (the Australian film of the same name based on this story was awarded a gold medal at the tenth Moscow International Film Festival in 1977).

It is impossible to list all the works by Australian writers which have become "naturalised" in the Soviet Union, and in any case there is no need to do so. Instead, in concluding this overview of Russian literary Australiana, I would like to look in greater detail at some of the authors who have come to occupy a special place for the Soviet reader.

Vance Palmer's "The Silver Oak", published in Russian not long before the writer's death in 1958, immediately won the praise of those who value the art of the short story. *The Swayne Family* has also been translated into Russian and Ukrainian, and in 1985, to mark the hundredth anniversary of Palmer's birth, *Foreign Literature* published his "Chekhov and the English-Speaking World" - an echo of another occasion, when the fiftieth anniversary of Chekhov's death was commemorated at Melbourne University.

Alan Marshall's *I Can Jump Puddles*, the most universally admired work of this remarkable man, is still read with undiminished interest in the Soviet Union as in Australia, by children and adults alike. It was indeed in our country that all three parts of Marshall's autobiographical trilogy were first brought together under the one roof, so to speak, in 1969. This unique *Bildungsroman* records the formation of a writer who has grasped the simple and eternal truth about the relationship between the artist and life, society and the people around him. The showing on Soviet television during the summer of 1985 of the Australian TV series based on the trilogy and on *How Beautiful Are Thy Feet* was warmly received by critics and viewers. "A wonderful sense of empathy which increased with each episode was the worthwhile
result of nine evenings' viewing," wrote Pravda; while the television critic of the Literary Gazette stressed "the affirmation of the self-sufficiency, independence and healing power of the human spirit," and with it the value of courage. "The hero survives, wins through, overcomes in himself what might be assumed to be the inevitable feelings of disadvantage and isolation, not to become the same as other people, but remain himself."

Marshall's sketches of the Aborigines of Arnhem Land and Torres Strait Islanders, These Are My People, together with his versions of Aboriginal myths and folktales, were published in co-operation with consultant ethnographers. Professor G.A. Tokarev, a recognised authority in the field, wrote the afterword for the collection People of the Dreamtime, a beautifully designed volume, with engravings by the Australian artist Lesbia Thorpe, which was recognised as one of the best-produced Soviet books in 1958. The legends were republished by Children's Literature Publishers in 1985, in their series "The International Library of Children's Literature". Marshall's prose derives its special character from his perception of the everyday miracle of existence; the world is reflected in the wide-open eyes of a child, but the reflection is corrected by the penetrating gaze of an adult, and concrete details acquire a symbolic significance which gives the story of some minor incident a general social and psychological relevance. As the years passed, Marshall's laconic style grew more deliberate and precise; and the publication of his selected works in the series "Foreign Masters of Prose" was a recognition of his achievement as an artist, and not simply as a man of great personal courage who led a remarkable life. Yuriy Nagibin, himself a great master of Russian prose, was struck by "the serene, entirely unselconscious, profound and pure tone" of Marshall's prose, and saw in the author himself "a wise student of life, who is not afraid to look into the dark corners of the human psyche or the depths of human suffering, who is not afraid to speak of what is depressing and degrading in man, but in such a way that the reader feels not pity, not impotent and enervating sympathy, but an ever-growing respect for the boundless might of the human spirit." In Marshall's work one recognises those features that invariably characterise the national democratic tradition in literature - the inner unity of the artist and his national origins, a steady, unflinching gaze, and the ability to transform everyday reality, to reveal the significance of what seems ordinary and banal, without offending against the truth.

Judah Waten is known in the Soviet Union for his works dealing with Australia's ethnic minorities (Jews, Italians, Aborigines and others) in which xenophobia, narrow-minded nationalism, prejudice and conflict
are portrayed as part of a blind, dark, destructive force. A writer with a spare, "objective", Flaubertian manner, Waten can achieve great dramatic intensity, as in his masterly short story "The Knife", describing the death of a young Italian working in a Melbourne cafe.

But there is more to Waten's work than the "immigrant theme". He has written of himself as someone for whom politics - in particular, the working-class movement - and literature have become inseparably intertwined. "I believe that throughout the world a great deal of social progress has been achieved, and that a lot more will be achieved, despite temporary setbacks and crises. When I was a young man, I used to admire the optimism and revolutionary enthusiasm of Shelley; I still do." For this reason he has always been concerned as an artist with man's sense of history, of being part of it. We find this in his novel *Time of Conflict*, in which an ordinary young man carried along by the stream is transformed into one who determines his own direction and destination; and also in the largely autobiographical *Scenes from Revolutionary Life* (where, however, the hero is not to be identified with the author).

*Shares in Murder* has been published in the USSR twice, and in 1985 a television adaptation by E. Volodarsky was screened on Soviet television (produced by V. Uskov and V. Krasnopolsky). It was chosen not simply as a good detective yarn, but for the quality of its realism, its social themes and the sureness of its characterisation.

In *The Ticket and Other Stories* John Morrison won many Soviet admirers as an artist acutely aware of the dramatic tensions on and below the surface of life, who frequently confronts his characters with a moral choice in which some course of action, sanctioned by conventional standards of behaviour, is ruled out of order by the invisible judge of conscience. Morrison's portrayal of the Australian waterfront and its workers is unsurpassed; his dockers are akin to Lawson's trade-unionist heroes, with their principles of working-class solidarity and spirit of "send round the hat".

Katharine Prichard praised her younger contemporary, Dymphna Cusack, for her ability "to take up themes of great social import, issues of vital general interest that need to be articulated and thought about." A critical reader will not fail to notice the repetition of the same situations and characters in her novels, the simplistic construction of her plots and the element of sentimentality. But her works differ markedly from the "love story" to which they owe so much in their attempt to link the "little world" of the women characters to the world at large, to find a point of contact between personal dramas and social conflict, and in their call for an active struggle with evil in all its forms. There is no mistaking where Cusack stands, whether she is writing about the re-
surge of Fascism and militarism, the threat of nuclear war, racism, the bloody consequences of imperialist adventurism, or about the egotistic philosophy of “success” and the pursuit of wealth, the re-placement of human values by the commercial principle. Her best book, *Say No to Death*, evokes indignation as well as sympathy: for the first to die are the have-nots, the weak, the helpless. As the Soviet poet Yuliya Drunina observed in her review of the novel, “... the social tragedy gives depth and significance to an otherwise not altogether original love story, while the love experienced by the heroine is so vividly described that it colours the whole narrative, endowing it with lyricism and poignancy.”35 The element of social commitment helps account for the impact of Cusack’s novels here during the 1960s, when she was one of the first Australian writers to become widely known. *Heatwave in Berlin* was adapted for the stage by Irina Golovnya (who also translated it), and the play has been performed. Cusack’s second anti-fascist novel, *The Sun is Not Enough*, was published in the mass-circulation literary journal *The Novel Newspaper* with a readership numbered in millions.

Patrick White’s *The Tree of Man* was published twice in the USSR in the 1970s, in the series “Foreign Masters of Prose”, in a translation by Natalya Treneva. It introduced readers to a novelist with an international reputation, an artist with a philosophic cast of mind, subtly perceptive of the unexpressed depths of the human soul, an ironic critic of philistine soullessness. This vast canvas was supplemented by a number of shorter narrative works, close to novellas in their size and scope: *Down at the Dump* (N. Volzhina, trans.), the finest of White’s short stories, “The Cockatoos” (R. Oblonskaya, trans.) and “A Woman’s Hand”, translated into Ukrainian by N. Borovik. Stories from the collections *The Cockatoos* and *The Burnt Ones* were brought together in a separate issue of *The Foreign Literature Library*.

It is well known that White’s work has provoked considerable controversy in Australia, not least because of the aesthetic stance proclaimed in his autobiographical essay “The Prodigal Son” (1958), where he emphatically dissociated himself from what he saw as the dominant trend of Australian literature, “the dreary, dun-coloured offspring of journalistic realism.” Soviet critics and reviewers have sought to interpret the problems of White’s *Weltanschauung*, his tortuous quest for spiritual purification and a higher state of grace, and to analyse the physiological aspects of his prose, a reminder of the vulnerability and certain doom of “material” man, and its pathological motifs, a peculiar affirmation of the individual’s right to be “different”, a challenge to the “normal” existence of the vulgar philistine. Vladimir Skodorenko’s introduction to *The Tree of Man* takes issue with the notion that White
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can be labelled a modernist. "The fact that the aesthetical ideal coincides with the ethical ideal in White's work is the fundamental reason why it is to be distinguished from the whole tendency of modernism in literature; the hallmark of modernism is its exclusion of moral considerations from the concept of Beauty" so runs his argument. White's work is indeed not free of modernist tendencies, but it is not they which determine its "essence and artistic significance."

What can be said of the translators of Australian literature? Naturally, the pioneers were people trained in English language and literature who already had considerable experience in translating the works of British and American authors into Russian. Yet Australian literature presented them with new problems and specific difficulties - differences of history, everyday realia, mental outlook and, finally, of language. Russian is a language of infinite resources, yet is it possible to translate in a single word such Australiana as bush, outback, or swagman? And what word should it be? Perhaps the first solutions to such problems were not always successful or definitive; but the general standard of translations improved from year to year, reflecting not only the developing skill of individual translators, but also a widespread growth of interest in the country itself, its present and its past, and an increased understanding of the finer points of Australian English.

Among the translators of Australian literature are such masters of their craft as Natalya Volzhina and Natalya Treneva (the translators of Patrick White), Rita Rayt-Kovaleva (editor of Lawson's collected stories), Mariya Lorie, Raisa Oblonskaya and Nora Gal (whose translation of Donald Stuart's "Condamine Bell" is as fine as the story itself). Among the translators of Australian poetry, we should mention Mikhail Zenkevich, Vilhelm Levik, Mikhail Kudinov (Lawson's verse) and Andrei Sergeyev (the poems of Mary Gilmore, Kenneth Slessor and Judith Wright). A special place belongs to those enthusiasts who devoted so much of their working lives to Australian literature and became its staunch champions, rejoicing at each new advance which brought it more and more within the reach of Soviet readers such as Oksana Krugerskaya, Irina Arkhangel'skaya, Irina Golovnya and Galina Usova, herself a poet.

The study of Australian literature and culture in the USSR dates from the 1950s, at the same time as Australian academics first began seriously and systematically to take stock of their country's literary tradition. During the sixties, special courses in Australian literature were given at the University of Moscow (by L.M. Kasatkina and A.S. Petrikovskaya) and the University of Kiev (by A.S. Petrikovskaya). It was in these
senior academic institutions that the first research in the field was undertaken - undergraduate dissertations and postgraduate theses. At the same time, an Australian component was introduced into the foreign literature teaching and research programs of the Krupskaya Moscow Regional Teachers' College and the Maurice Thorez Institute of Foreign Languages in Moscow, under the supervision (respectively) of E.Ya. Dombrovskaya and Irina Golovnya. 

Since then, the study of Australian literature has expanded significantly, both in volume and in terms of geography. Younger academics in Moscow, Kiev, Tbilisi, Donetsk and Novosibirsk are now active in the field, and the Pacific Studies section of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences provides the lead in co-ordinating their efforts, with its annual conferences on Australia and the Pacific which attract participants from all over the country. Research interests are centred for the most part on the "classics" of Australian literature, on literary realism, on specific aspects of the literary process, its genesis and typology. The first monographs, theses and books, by Kasatkina, Petrikovskaya, Kotlyarova, Andreyeva and Zernetskaya, as well as a collection of essays *Australian Literature* (Moscow, 1978) bear impressive witness to the range of topics covered.

The serious study of Australian literature in the USSR began with the works of Katharine Susannah Prichard. The first postgraduate thesis in the field, submitted by Lyudmila Kasatkina (later Senior Lecturer at Moscow University), was devoted to this subject. Kasatkina and the others who have followed her in writing on Prichard (B.A. Chaban, A.S. Petrikovskaya, O.V. Zernetskaya and others) regard the writer as the pioneer of socialist realism in Australian literature, striving for a synthesis of the personal and social elements in art, for the depiction of humanity in its relations with nature and society, in the whole range of human contacts and experiences. Continuing the nineteenth-century realist tradition, Prichard's work is also seen to display certain innovative features deriving from the socialist ideas she believed in and sought to express. Inspired by the idea of revolutionary development, she discerned in the world around her signs of future, though not imminent, changes. 

The trilogy - *The Roaring Nineties, Golden Miles* and *Winged Seeds* - is viewed as the crown of Prichard's achievement, in which the innovative features of her art stand out in bold relief. Against the vast back-cloth of Australian life at the turn of the century are depicted dozens of characters, people of different professions, different backgrounds and opinions, their lives bound up with social changes, their search for personal happiness linked with the struggle for freedom, with the laws of history. Prichard chose the genre of the family chronicle, the social
"saga" which had already produced in the twentieth century such masterpieces as Galsworthy's *The Forsyte Saga*, Thomas Mann's *Buddenbrooks*, Maria Dabrowska's *Noci i Dnie* and the novels of Sigrid Undset. The "saga novel" became a common phenomenon in Australian literature in the thirties, perhaps as a way of taking stock of the nation's progress to date. But Prichard's trilogy was written at a time when a tendency towards "epic" narrative forms with many levels and story-lines had asserted itself in world literature as a response to the need to assess the complex experience of the twentieth century, an epoch of great social upheaval and political turmoil - the general crisis of capitalism, the collapse of colonial empires, world war, the emergence of socialist states, the rise of Fascism. Prichard's Sally Gough, in committing herself to a wider range of responsibilities, belongs in typological terms among the ranks of those women characters who refuse to be reconciled to the evil that exists in the world, and whose maternal feelings develop into a recognition of their wider duty to society - in the tradition of Nilovna in Gorky's *The Mother* or Annette Rivière in Romain Rolland's *L'Âme enchantée*.

Soviet scholars have recognised Prichard's boldness in addressing social themes, the graphic qualities of her writing, the emotional power of her best scenes, her all-pervading love for Australia and the unique character of her artistic world, dominated as it is by a strong, eternally youthful feminine nature. Of course, the writer was not equally successful in everything; the synthesis between the historical, the socio-political and the personal is not always an organic one, and from time to time the first two of these planes find their expression in publicism and propaganda. Despite the perhaps inevitable price to be paid for her audacious concept - to keep abreast of time itself, perceive the direction in which it is moving, catch what is essential in all its mass of positive and negative impulses and elements - the writer's artistic search was by and large successful. An increased historicism, the interpretation of contemporary reality as living history, the embodiment of the idea of humanity's continuing struggle for social justice - these are the qualities which enable us to number Prichard's trilogy among the best of the "panoramic" novels by such progressive writers of the forties and fifties as Louis Aragon, Marie Pujmanova, Jaroslaw Iwaszkiewicz, Jorge Amado, Dimitr Dimov and others.

A.S. Petrikovskaya's *Henry Lawson and the Origins of the Australian Short Story* (1972) was the first monograph on Australian literature to be published in the USSR. For that reason, it devoted considerable attention to the history of Australian literature in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and contains a brief survey of literary
developments before Lawson and during his lifetime, from the first poems and biographies of convict days to the crystallisation of a national literature in the works of the "Bulletin school".

In its analysis of Lawson's short stories, this study takes issue with the crude distinction often made between Lawson's poetry - "propagandistic", "rhetorical" and ephemeral - and his "apolitical" and "objective" prose, drawing attention to the specific differences between the two genres and to the influence of the underlying aesthetic traditions. Thus, while the theme of the "battler" in Lawson's poems relates to the established tradition of "the song of the struggle" in both British and Australian literature in the late nineteenth century, his stories show the influence of American and English critical realism, of Bret Harte and, more markedly, of Dickens - in their choice of subject, in the moral values they express, in their juxtaposition of social opposites, in their blend of humour and pathos, in the penchant for ironic periphrasis and grotesque exaggeration for satirical ends. But Lawson's poetry and prose both share a common hero and a common basis - the social and political reality of the "roaring nineties".

"Mateship" is seen as the cornerstone of Lawson's perception and view of the world. The sources of this dominant theme in his work are to be sought in a combination of the ethical principles of socialism and the peculiarities of the national psychology and ethos, developed by history and rooted in the conditions of rural life at a particular period (and here the author's view agrees with that of Vance Palmer and Arthur Phillips). However, the notion of mateship as myth is rejected: mateship, for Lawson, it is argued, is a yardstick of that humanity that knows no boundaries - racial, national or social. In its concrete historical content, as shown in his best works, mateship is for the most part the mutual cooperation that exists between working men, those who battle against the odds, "the simple heroes of ordinary life."

Lawson was not consistent in his social views. Like many of his contemporaries, he was not free of the influence of an isolationist and chauvinist ideology. And yet, his work is profoundly national in character. The richness of Lawson's stories, their authentic Australian colours and, at the same time, the universality of their themes, were recognised by Edward Garnett already at the beginning of the century. Listening to the original voice of Lawson's narrator - a fusion of the vernacular and polished literary language, with its nuances of gentle humour and cool irony - Soviet scholars were among the first to note how the writer's prose, with its understatement, its economical yet vivid strokes, and the psychological subtext of its dialogue resembles the spare, functional prose of the twentieth century. Moris Mendel'son, the
distinguished Soviet scholar of American literature, in his review of *Send Round the Hat* in 1946, detected a more austere use of colour than in Bret Harte. And in his introduction to this same edition, Evgeny Lann wrote: “Lawson anticipated the poetics of the best Anglo-American short-story writers, and the significance of his art for the history of literature is indisputable, both as art and as an historical fact.”

It is difficult to agree with the Australian scholar W.F. Mandle that Henry Lawson, like Banjo Patterson, “must remain quaint and parochial” to the outside world. What is national in their work is indissolubly fused with what is international in its appeal. Lawson's books are alive with the youth of the country, the spirit of its pioneers, people as the times have made them, with all their human weaknesses and moral strengths, suffering when they fail and dogged in their pursuit of happiness. All this finds a ready response in any country.

The first monograph devoted to Australian poetry was *The Rise of Australian National Poetry: the Ballad Genre*, by Marianna Andreyeva, of the Department of Foreign Literature at Moscow University. This places the ballad in its context as the link between the literature of the colonial period and the new national school. By studying the evolution of the genre - “directly linked to the development of national self-awareness” - from the old Scots ballads to the ballads of the bush, and by analysing (in the works of Adam Lindsay Gordon, Henry Lawson and A.B. Patterson) the literary ballad which took the place of the ballads of folklore, Andreyeva is able to show the interaction of folkloric and literary factors, of tradition and innovation. Tracing both romantic and realist trends - the influence of English Romanticism, with its concept of the individual in solitude and its notion of “otherworldliness”, and the contribution of folklore directly related to life in the bush, the author does not overlook the socio-historic origins of such influences, and the reasons why they found such fertile soil. The ballads of Banjo Patterson, which she considers typologically “pure” examples of the genre, are characterised by both the collective philosophy of Australians, and the romantic idealisation of a hero who embodies the national trait of individualism.

Olga Zemetskaya, an academic based in Kiev, has concentrated her attention on the realist novel of the 1930s. Her monograph, *The Australian Social Novel in the 1930s* (1983), examines the social, historical and aesthetic reasons for the development of the democratic tradition in Australian literature. The author divides the genre into two types (although she is careful to reject any hard-and-fast division): the “saga novel” (Brian Penton, Miles Franklin, Xavier Herbert) and the socio-psychological novel of Australia (Henry Handel Richardson,
Katharine Susannah Prichard, Vance Palmer, Alan Marshall, Christina Stead and Jean Devanny). “By the end of the twenties”, the author writes, “we observe a marked tendency in Australian literature to interpret the fate of the individual, determined as it is by social factors, during those years when the country was still being discovered and settled.” This tendency, which becomes particularly pronounced in the thirties, is seen as the result of a desire “to find answers to the vital questions writers found were posed by the contemporary social reality around them.” One interesting suggestion is that the “belated” development of the social novel in Australia, which came into its own only after the genre had achieved its greatest success in the literatures of Europe and America, intensified the degree of its “interaction” with other national novelistic traditions. At the same time, of course, the prime source still remains Australian reality, and the formative principle the literary traditions that had already come into being. Characterising the different creative manner and style of the best novelists of the thirties, Zernetskaya stresses what they have in common, that imprint of the times that leads us to view this literary grouping as a distinct artistic phenomenon.

The same author, in her book *Vance Palmer and the Australian Novel* (1984), returns to her theme; the investigation of Palmer’s work begun in the earlier study is here developed into a portrait of Palmer the novelist which embraces all his literary career. In Palmer, the author sees an outstanding master of critical realism, a major international figure, one of those writers who did most for Australian literature and brought it to the attention of the world at large. The book offers a systematic analysis of Palmer’s novels, their generic characteristics and their artistic methods, and at the same time presents a great deal of factual, biographical and historical material not before readily available to Russian readers. Zernetskaya concludes that, during the twenties and the thirties, Palmer “travels the long and difficult journey from his early affirmation of ‘natural man’ and the elevation of nature into a moral absolute, to his realisation of the deficiencies and the utopian nature of this theory... His view of the family as the only refuge from the vicissitudes of life gives way to the idea of the close and mutual interdependence of the life of the family and the social reality that changes people’s lives, confronts them with the necessity of choosing and reconsidering the stance they have adopted in life.” A separate chapter is devoted to the trilogy *Golconda, Seedtime* and *The Big Fellow* as the summit of Palmer’s art. The author rightly stresses how Palmer’s outlook and activity combine a passionate devotion to Australian culture and concern for its well-being with an utter lack of narrow-minded nationalism, an encyclopedic personal culture and a broad perspective on artistic developments.
throughout the world. There is also a great deal of interesting information, culled among other places from the writer's letters, about his special attitude to Russian culture and his contacts with Soviet writers. He met Aleksandr Fadeyev at the World Peace Congress in Helsinki in 1955, and entertained Aleksey Surkov during the latter's visit to Australia. Zemetskaya attributes Palmer's enormous influence on the Australian literary movement to his penetrating exploration of the social environment and his fine understanding and exposition of Australian self-awareness, with all that rich diversity of creative impulses which he himself radiated. Together with Prichard, Palmer is the link between the two phases of Australian realism, from the 1890s to the middle of the twentieth century.

A major landmark in the study of Australian literature in the USSR was the inclusion of chapters devoted to its history in the nine-volume *History of World Literature*, a definitive work of reference produced by the Gorky Institute of World Literature of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The authors of the Australian chapters were Marianna Andreyeva and A.S. Petrikovskaya.

Further evidence of the stature of Australian literature in the USSR is the attention paid to the various anniversaries of major writers. The *Literary Gazette, Foreign Literature*, and *The Literary Ukraine* are among the journals and newspapers that have published articles and translations to mark the centenary of Lawson's birth and the anniversaries of Prichard, Palmer and Alan Marshall. The USSR-Australian Friendship Society (which has a collection of about five million books in over one hundred and thirty languages) arranges exhibitions and literary evenings to commemorate important events in Australian literary history; Marcus Clarke, Mary Gilmore, Dymphna Cusack, K.S. Prichard, R.D. FitzGerald and John Morrison are among the writers whose works have been honoured in this way.

The role of the Library of Foreign Literature extends beyond the organisation of such occasions. It is a centre for bibliographic research, and publishes numerous catalogues and indexes. Australian writers like Lawson, Prichard and Marshall are among the many represented in its published listings, which cover material in the original language as well as in Russian, and incorporate critical and biographical essays.

Another substantial contribution to the study and publication of Australian literature here is made by writers themselves, both Soviet and Australian, and especially those who have visited each other's countries. The very fact of their having made the journey, their accounts, opinions and impressions, all help bridge the gap and further contacts. Over the
past twenty-five years, many of our leading poets, novelists, dramatists
and critics, representing the whole range of our multinational literary life,
have visited Australia - Aleksey Surkov and Boris Ryurikov, Daniil
Granin and Yuriy Nagibin, Aleksey Sofronov and Nikolay Gribachov,
Sergey Narovchatov and Mikhail Lukonin, Samuil Alyoshin, Evgeny
Evtushenko, Andrey Voznesensky, Iosif Noneshivili, Oleg Shestinsky,
Vardges Petrosyan. The echoes of these journeys have assumed many
forms - Aleksey Surkov's free translations of the ballads which so took
his fancy ("Waltzing Matilda", "Lazy Harry's", "Click Go the Shears",
"Reedy River" and others);45 Daniil Granin's thoughtful and sympathetic
tavel sketch *A Month Down Under* (1966); Yuriy Nagibin's pen-portrait
of Alan Marshall, full of that insight one writer can bring to the study
and appreciation of another; and the Australian-inspired poems of Aleksey
Surkov, Galina Usova and Sergey Narovchatov, who on his return from
that country declared he could not remember another journey "so rich in
impressions".46

But we should not forget all the others who have played their part in
the process. There are writers who have never set foot in Australia, but
who have willingly helped to promote Australian literature in the USSR.
Thus, the foreword to Alan Marshall's autobiographical trilogy was
written by Boris Polevoy, whose novel about a wartime amputee (*The
Story of A Real Man*) gave him particular insight into the nature of true
courage. Evgeny Vinokurov, one of the best poets of the wartime genera­
tion, introduced the anthology *From Contemporary Australian Verse* by
insisting on the untranslatability of the poems, of their "spirit" if not their
verse-form, since "all people on the face of the earth, whatever the
differences between them, are somewhere deeply united by their
humanity". "What this collection gives us", he goes on, "cannot be
culled from any scientific textbook. We discover here . . . the inner
psychology of the life of Australia, the spiritual world of her poets, faint
murmurs transformed into a thundering tocsin, shadows pinned down
with amazing graphic accuracy . . . This is the voice of the heart of
Australia, the testimony of the innermost spiritual recesses of her
people."47

In the years after the war, visits by Australian writers to the USSR
became a common occurrence: Alan Marshall, John Morrison, Manning
Clark, Judah Waten, Bert Vickers, Dymphna Cusack, Betty Collins,
Victor and Joan Williams, Geoffrey Dutton, Patsy Adam Smith, David
Williamson, Barbara Jeffries, Thomas Shapcott, Chris Wallace Crabbe
and Olga Masters have all made the journey. Katharine Susannah
Prichard did all she could to promote the publication of Australian
writing here - by personal recommendations in letters and conversations,
by sending books to the Foreign Commission of the USSR Writers' Union. During the sixties, Judah Waten published a series of surveys of new Australian literary developments in the Soviet press. Arthur Phillips, author of *The Australian Tradition*, wrote the foreword to the first post-war collection of Australian short stories, and in it explained how the Australian national character and psychology has, in his opinion, determined the whole tenor of a literature which, if not distinguished by any great degree of intellectual refinement, has still affirmed certain important moral standards in its judgement of mankind. The Soviet reader was thus introduced to Australians as people and invited to enter with them into a relationship of mutual understanding and trust; and that indeed has been the result of our acquaintance with many Australian writers and their books. One remarkable instance of such spiritual unity, of fusion of literary interests with a real concern for the fate of one's own nation and of all the nations of the earth, of a recognition of those aims and aspirations all men hold in common, and of a true "meeting of the minds" between the peoples of distant countries, is the relationship between Alan Marshall and Soviet readers and writers. His books have won him hundreds of thousands of friends in all the Soviet republics, and personal encounters in both Australia and the USSR have left a lasting impression in many hearts. For many years he was president of the Australian-USSR Friendship Society, and on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday in 1977, the Soviet Government awarded him the Order of the Friendship of the Peoples in recognition of his work. Despite his many other commitments, Marshall was punctilious in answering letters from the USSR, and in the last five years of his life maintained a correspondence with the members of the Australian Literature Society of the Novosibirsk District Library, jokingly describing them as his adopted children. Elena Emelyanova, a lecturer in foreign literature who prepared some of Marshall's "Siberian letters" for publication, describes how by studying his stories the members of the Society were able to feel "at home" in Australia and imagine themselves in the bush among Marshall's heroes. For their part, his Novosibirsk friends were no doubt able to introduce the writer to some new aspects of our life and literature; reading the books they sent him, he reflected upon the poetry of Aleksandr Tvardovsky, Mustai Karim and Kaisyn Kuliev, and exchanged his thoughts on Dostoevsky, Gorky and Sholokhov. The correspondence is only one of the many aspects of that part of Marshall's literary and social activity connected with the Soviet Union, and one which, sadly, relates to the end of his life; yet it reminds us too of his early years, and leads us to rejoice that the words addressed by the writer to the Soviet people in 1964 were to
acquire an even firmer basis. "When I flew recently to the Soviet Union on my first visit to your country, I felt as though I were coming home", he wrote to the reader of I Can Jump Puddles. "For many years now I have been meeting people from your country not as a stranger, to whom one nods politely from a distance. I came to you as a friend, certain I would find warmth and understanding. My feelings were yours, my hopes and expectations were yours, my faith in and love for humanity were yours. From the pages of my story I have extended my hand to you, and you have responded with a fervent handshake."48

Marshall once likened his friendship for the Soviet people in its constancy to the Australian redgum, famed for its strength: "No matter how strong the wind, it stands straight and steadfast, it does not fear the rain, it remains intact in the floods, and it shelters all who need the protection of its branches... the longer it lives, the more beautiful it becomes."49

Literature is as universal as life itself: it is its mirror, its projection. One need not be a prophet to foretell that the publication and study of Australian literature in the USSR will in the future develop in scope and in depth. We live in an age of intensive internationalisation in our economic, political and cultural life. The connections between different peoples and countries, their dependence on each other have become truly multifaceted and are manifest in all areas of physical activity and spiritual endeavour. It is in our power to ensure that the transmission of the cultural heritage and its riches takes place in a spirit of humanism, mutual understanding and fruitful cooperation; and that its symbol and model shall always be the "fervent handshake" of Alan Marshall.

Translated by John McNair
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Soviet-Australian Economic Co-operation: Present Situation and Future Prospects

A. Chuyko*

In 1992 we will mark a unique event in the history of Soviet-Australian political contacts, the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations on October 10, 1942. The development of the reciprocal relationship in the years since this notable event, however, has not been marked by uniform progress.

During the war years, both countries, as members of the anti-fascist coalition, chose the path of co-operation. Australia, herself involved in military operations against Japan, not only maintained trade relations with the USSR, but also offered it assistance through voluntary organisations such as the Congress for Friendship and Aid to the Soviet Union and the Russian Medical Aid and Comforts Committee. At the same time, members of the Australian Labor government, in public statements on the USSR, acknowledged its “decisive role in deciding the fate of the countries of the Pacific”.¹

Immediately after the war (1945-47), the spirit of co-operation continued to prevail in Soviet-Australian relations, apparent in particular in the work of the Far East Commission, created as a joint control mechanism with full authority in deciding the question of Japan. However, shortly afterwards, the situation took a dramatic turn for the worse under the influence of the “Cold War”. As a result, diplomatic relations were suspended in 1954 and restored only in 1959.

During the sixties, bilateral cooperation was renewed, as the signing of the 1965 trade agreement attests. In the next decade, in 1973, a new agreement on the development of bilateral commercial and economic relations was concluded, clearing the way for the removal of all restrictions on the Australian side on trade with the USSR. At the end of

* This article was originally written in 1988 and up-dated in 1989; in view of developments that have taken place since then, it now bears a more retrospective and historical character than its author originally intended. (eds.)
that year, the first session of the Mixed Commission for Trade and Economic Co-operation took place in Moscow.

Trade between the Soviet Union and Australia has not always been smooth and trouble-free. Even now it comes up against certain obstacles, mostly artificial in character. Nevertheless, in the main, trade is developing satisfactorily, assisted not only by the relative closeness of the two countries in geographical terms, but also by the fact that mutually advantageous trading contacts are in the interests of both. Confining ourselves to the last ten-year period, we will see that commodity circulation increased by a third between 1976 and 1985 - from R. 410 m. to R. 546 m. Such a plain statement of the facts is, however, obviously inadequate, especially in view of the specific nature of Soviet-Australian trade. To a great degree it is characterised by a lack of balance, and not in the Soviet Union’s favour. For the years indicated, the ratio between Soviet exports to Australia and Soviet imports from Australia was somewhere in the region of 1:55. The fact that in 1985 this ratio was noticeably better - 1:39 - gives some grounds for hope, but it should not be forgotten that the value of Soviet exports to Australia remains insignificant R. 14 m. in 1985, as against R. 3 m. in 1976 (Soviet imports from Australia in these years were worth R. 532 m. and R. 407 m. respectively).

The debit side of the balance in Soviet trade with Australia shows clearly the full extent of the trading imbalance between the two countries. Usually this figure is in the range of R. 400-500 m. In 1985, at R. 518 m., it was slightly less than the general deficit of the USSR in its trade with industrially developed capitalist countries. Clearly, such a situation cannot benefit the Soviet Union. At the same time, it must be remembered that imports from Australia form a significant part of total Soviet imports. In 1985, the Australian share of total Soviet purchases from foreign countries was almost 1 per cent - a high enough figure, especially when one considers the whole range of Soviet trading contacts, the huge scale on which our trade is conducted (imports in 1985 amounted to R. 69.1 billion), and also the relatively small size of the Australian economy.

The importance of trade with Australia in the context of our imports generally is determined primarily by the high level of our purchases of Australian agricultural commodities. It is well known that Australia's special place in world trading patterns rests on her primary produce, that is her agricultural goods and the produce of her mining industry. This is reflected with particular clarity in the structure of Soviet imports from Australia (see table 1).

The structure of Soviet purchases from Australia points indirectly to
the reasons for the notable fluctuations. The point is that they are characteristically concentrated on a rather restricted range of goods (wheat and wool constitute up to 88 per cent of Soviet imports from Australia). Furthermore, as a rule, the dominant part played by foodstuffs tends in the long run to increase the degree of fluctuation, since, in the absence of long-term contracts between the two countries, the volume of imports of meat, sugar and especially wheat are dictated by the level of our own domestic production and consumption of these commodities, which of course varies considerably from year to year.

**TABLE 1** The Structure of Soviet Imports from Australia (Classified by commodity in millions of roubles; % of the total shown in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Fine Wool</th>
<th>Meat</th>
<th>Barley</th>
<th>Raw Sugar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>152(37)</td>
<td>114(38)</td>
<td>8(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>435(56)</td>
<td>141(18)</td>
<td>49(6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>133(33)</td>
<td>220(55)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>266(55)</td>
<td>145(30)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16(3)</td>
<td>30(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>191(37)</td>
<td>233(44)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75(14)*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes barley and other grains, excluding wheat.

Source: External Trade of the USSR: A Statistical Year book² (for each of the years shown).

By largely concentrating her purchases of Australian goods on two commodities, wheat and wool, the Soviet Union is able to meet a substantial part of her import requirements in these areas from Australian sources. High quality Australian Merino wool is particularly valuable in this respect. There is no alternative supplier anywhere in the world, since Australia accounts for up to 60 per cent of world wool exports. In the USSR, the production of fine wool is insufficiently developed, while the demand for this raw material in the textile industry is great. Purchases of Australian wool are therefore large and, unlike food products, are little subject to fluctuation, usually amounting to 50,000 - 60,000 tonnes (62,000 in 1985). These purchases provide the USSR with from two-thirds to three-quarters of its total import requirement for fine wools, and about half of its requirement for wool of all kinds. The stability and volume of Soviet export orders are greatly appreciated by Australian
producers, especially in current conditions, when the world demand for wool is unstable.

Soviet purchases of foodstuffs are more diversified as regards the country of origin, and Australia's share of this market is by no means the largest one. Nevertheless, Australian wheat deliveries to the USSR reach the impressive level of between 1 and 2 million tonnes (rising to a record of 3.4 m. tonnes in 1980) - although this is still below the level of imports from Canada and the USA.

As we have noted, purchases of other food products vary, but in individual years can attain high levels and play a not insignificant part in Soviet imports overall. Thus, in the period 1982-83, 160,000 tonnes of raw sugar was bought annually, accounting for 3 per cent of all Soviet sugar imports, and in 1984 the figure was higher still - 328,00 tonnes, or 7 per cent.

In individual years, Australia also supplies meat (19,000 tonnes of lamb in 1982) and barley (727,000 tonnes in 1985, this figure includes rice and other grains, excluding wheat). The country has huge export potential in these and most other agricultural commodities, and when necessary is in the position significantly to increase the volume of its exports to the USSR, as for example in 1980, when exports of lamb increased by many times. The same is true of crops comparatively new to Australia, rice and cotton, which have been cultivated there only recently but have already been exported to the Soviet Union. Butter, although it is one of a number of products which, under the pressure of competition from New Zealand, is becoming less significant in Australian agricultural production and exports, still has a future as an export to the USSR; besides, in the past two or three years, Australian butter production has again been on the increase.

The growth of Australian exports to the USSR depends in large measure on the various steps currently being taken in our country in conjunction with the Food Programme to improve the operation of the whole agro-industrial sector. As these measures achieve their objective, we can expect to see a fall in the import requirements of the USSR as far as foodstuffs are concerned, and a corresponding decrease in imports from Australia, which, as we have seen, are predominantly in agricultural commodities. This will inevitably lead to a reduction in the trading imbalance.

It is true that, in recent years, the range of Soviet purchases from Australia has broadened. It now includes industrial raw materials, in particular metal ores, as well as manufactured goods produced by the few Australian industries marketing their products at sufficiently competitive prices - scientific measuring equipment, monitoring equipment for certain
industries, medical and other specialist equipment.

Soviet exports to Australia are a complete mirror-image of our imports from Australia. In the first place, the volume is negligible, especially when compared with the total exports of the USSR - 72.5 billion roubles in 1985; although we should not forget that between 1976 and 1985 the value of these exports increased by a factor of 4.4 (as against an admittedly low base figure). Secondly, the structure of Soviet exports to Australia shows great variety, and is dominated by machinery and technology (up to one third of the value of total exports, increasing to 37 per cent in 1983 but falling to 15 per cent in the following year as a result of a marked increase in other categories of exports - (see Table 2).

**TABLE 2 Soviet Exports to Australia**
(classified by commodity in thousands of roubles; % of the total shown in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (R.m.)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicles</td>
<td>687(922)</td>
<td>194(32)</td>
<td>4274(37)</td>
<td>3228(15)</td>
<td>3236(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal cutting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>machine tools,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forge and press</td>
<td>567(19)</td>
<td>714(12)</td>
<td>180(2)</td>
<td>114(1)</td>
<td>448(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refrigeration and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>548(5)</td>
<td>430(2)</td>
<td>234(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air-conditioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tractors</td>
<td></td>
<td>170(3)</td>
<td>1116(10)</td>
<td>2189(10)</td>
<td>1612(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>961(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>245(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3815(31)</td>
<td>11673(10)</td>
<td>7192(52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>608(20)</td>
<td>1297(22)</td>
<td>673(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>481(16)</td>
<td>766(13)</td>
<td>607(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sodium of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potassium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bichromate</td>
<td>481(16)</td>
<td>766(13)</td>
<td>607(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1063(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over the past decade there have been great changes in the structure of Soviet exports to Australia in all of the basic categories of goods. In particular, until the 1980s, machine tools and forge-and-press equipment formed the basis of Soviet mechanical exports. The position changed literally in a few years. Already in 1982-1983 we see a shift towards three other goods - tractors, light vehicles and air-conditioners. These are the products that have proved their competitiveness in the Australian market, especially in view of the substantial demand that exists in a country with a highly-developed agricultural (including crop-growing) sector and a relatively large fleet of motor vehicles. All the same, the recovery in the Australian economy that began in the second half of 1983 and continued throughout 1984 and 1985 might have been expected to restore Soviet machine tools and other equipment to their former position among our exports to Australia, but this did not happen. It may be that in this matter more assistance might have been expected from the Australian authorities, both in purely commercial transactions and at the level of meetings within the framework of the Mixed Commission on Economic Co-operation and the Working Group on Machinery and Equipment. The expansion of Soviet exports to Australia is no easy matter, especially if we consider the intense competition from similar goods produced by Western manufacturers (in 1985-86, Japan, the USA and the EEC accounted for 88 per cent of all Australian purchases of machinery). Nevertheless, the objective is one we can achieve if we intensify our efforts and if more support is forthcoming from the Australian Government and business community. Soviet-made machinery and equipment might then find a much wider demand, especially new products with applications in such vital areas of the Australian economy as agriculture and mining (e.g. mechanical fertilisers, mining equipment and lifting and transport technology, such as large-capacity dump-trucks and powerful excavators).

In a number of cases, however, the Australian authorities erect almost insurmountable barriers. In 1984, for example, Soviet exports of light vehicles to Australia were curtailed, a move dictated solely by the tightening-up of Australian import policies, although the Soviet-made
vehicles, especially the Niva, had proved their worth, both with consumers in Australia and at rallies held in Australia in 1985. The range of everyday consumer goods exported by the USSR to Australia has also changed significantly over the past ten years. Up until the end of the seventies, these consisted primarily of cameras, clocks, watches and watch-mechanisms. But in the eighties, the export of these items fell off sharply, while Australian sales of Soviet-made hunting rifles reached comparatively high levels. This is a product of no small importance, especially in Australia where high levels of consumer spending are reflected in the lifestyle of a significant part of the population. However, the range of general consumer items exported by this country to Australia is, in our view, not broad enough. To achieve greater variety, we need the support of the Australian side in the important matter of advertising, which is vital in bringing products to the notice of a consumer abundantly supplied with advertisements for Japanese, American and European goods.

Raw materials for the chemical industry are an important and virtually stable component in Soviet exports to Australia. It should be borne in mind that this is one of the fastest, but at the same time steadily growing industries in Australia, and creates a corresponding demand for the necessary raw materials. Here the future prospects for Soviet exports look bright.

Another important item in the overall structure of our exports to Australia is fish products, more especially tinned salmon. In our view, both countries could achieve greater co-operation in the seafood trade, including actual fishing operations. Since Australia's own fishing fleet does not have the capacity to exploit fully the resources of her waters, it would seem to make good sense to enlist the aid of Soviet vessels.

Fuel is not a constant factor in Soviet exports to Australia, but it is in a sense a reserve commodity which helps to reduce our trade deficit.

Analysing the structure and dynamics of bilateral trade, we can conclude that the notable imbalance is to a great extent related to the foreign trade requirements and opportunities of the Australian economy. Its export resources in products of interest to the USSR are more extensive than its import requirements, especially when we take into account that these are for the most part satisfied by the developed capitalist countries - Japan, the USA, the EEC. In other words, Soviet exporters must contend with stiff competition from the largest monopolies in the world which have long been established here and which are assured of a powerful and well-developed retail network, after-sales service facilities (especially important for the success of machinery and equipment on foreign markets) and advertising services. In such
circumstances, the problem of improving the competitiveness of our products to which the Soviet Government is directing its efforts is one that can be solved only with a suitable measure of co-operation between the Australian authorities and Soviet exporters.

There are in addition technical standards and other regulations, which necessitate extra expenditure on modifications to imported machinery. It is our opinion that, in the case of Soviet goods, these difficulties could be resolved if the Australian authorities were willing.

The economic difficulties which overtook Australia from the mid-seventies and which were reflected in her foreign trade by a decline in the rate of export growth, a reduced level of assets (and even the appearance of a deficit) in her balance of trade, and a deterioration in "the terms of trade" are compelling the business community to increase its efforts to adapt to the changes in world trading relations by restructuring the economy in the direction of a more efficient manufacturing sector (the metallurgical and chemical industries), and by developing a number of high-technology industries that can compete effectively on the world market. This is bringing about a change in the structure of Australian imports and creating the conditions for an increase in Soviet exports to Australia of a number of new products, primarily in the area of machinery and technology. The joint Soviet-Australian companies "Belarus Tractors" and "Tekma" have played and will continue to play a major role in this direction. At the same time, there are increased opportunities to sell Soviet licences to Australian companies engaged in providing new equipment to industry, particularly in mining, metallurgy and chemicals. These possibilities are already being realised to some extent, and this area of international trade is in general one of the most promising, insofar as Soviet research and design developments offer a wide choice to foreign customers, including Australians. At the same time, Australian scientists and engineers have also made significant advances in a range of production areas - for example, in biotechnology, in the development of specialised precision instruments.

Trade co-operation between the two countries might be further advanced by the development of other areas and forms of economic relations. There is scope for co-operation, for example, in utilising the manufacturing capacity of Soviet industry to process and enrich mineral raw materials for Australia; in inviting Soviet involvement in the construction of energy-generating installations (thermal electric power stations) and other individual infrastructure projects in Australia, as well as in the development of various mining sites. There is in principle no reason why third countries might not also be involved in such projects. There are prospects too for co-operation in fishing, agriculture (especially
stock-farming) and the food industry. Co-operation in the area of transport, specifically in shipping, is already developing satisfactorily, although of course the possibilities have by no means been exhausted.

Such an expansion in Soviet-Australian economic relations can occur only if the Australian Government and Australian business are willing to see it happen. The conservative Fraser Government in power from 1975 until 1983 followed a declaredly anti-Soviet line, although as a result of pressure from farmers anxious to sell their agricultural produce, it was forced to maintain and even to expand trade with the USSR. The Hawke Labor Government which came to office in 1983, while not entirely changing the policy, has at the same time shown greater flexibility in the area of foreign trade, recognising the benefits which can come from the development of mutually beneficial commercial and economic links. One such benefit is that the USSR is one of the biggest purchasers of Australian agricultural produce (accounting for usually 7-8 per cent, with a 2.9 per cent share in total Australian exports in the 1985-6 (Australian) financial year ending in June. Moreover, the Soviet share of Australian exports of wool and wheat is usually in the region of 13-17 per cent, while in 1985-6 the USSR bought 9 per cent of all Australian wool exports, 14 per cent of wheat exports and in 1984-5, 8 per cent of raw sugar exports.

The problem of selling her agricultural produce is an urgent one for Australia. The increased self-sufficiency in food production among the developed capitalist countries has led to the accumulation of large surpluses which flood world markets. Whereas, in the past, only the USA, Canada and Australia were major exporters of, for example, wheat, nowadays the member-states of the EEC like France and Great Britain are exporting it in increasing quantities. Thus, Australia has not only lost one of its major customers in the Common Market, but has also gained a serious new rival in many of its traditional markets. A similar threat is now posed by the EEC countries on the international raw sugar market. Australia's periodic efforts to resolve the problem are as a rule unsuccessful. If we consider, too, that the developing countries, which in most cases are experiencing economic difficulties, are not in a position to constitute a sufficiently profitable market for food products, it becomes clear how severe the problem of agricultural sales is, for Australia as a whole and for her farmers, who constitute a significant, and more importantly, and influential part of her population. It is therefore logical and reasonable that the present Labor Government is seeking to expand and upgrade bilateral contacts. After the normalisation of Australian-Soviet relations in the areas of culture, science and sport in May 1983, the fifth session of the Mixed Commission for Trade and Economic Co-
operation was convened in Moscow at the end of that same year, after a lengthy recess. This located some promising areas for the development of mutual relations.

In 1984, the fourth session of the Soviet-Australian Working Group on Trade in Machinery and Equipment was held in Australia. Further evidence of increased interest in the development of economic links with the USSR among Australian businessmen was the agreement signed in the summer of 1984 by the Confederation of Australian Industry, the leading business organisation in the country, and the Soviet Chamber of Industry and Commerce, which provided for increased trading contacts. In Moscow in May 1985, there was a joint meeting of the Soviet-Australian Commission on Trade and the Australian - USSR Business Council. According to the Chairman of the Council, John Elliot, Chief Executive of Elders-IXL, an established trading partner of the USSR, "this meeting has shown that there exist great possibilities for expanding trade for the mutual benefit of the two countries . . . the Business Council comprises 40 Australian companies, of which 33 have sent representatives to your country. This is further proof of the great interest in our country in the development of mutually advantageous trade."^3

In Australia there is indeed much support for trade with the USSR. Special consultative groups have been set up in each state, including representatives of the business community, to ensure its further development. Their task is to assist Soviet exporters in marketing their goods in Australia, and one can only hope that their efforts will produce practical results.

In October 1985, an Australian trade exhibition, "Australian Goods for Export", was organised in Moscow by the Australian Ministry of Trade, with the assistance of the Expocentre Organisation of the USSR Chamber of Industry and Commerce. Twenty-three of Australia's leading companies and organisations took part in the exhibition, which focused on products and technology associated with agriculture, mining and metallurgy.

Another important development in recent years has been more frequent political contacts which consolidate and expand the basis for bilateral relations. The former Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Bill Hayden, paid an official visit to Moscow, and in May 1985 a delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet paid an official visit to Australia.

A brief look at the history of Soviet-Australian relations in the context of their present state, especially in the area of trade, will convince anyone that these relations have both expanded and improved greatly. Nevertheless, there remains scope for increased co-operation between the
two countries, co-operation that can not only increase mutually beneficial trading contacts, but also strengthen the spirit of good-neighbourliness in relations between our two countries, and indeed among all countries in the western Pacific region.

Translated by John McNair

NOTES

Australian Studies in the USSR:  
A Brief Outline  

K.V. Malakhovsky  

Between the Revolution of 1917 and the 1950s, only a handful of books on Australia were published in the Soviet Union—the most significant being A.G. Mileykovsky's *Economic Geography of Australia* (1937) (Appendix, 1.18). In the past thirty years, however, the situation has changed dramatically, with the publication of numerous studies on almost every aspect of Australia and Australian life. Three institutions within the Academy of Sciences of the USSR have emerged as major centres of Australian studies: the Institute of Oriental Studies, the Institute of Ethnography and the Institute of World Economics and International Relations.  

Research on Australia in the Institute of Ethnography concentrates for the most part on anthropology, ethnography and geography, and is well represented by the many publications of Dr V.R. Kabo (Appendix, 1.06, 1.07, 3.01-3.15). In the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, the emphasis, naturally enough, is on the current political and economic situation in Australia, and on developments in Australian foreign policy. The two substantial studies by Dr. I.A. Lebedev (Appendix, 1.09, 1.10) are typical in this respect.  

At the Institute of Oriental Studies, a special Department of Australian and Pacific Studies* undertakes research into the history, politics, economics, ethnography and culture of all the countries of the Pacific Basin, as well as into international relations within the region. A brief survey of the main areas of interest within the Department will give some idea of the scope of its work and of the range of publications by academics associated with it.  

In the area of history and politics, for example, research has focused both on individual developments and on specific topics and events. Thus,  

---  

* Now called the Department of South Pacific Studies. trans.
in the past two decades, historians in the Department have published
general histories of Australia (K. Malakhovsky: Appendix, 1.12, 1.13,
1.14), New Zealand, New Caledonia and French Polynesia, studies of
colonialism in the region and analyses of such local questions as
Australian political parties (Appendix 1.26) and professional training in
the countries of Oceania. Special areas of interest have been the life of
indigenous populations before European settlement, the impact of
colonisation and the various systems of colonial rule, the emergence of
national liberation movements, the process of decolonisation and the
advent of nationhood in the new Pacific states. As far as Australia and
New Zealand are concerned, particular attention has been paid to such
questions as social structure, nationalism, the origins of capitalism, the
rise of the working-class movement and the contemporary role of the two
countries in the international arena. Recent developments in the Pacific,
such as initiatives in regional security and mutual co-operation, moves
towards integration and proposals for a "Pacific Community" have also
been the subject of special study.

Economists in the Department are engaged in a comprehensive
survey of the economy of Australia and Oceania, which includes research
into the distribution of the workforce, natural resources in the region, the
activities of foreign monopolies and multinational corporations,
economic aspects of regional integration, economic forecasts for
individual industries and prospects for economic co-operation between the
USSR and the nations of the South Pacific. There is of course special
emphasis on Australia as the major industrial power in the region, and
since 1970 three books devoted to various aspects of the Australian
economy have appeared. V.I. Ivanov's Foreign Capital in Australia
since the Second World War (Appendix, 1.04) examines the role of
British, American, Japanese and other overseas companies in Australia,
and assesses the influence of foreign investment in the economy. B. B.
Rubtsov's Finance, Money and Credit in Australia (Appendix, 1.22)
alyses the structure and dynamics of the Australian financial system,
while M.S. Khanin (Appendix, 1.08) reviews the development of the
transport industry in a capitalist economy. Articles in the annual
collective volumes published by the Department (Appendix, 2.04-2.09,
2.11-2.16, 2.18, 2.19) are devoted to the economic policies of the
Australian and New Zealand governments, and to the situation in key
areas of the economy of the region as a whole - especially mining,
agriculture, banking and state finances as well as to trading relations
among the countries of the Pacific Basin.

Ethnographic research in the Department is concerned with various
aspects of the ethnic origins of the Australian and Oceanic peoples and
with the cultural consequences of contact with the Europeans and the colonial policies of the European powers and the USA, as well as with modern developments in the way of life of the Aborigines, the Maori and the peoples of the Pacific island states. Historical ethnography is represented by a number of studies of the impact of external forces on traditional societies, for example in Eastern Samoa and Guam (Appendix, 3.16, 3.17). Other examples of ethnographic research include V.P. Nikolayev's article on the ethnological implications of regional cooperation and integration (Appendix, 3.18), L.G. Stefanchuk's studies of population migration in Papua-New Guinea (Appendix, 3.22, 3.23), and a paper by E. I. Razzakova on the struggle for land rights by Australian Aborigines and the differences between traditional and modern concepts of land-ownership (included in Appendix, 2.14).

In the 1970s, the research program of the Department expanded to include the study of contemporary culture - education, science, literature and the arts - in Australia and the Pacific. In 1972, A.S. Petrikovskaya published the first Soviet (and, for that matter, the first Russian) monograph on Australian literature (Appendix, 1.21), and six years later edited a volume of essays under the title Australian Literature (Appendix, 2.10), where special attention is paid to the development of the novel and the role of the ballad form in the evolution of a national literature. In general, the literary research undertaken in the Department focuses on the historical context and the relationship between literature and social consciousness, although due account is taken of the unity of form and content in the analysis of individual works.

Since 1969, the Department has conducted annual conferences on Australian and Pacific studies which are attended by virtually all specialists working in the area in the USSR. At each conference between thirty and forty papers are presented, and these are published both as pre-conference abstracts and, later, as articles in special conference volumes. Each year, more and more regions of the Soviet Union are represented, and more and more aspects of the discipline are covered.

After these general remarks on Australian studies in the USSR, I would like to take a more detailed look at the work of some of the most prominent Soviet Australianists, most of whom have been active in the field for a good many years.

Igor Alekseyevich Lebedev specialises in Australian history, politics and economics, and also has research interests in Commonwealth history and in the problems of the countries of the Pacific and Indian Oceans. He is the author and editor of three books on Australia, as well as individual
chapters in many collective volumes and upwards of fifty articles in learned journals and encyclopedias. Several of his works have been translated into English and other languages. In 1973 he was awarded a higher doctorate for a thesis on "The Internal and External Policies of Australia, 1939-1970".

Dr Lebedev's interest in Australia goes back almost three decades and was the logical extension of his general interest in British history, the British Empire and Commonwealth and British foreign policy. His research into various topics connected with Australia - British settlement of the continent and British colonial policy - gradually led to an interest in Australian studies per se. In a series of articles, Dr Lebedev has examined various aspects of Australia's historical development as an independent state. His first visit "down under" in 1963 stimulated his special interest in the political and economic problems of contemporary Australia, and the results of his researches were published in the chapters on Australia in a book, *The Economy and Politics of Australia since the Second World War* (Appendix, 1.09), one of the first academic studies in the Soviet Union devoted specifically to post-war Australia. Here Lebedev is particularly concerned with the nature of Australian capitalism and the extent of the country's economic and political independence in the context of her relationship with Britain and the United States.

Dr Lebedev next turned his attention to Australian foreign policy, following a number of articles with a second book, *Australia's Foreign Policy* (1975; Appendix, 1.10). Here he identifies the domestic and external influences on the foreign policy of successive governments, with particular reference to Australia's increasing role in international affairs and the relationship between the "dependent" and "independent" tendencies in her policies. While recognising the influence of US foreign policy and emphasising the loss of independence caused by Australia's involvement in ANZUS and the Vietnam War, Lebedev argues that, by the mid seventies, and as a result of such factors as new developments in the international situation and in the Pacific region, internal changes and increased economic power, Australia had begun to follow a more independent line and to question the traditional view that her interests inevitably coincided with those of the United States. An Australian review of the book, while taking issue with its "ideological approach", recognised Lebedev's achievement in identifying and analysing the main periods in the development of Australia's post-war foreign policy.

Recent economic and political developments in the Pacific region have underlined the need for a wider perspective on contemporary Australian affairs. Discussions with Australian colleagues, both in Australia and in Moscow, convinced Lebedev that the economy and
politics of Australia should be seen in the context of the country's global and regional role. With this in mind, he edited and contributed to *Australia and Canada* (1984; Appendix, 2.17), a collection of essays offering a comparative study of the two countries over the past two decades. Such an approach to the economy and politics of Australia and Canada (which, for all their differences, share a similar pattern of historical evolution and occupy a comparable position in the world today) can, in Lebedev's view, shed light on the most characteristic tendencies in their development - in particular, their common tendency towards greater independence in the political and economic spheres.

Australia remains at the centre of Dr Lebedev's research interests, although recently he has turned his attention also to the problems of the Pacific and Indian Ocean regions. He remains convinced that, without an analysis of Australian politics, and without some consideration of Australia's role, no account of the political and economic processes at work in today's world can be complete.

Dr Vladimir Rafailovich Kabo, Senior Research Fellow of the Institute of Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences, has been studying the history and ethnography of the Australian Aborigines, and of primitive societies in general, since 1957. In that time, he has published three books and some one hundred articles in learned journals, both in the USSR and abroad. As an Australianist, he has concentrated on the origin, history, social organisation and culture of the Aborigines, and on their position in Australia today. His book, *The Origin and Early History of the Australian Aborigines* (1969; Appendix, 1.06) can claim to be the first multidisciplinary study of this complex subject to appear anywhere, drawing more extensively than comparable works by Australian and other specialists on a whole range of sources - anthropological, geological, palaeographic, archaeological, ethnographical and linguistic. He examines such questions as the ethnogenesis of the Aborigines, their genetic and cultural links with Southern and South-East Asia, their settlement of Australia some forty thousand years ago, their migrations over the continent and their subsequent history, including the effect of palaeoclimatic changes and geographical conditions on the development of Aboriginal culture. Twenty years after its first publication, this work has never been superseded, and it remains a model of its kind.

Dr Kabo's second book, *The Tasmanians and the Tasmanian Problem* (1975; Appendix, 1.07), applies the same multidisciplinary approach in support of the thesis that the Tasmanian Aborigines settled the island in the Pleistocene Age, twenty thousand years ago, and developed in isolation, their unique anthropological features the result of
automatic genetic processes. Like its predecessor, this study was favourably received in the Australian journal *Oceania*;² while the results of Dr Kabo's research into these questions were reported in a paper to the seventh International Congress on Anthropology and Ethnography in 1976 (Appendix, 3.10).

Dr Kabo has devoted several articles to the structure of Aboriginal society, a subject he returns to in a chapter of his third book, *The Primitive Pre-Agricultural Commune* (1986; Appendix, 3.15; see also Appendix, 3.05, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13). Here he examines the commune as the most important socio-economic unit in the traditional society of the Aborigines and other hunter-and-gatherers—a unit which, for all its significance, has so far been little studied. Kabo discusses the structure of the commune, its economic and social functions, its dynamics in various ecological environments and its relationship to other social institutions, such as the family, the clan and the tribe. A separate chapter attempts to reconstruct the social structure of the extinct Tasmanian Aborigines, again focusing on the commune which, despite its neglect by earlier and contemporary historians, is seen as an essential key to understanding the structure of hunter-gatherer societies.

Kabo's writings on Aboriginal culture include articles on stone artefacts and rock paintings (Appendix, 3.02, 3.03, 3.06) and a study of the possible links between the labyrinth motif in Aboriginal art and the ethnic origins of the race (Appendix, 3.04). A more recent article, "The Aborigines of Australia" (1984; Appendix, 3.14), gives a broad picture of traditional Aboriginal culture and society and touches on contemporary aspects of Aboriginal life, in particular the tendency towards decentralisation. In addition, Dr Kabo has devoted considerable attention to the work of earlier Russian Australianists (Appendix, 3.10, 3.08, 3.09) and of Australian ethnographers. He has edited and written the introduction for the Russian translation of (among others) Ronald and Catherine Berndt's *The World of the First Australians* and Douglas Lockwood's *I, the Aboriginal*.³

Alla Savel'ievna Petrikovskaya, Senior Research Fellow of the Institute of Oriental Studies, is one of the pioneers of the study of Australian literature in the Soviet Union. Her interest in the subject goes back to the 1950s, when she compiled a listing of all works of Australian and New Zealand literature in the English-language catalogues of the Lenin Library in Moscow. Her first articles appeared soon afterwards in literary journals and newspapers, both in the capital and in Kiev, and she was given the opportunity of conducting special courses in Australian literature at Moscow and Kiev universities. In 1969 Dr Petrikovskaya was awarded her Candidate's degree for a thesis on Henry
Lawson, which later became the basis for the first Soviet monograph on Australian literature, *Henry Lawson and the Birth of the Australian Short Story* (1972; Appendix, 1.21). Since then, she has written numerous articles on a wide variety of subjects which have appeared in publications of the Department of Australian and Pacific Studies and elsewhere. They all attest to her desire to illumine all that is worth while in Australian literature from its origins to the present day - be it the poetry of Francis Adams, the new wave of writers of the sixties, the theme of the Second World War or the works of Aboriginal writers.

Since joining the Department of Australian and Pacific Studies, Petrikovskaya has broadened her research interests into the area of general cultural studies. For example, she was the sole author of the sections on culture in *Australia Today* (Appendix, 2.03), surveying developments in education, science, the arts, literature, the media, library science and so on. She has also written a number of articles on the growing role of the state in education, science and culture in post-war Australia (Appendix, 3.19, 3.20, 3.21). Since the mid seventies, she has developed a special interest in culture and ideology in the newly-independent Pacific states, and in particular in native islander literature, which appeared in the era of decolonisation as a reflection of socio-political and cultural change, national liberation aspirations and nascent national consciousness.

Her academic research apart, Dr Petrikovskaya has played a leading role in introducing the Soviet readers to the works of writers from Australia, New Zealand and Oceania. She is the author of dozens of entries in encyclopedias and reference works, and of articles and reviews in such mass-circulation publications as *Inostrannaya literatura* [Foreign Literature], *Sovremennaya khudozhestvennaya literatura za rubezhom* [Modern Literature Abroad] and *Literaturnaya Gazeta* [The Literary Gazette]. She has edited, compiled and written introductions for a number of books, including the *Vsemirnaya literatura* [World Literature] series, a selection of works by Alan Marshall for the series *Mestera zarubezhnoy prozy* [Foreign Masters of Prose], collections of works by Aboriginal and islander writers, as well as translations of individual novels and short stories by authors such as Witi Imihaera, F.D. Davison and Dymphna Cusack. One of her recent collections, *The Modern Australian Novella* includes works by writers as diverse as John Morrison, Donald Stewart, Alan Marshall, Judah Waten, Patrick White, Hal Porter, Peter Cowan, Thomas Hungerford, Elizabeth Jolley and Peter Carey. Petrikovskaya is currently working on a comprehensive history of the Australian novel as the reflection of the nation's life and history.

I myself date my special interest in Australian history and politics to my first visit to the country in 1967. When, during my stay in
Canberra, I mentioned my wish to collect materials on Australian history, I was jokingly told by Australians that their country had no history. Over twenty years later, it is clear to me that, while the changes in Australian life since the Second World War have been enormous, the country does indeed have a history, and one which seems more unique the more one studies it. Surveying the two hundred years of "British Australia", one cannot but be struck by the individual and even paradoxical character of its political, economic and social life. I have written several books on Australia (Appendix, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15), in each of which I have tried to trace the development of political, economic and cultural life in the "Fifth Continent" since the arrival of the British. I have concentrated particularly on social changes and on class structure, on the rise of nationalism, the growth and the struggle of the political parties, social movements (especially the working-class movement) and on the evolution of foreign policy. My current research project is a book on Australia in the 1980s,* in which I intend to review the latest developments in the country's life and in her role in the international community.

Finally, it is a pleasure to introduce to the Australian reader one of the younger generation of Soviet Australianists. In 1985, Elena Viktorovna Govor published the definitive Bibliography of Australia (Appendix, 4.01), which she began as a student of the Minsk Institute of Culture in 1975 and completed as an associate of the Department of Australian and Pacific Studies. This, the first comprehensive and systematic bibliography of Russian and Soviet writing on Australia ever published in the USSR, answers a long-felt need that had grown particularly acute with the increased interest in Australian studies over the past few decades. It is a monumental achievement which is of value not only to academics, but to executives, journalists, tourists and the reading public in general. The exhaustive coverage (with sections, among other things, on geography, ethnography, economics, history, government, law, the arts and literature) makes it possible for the first time to take stock of the Russian and Soviet contribution to Australian studies. Chronologically, the scope of the work extends from the first mention of Australia in a gazetteer of 1710 to the end of 1983.** The selection of items combines comprehensiveness with a


regard to scholarly significance, and includes books and monographs, chapters in books and articles in journals, newspaper reports, thesis abstracts, conference papers, book reviews, official publications and limited editions. The bibliography covers both sources written in Russian (and Ukrainian and Belorussian) and works translated into Russian. All references have been verified in the catalogues and card indexes of the major Soviet libraries; while complete runs of dozens of newspapers and journals have been examined de visu.

The entire corpus of material, numbering some six thousand items, is carefully categorised and partially annotated, especially in the case of the rarer pre-revolutionary titles. The chronological order of entries within each subdivision enables one to follow the development of research in any given area, and the detailed alphabetical index makes it easy to find everything written by or about any particular author.

E.V. Govor's Bibliography has unearthed much unknown and forgotten material, and corrects the misconception that before the Revolution Australia was indeed a terra incognita for the Russian reader. It also reveals the extent of early Soviet writing on the continent and gives a full picture of the achievement of Soviet Australianists - while at the same time identifying those areas neglected by our specialists. For the first time, this remarkable work of reference brings together the full range of materials pertaining to the history of Russian-Australian relations, including reports of nineteenth-century naval expeditions, accounts by individual travellers, the Australian publications of Miklouho-Maclay, sources on Russian political émigrés in Australia in the early twentieth century, and documents on the first post-war contacts and the development of relations since the 1960s. It also gives some idea of the number of Australian authors whose works - fiction, non-fiction and scientific literature - have been translated and published in the USSR.

In the Bibliography of Australia, all students of Australian studies in the USSR, Australia and elsewhere, will find an indispensable guide to Russian Australiana.*

* E.V. Govor began work on a PhD in 1991 at The Australian National University. trans.

Translated by John McNair
Notes


2. See reviews by A. Capell in Oceania, XLIII, 2 (December 1972): 160-61; and XLIX, 2 (December 1978): 159-60.


APPENDIX:

A Bibliography of Recent Soviet Publications on Australia.

[Note: this is a selective rather than a comprehensive bibliography, intended to provide more information about the works and authors referred to in the foregoing article.]

1. Books and Monographs


2. **Collections of Articles and Essays.**

2.01. *Narody Avstralii i Okeanii* [The Peoples of Australia and Oceania] (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1956).

2.02 *Raspad Britanskoy Imperii* [The Fall of the British Empire] (Moscow: Nauka, 1964).

2.03 *Sovremennaya Avstraliya* [Australia Today] (Moscow: Nauka, 1976).


3. Individual Articles and Essays Referred to:

3.01. V.R. Kabo, "A.L. Yashchenko i ego puteshestvie v Avstraliju" ["A.L. Yashchenko and his Visit to Australia"], Sovetskaya etnografiya, No.6 (1957).

3.02. V.R. Kabo, "Kamennyie orudiya avstralijtsev" ["Stone implements of the Australians"] Trudy Instituta etnografii AN SSSR, t.80 (1960).


3.05. V.R. Kabo, "Pervobytnaya obshchina okhotnikov i sobiratelei (po avstraliyskim materialam)" ["The primitive commune of hunters and gatherers (from Australian materials)"] in the collection Problemy istorii dokapitalisticheskikh obshchestv [Problems in the History of Pre-Capitalist Societies] (Moscow, 1968).

3.06. V.R. Kabo, "Sinkretizm pervobytnogo iskusstva (po materialam avstraliyskogo izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva)" ["The syncretism of primitive art (from the materials of Australian graphic art)"], in Rannie formy iskusstva [Early Forms of Art] (Moscow, 1972).


3.08. V.R. Kabo, "K beregam ozera Vechnoy Molodosti. Iz istorii russkoy etnografii" ["To the shores of the Lake of Eternal Youth. From the history of Russian ethnography"], Sbornik MAE, t. 30 (1974).


3.13. V.R. Kabo, "La communaute chez les predateurs (D'apres des donnees australiennes)", in La communaute et ses types. Etudes ethno-grapiques en URSS (Moscow, 1982 - also published in English).
3.15. V.R. Kabo, chapters in his Pervobytnaya dozemled'cheskaya obshchina [The Primitive Pre-Agricultural Communes] (Moscow, 1986).
3.16. V.P. Nikolayev, "Nekotorye itogi kolonial'nogo gospodstva SShA v Vostochnom (Amerikanskom) Samoa, 1900-1970" ["Some Results of USA Colonial Rule in Eastern (American) Samoa"], in 2.06.
3.18. V.P. Nikolayev, "Prirodnye i etnosotsial'nye usloviya integratsii Okeanii" ["Natural and ethno-social Conditions of Integration in Oceania"], in 2.08.
3.23. L.G. Stefanchuk, "Razvitie Port-Morsbi" ["The Development of Port Moresby"], in 2.11.

4. Bibliography

Russian and Soviet Studies in Australian Universities

T.H. Rigby*

Introduction

There was no substantial scholarly study of Russia or the Soviet Union in Australia prior to the Second World War. This may seem remarkable when one considers the enormous contributions of Russia's writers, artists and scholars to modern European culture, the international importance of the Soviet Union, and its role as the pioneer of a totally new form of human society with claims to universal validity. This scholarly gap was not a consequence of general intellectual backwardness. Australia was culturally provincial, but not a cultural desert, and its solid university system, whose origins went back to the 1850s, produced many outstanding scholars in a variety of fields, even if the majority of them were obliged to go abroad, usually to Britain, to gain advanced experience and recognition. Nor was it due to a total ignorance of Russian culture or a lack of interest within the Australian intellectual community in the great issues posed by the theory and practice of Soviet socialism, as Professor Clark reminds us in this volume.

The explanation lies primarily in the colonial character of Australian universities well into the twentieth century. Here, of course, the term colonial is used in a socio-cultural rather than a political or administrative sense. The Australian universities were from the outset autonomous institutions in the essentially self-governing colonies of the nineteenth century, but the fact that the overwhelming majority of Australians were

*In the nature of things, an account such as this is soon overtaken by events. The past few years have seen a number of changes and developments in Australian Slavic Studies which rendered parts of the original article written in 1988 obsolete. In revising his contribution for publication, the author has made every attempt to update his survey as far as 1990. - eds.
migrants or the children of migrants from the British Isles meant that the colonial universities, like all other colonial institutions, naturally took their models from "the old country". This situation did not greatly change with the establishment of the Australian Federation, despite the ever-growing sense of Australian nationhood, for Australian culture remained essentially a provincial variant of British culture, many Australian scholars still went to Oxford or Cambridge to complete their education, and there was a constant spontaneous circulation of teachers and scholars among the universities of Britain and Australia (as well as New Zealand). It is not surprising, therefore, that the structure of university programs and the content of courses long continued to reflect British conditions. As in Britain, "modern" studies, whether in language, literature or history, were very slow to develop, as were the social sciences generally, and as modern foreign languages, societies and cultures began to be studied, these were virtually limited to the ones of greatest relevance and importance to the intellectual and practical concerns of "the old country", namely French and German. Thus not only were Russia, the USSR, and the other Slavonic countries and cultures a blank spot, so too were those of the Hispanic world and of Italy, not to mention the great Asian countries, whose proximity and importance to Australia were to be realised for the first time only through the harsh experience of the Second World War.

In considering the appearance of Russian and Soviet studies in Australia and their development over the last four decades, a number of factors need to be borne in mind. First is the enormous expansion of the Australian university system - from six universities with 16,000 students in the mid 1940s to nineteen universities with 170,000 students in the mid 1980s (there is no space to consider here the whole parallel system of colleges of advanced education which evolved over the same period). Second is the marked diversification of fields of study, common to all developed countries. Thirdly there is the great expansion of postgraduate study and research in Australian universities, which up to the 1940s concerned themselves predominantly with undergraduate teaching. Fourthly, in the humanities and social sciences there has been a marked increase of interest in the more "exotic" cultures, partly reflecting similar developments in Britain and the United States, but also conditioned by a less Anglocentric view of the world as well as by a realisation shared by governments and the scholarly community of the need for specialists to facilitate Australia's ever-growing international economic, political and cultural contacts. And finally, connected with the latter, and also with the reduction of Australian isolation due to modern communications and air transport, there has been greatly expanded movement of students, teachers
and scholars between Australian universities and those of a wide range of countries in Europe, the Americas, Asia and Africa.

If these factors have affected Russian and Soviet studies along with most other fields, several specific factors have also made themselves felt. Most obvious here is the great increase of the Soviet Union's international influence, its emergence as one of the world's two "superpowers". Then there are pressures arising from bilateral relations, both positive and negative. Among the Australian people, who fought for six years against the fascist dictatorships, there was widespread sympathy and admiration for their wartime Soviet allies. During the "Cold War" the USSR remained at the centre of attention, and paradoxically it reinforced the interest in Russian studies generated by the wartime alliance, since both experiences encouraged an awareness among both students and the wider public of the need for a better understanding of Russian history and culture and of contemporary Soviet society. In more recent years, as Australian-Soviet relations have grown more complex, involving elements of co-operation and mutual benefit, alongside elements of disagreement and competition, there has been an increased sense in Australia of the need for personnel trained to relate effectively with their Soviet opposite numbers.

Largely as a consequence of these varied factors, Australian universities have built up since World War II a significant record of teaching and research on Russian language and literature and on different aspects of Soviet history and society. Of course various fortuitous circumstances and the activity of particular individuals have also been important, as we shall see. At the same time, the growth of Russian and Soviet studies has proceeded unsystematically, irregularly, with various setbacks, and with some major gaps. Here, too, developments affecting Australian universities generally played a role alongside more specific factors. It is time, however, to conclude these general remarks and return to the period just after the Second World War, when the story of Russian studies in Australia had its beginning.

Language and Literature

At that time a little Russian was already being taught in the Universities of Sydney, Melbourne and Queensland, but not as part of any degree course. Then in 1946 the University of Melbourne decided to appoint a full-time lecturer in Russian and to establish it as a regular degree subject in the Faculty of Arts. The advertisement attracted a considerable field of applicants from Australia and overseas, and the choice fell on a young but experienced and gifted teacher, Nina Christesen (Nina Mikhaylovna
Maksimova), daughter of Russian migrants from St Petersburg, and a graduate of the University of Queensland, in whose Institute of Modern Languages she had taught Russian part-time for several years.

Her task was a daunting one: to introduce a totally new subject with totally inadequate resources. "In every way," she later wrote, "I was obliged to begin from scratch at Melbourne University. There was no established department, no staff, no suitable textbooks, no library (except my own), no secretarial support, and nobody to whom I could turn for advice on how best to structure the courses." She was located at first in the Department of French, and it was not till 1949 that a separate Department of Russian was established. By this time she was teaching three one-year courses in Russian, at pass and honours levels, with the assistance of such able part-time and temporary teachers as Helen Civian, Maurice Yashounsky and Helen Timm. That the department survived and prospered under these circumstances was due primarily to Nina Christesen's qualities as an inspiring, inventive and indefatigable teacher. But the great wave of interest in things Russian also played a part, and quite a few scientists and members of the university teaching staff joined these classes alongside the young students, who included many World War II veterans. In 1950, a second regular lecturer was appointed in the person of Boris Christa, from Cambridge. Further appointments were made in the following years (notable Zinaida Uglitzky and Dmitri Grishin), new courses and methodologies were introduced, and postgraduate studies evolved, the first MA being awarded in 1954. By 1958 student numbers reached 157.

Meanwhile from the early 1950s some Russian was being taught in the Canberra University College, which prior to its incorporation in the Australian National University in 1960 prepared students for examinations of the University of Melbourne. In 1954 the College appointed me as Senior Lecturer in Russian. A graduate of the University of Melbourne, I had recently completed a PhD degree at the University of London. The context of this appointment is worth noting. The Commonwealth Office of Education, an agency of the Federal Government, had made a special grant to the Canberra University College for the purpose of teaching "oriental languages", which initially was taken to mean Chinese and Japanese, but then Russian was added as an afterthought. So Russian was taught for a time in the Department of Oriental Languages, before being redefined as a European language by being transferred to the French Department, and later to the Modern Languages Department. In practice, the teachers of Russian language and literature, who numbered four by the early 1960s, operated as an autonomous sub-department, and a full honours degree course in Russian
was provided. However, this story is symbolic of the ambiguous position of Russian studies in Australia - not fully accepted either by scholars in more traditional departments focusing on Western Europe, for whom Russia is not European enough, or by those in the newer departments focusing on more "exotic" languages and cultures, for which Russia is too European. We shall come back to this problem later.

The University of Melbourne and the Australian National University remained the only higher educational institutions teaching Russian right up to 1963, when in the same year it was introduced by Monash University (also in Melbourne) and the University of Queensland in Brisbane. Four years later it was established in the University of New South Wales (in Sydney).

There were subsequent unsuccessful attempts to introduce Russian in the University of Sydney, where no suitable appointment to the chair could be made and the project lapsed, and in the University of Adelaide, where the project was eventually shelved owing to lack of funds. The 1960s also saw the heightening of the status of Russian through greater administrative independence and the creation of separate chairs, the first at Monash University in 1963 with the appointment of Professor Reginald de Bray, a London graduate who had been teaching at the University of Melbourne. (The Chair was occupied in 1967-68 by Professor Rudolf Zimek, from 1969 to 1972 by Professor Z.F. Oliverius, of Charles University, Prague, and since then by Professor Jiri Marvan). Queensland University followed suit in 1966, with Professor Boris Christa, who, as noted, had also taught at Melbourne, and more recently as Associate Professor of Russian in Auckland, New Zealand. Then in 1967 came the University of New South Wales, which appointed Professor Tatyana Cizova, who was born in the USSR and educated at the Universities of Sydney and London. In 1971 a chair was created in the Australian National University's Russian Department, and Professor de Bray was appointed to it, moving from a Chair at London University's School of Slavonic and East European Studies. Ironically, it was the University of Melbourne, the first to introduce the teaching of Russian language and literature, that was the last to place it under a separate chair, with the appointment as Professor of Russian in 1977 of Dr Roland Sussex, a graduate of the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, who took his doctorate in London and was for some years Senior Lecturer in Linguistics in Monash University.

Thus in three decades the study of Russian in Australian universities had grown from nothing to a level with which a nation of under fourteen million could feel some satisfaction: five departments, each under its own professor, a total teaching staff of twenty-nine, five hundred
undergraduates, and substantial levels of postgraduate research - nine PhDs and thirty-two MAs having been awarded up to 1976. Since then, however, expansion has levelled off, and although there have been some important innovations, notably in course programs (on which more later), there have also been serious setbacks. The Russian Department in the University of New South Wales lost its professor, sank to a staff of two, and was obliged to curtail its courses. The Australian National University, too, made no new appointment to the Chair of Russian on the retirement of Professor de Bray, and although a full range of courses in Russian language and literature is still taught, Russian, along with the Germanic and Romance languages, has now been incorporated into a large new Department of Modern European Languages, thereby losing a degree of its independence. Similar "administrative" mergers have since then taken place at both Melbourne and Monash Universities.

In considering the character of courses in Russian language and literature one must bear in mind that Russian is taught in only a tiny minority of Australian secondary schools, mostly in Melbourne. Consequently students must devote much time to acquiring effective linguistic competence before they can begin to study literary texts in the original or proceed to more theoretically oriented linguistic studies, which in practice are largely concentrated in the third (final) year of the basic ("pass") degree and the more specialised courses of the four-year "honours" degree. On this common basis, however, the different departments have erected rather diverse patterns of teaching and research, the main components of which have been nineteenth and twentieth century literature, linguistics/philology, other Slavonic languages, and cultural, social and historical studies.

Under the leadership of Nina Christesen, the Russian Department at Melbourne University evolved as a strong centre of modern literary studies, and this field is still well represented in teaching courses and in the research of Dr Judith Armstrong and Mr Igor Mezhakov-Korjakin. However, serious work in philology was also under way there by the 1960s, and since the appointment of Professor R.D. Sussex (who in 1990 moved to the University of Queensland, where he heads the Centre for Language Teaching and Research) linguistics moved into the centre of the stage. Having absorbed the Horwood Language Centre, which specialises in language teaching methodology, the Department became known as the Department of Russian and Language Studies. Roland Sussex's own wide research interests include translation, Slavonic languages in émigré communities, and computer-aided instruction. These interests are to some extent shared by Paul Cubberley, whose chief area of research is historical Slavonic phonetics. Nine out of the twelve present postgraduate students
are working on linguistic topics. At the same time the department offers a very popular first-year course entitled “Russian Literature and Society”, and a second-year half-course entitled “Soviet Writers and Society”, which do not require a knowledge of Russian.

The Russian Department at Monash University specialised from the first in Slavonic linguistics. Its first Professor, Reginald de Bray, was the author of the standard work *Guide to the Slavonic Languages* with a particular interest in the historical phonology of Serbo-Croatian; his successor, Z.F. Oliverius, was a specialist in Russian and Czech phonetics and the formal and semantic aspects of morpheme analysis in Russian; and the present Professor, J. Marvan, specialises in the morphology of word-change, the diachronic and synchronic links between the Slavonic languages, Slavonic morphology, comparative Slavonic and Balto-Slavonic philology, and Russian-English linguistic contacts in Australia. The six other teaching staff of the department are also largely engaged in language work, although three have substantial literary interests. Despite its primary emphasis on Russian language and literature, the department has progressively introduced the study of other Slavonic languages and literatures as regular degree subjects, first Serbo-Croatian, and later South Slavic (Macedonian and Bulgarian), Polish, and Ukrainian. These developments were reflected in the renaming of the department in 1982 the Department of Slavic Languages. It is noteworthy that the honours curriculum also offers two Baltic subjects, namely Contemporary Lithuanian and Comparative Studies of Lithuanian and Latvian. No more than forty per cent of the department’s students are now enrolled in Russian courses, and this department is unique in Australia in its range of linguistic interests.

The establishment of Polish and Ukrainian studies at Monash University was substantially assisted by the respective ethnic communities in Australia. The work in Ukrainian is of course of particular interest to us since Ukrainian is the second most widely spoken language in the USSR. A full three years of Ukrainian language and literature is now taught, under Dr Marko Pavlyshyn, whose research interests range from literary theory, through Central and East European literary history, to contemporary Ukrainian literature. Dr Slobodanka Vladiv is also closely interested in Ukrainian literature alongside Russian and other Slavonic literatures. In 1986 the first Australian PhD in the field of Ukrainian studies was awarded to Monash scholar Mrs O. Rosalijon.

At this point we should turn to another university, not so far mentioned, namely Macquarie University in Sydney. Some years ago the Federal Government decided to support the teaching of languages spoken
by major non-British immigrant communities in Australia, and to this end it provided funds for the establishment within the Modern Language Department of Macquarie University of a program on Slavonic languages and cultures other than Russian (which is taught in Sydney at the University of New South Wales). Under the leadership of Dr John Besemerès and Dr Peter Hill, strong programs in Polish and South Slavic (Croatian, Serbian, Macedonian) cultures were created, to be followed in 1984 by the establishment of a lectureship in Ukrainian studies, financed, like its Monash counterpart, by the Australian Ukrainian community, and filled by Dr Natalia Pazuniak. The Macquarie University program now offers three-year “majors” in Ukrainian language and Ukrainian literature, and two-year “sub-majors” in Ukrainian civilisation.

As already mentioned, the Russian Department in the University of New South Wales has suffered serious staffing problems in recent years, and now has only two full-time teachers, namely Barry Lewis (research interests: Russian and Czech language, contemporary Russian and Czech literature) and Michael Ulman (modern and contemporary Russian literature, parody, semiotics). It had nevertheless about forty students in its first-year course in 1986, manages to maintain most of its courses by offering some of them in alternate years, and continues a modest level of postgraduate teaching.

By contrast with the departments so far discussed, the Department of Russian at the University of Queensland has throughout its existence maintained a dominant emphasis on modern Russian literature. Professor Christa’s principal interests are the writers of the Silver Age (early twentieth century) and literary theory, his chief research centring on the poet Andrey Bely and more recently on semiotics. Of the four members of the department now in post, Dr John McNair specialises in literary history, Dr Maria Kravchenko in Russian folklore, Dr Lyndall Morgan in Soviet literature and journalism and Dr Robert Woodhouse in comparative and historical linguistics. The department is also unique in offering, in addition to majors (i.e. three-year sequences of courses) in Russian language (involving the study of literary texts in Russian), a major in Russian literature and civilisation studied in translation. In addition, it offers professionally oriented courses on translatorship and interpretership. The majority of PhD and MA theses completed in the department have dealt with literary topics or with problems of contemporary Russian usage. Finally, we should note the department’s research interest in the Russian immigrant community in Australia, and in Russian sources on Australia.

At the Australian National University the Russian language teaching
has also been linked closely with the study of nineteenth and twentieth century literature. The conversion of the Russian Department under Professor de Bray into a Department of Slavonic Languages proved short-lived, although courses in Old Church Slavonic and Serbo-Croatian are still available for advanced-level students. At the same time the Russian Department (now the Russian Section of the Department of Modern European Languages) has a long history of co-operation with social science departments in the provision of courses on modern Russia. Several of its students have gone on to take higher degrees in history or political science. Such co-operation has been further assisted by the recent introduction of “field programs”, i.e. sequences of courses combining components from different disciplines and departments. In a related development, the Russian Section has also followed Queensland and Melbourne Universities in introducing courses not requiring a knowledge of Russian. Research interests are focused on nineteenth and especially twentieth century Russian literature and the modern Russian language, although Margaret Travers continues the interest established under Professor de Bray in the development of Russian, while Sonja Witheridge also works on comparative Slavonic philology and on Serbo-Croatian language and literature. Both Sonja Witheridge and Rosh Ireland have a strong interest in Soviet literature, the latter studying in particular the war prose of 1941-45. Kevin Windle’s interests range from the teaching of Slavonic languages through literary translation from Russian, Ukrainian and Polish to the study of Soviet television and radio. Liudmila Kouzmin has made an extensive study of the Russian of the migrant community in Australia. Research carried out by postgraduate students has also related mostly to modern Russian literature or language.

We see, then, that while there have been some setbacks over the last decade, and probably some decline in the overall number of Russian language students, there has also been a marked diversification of the work of Australian Russian and (Slavonic) departments. This has involved greater specialisation between departments and the extension of their activities into important new areas, notably Ukrainian studies, collaborative teaching with social scientists, and the introduction of Russian literature and culture to wider circles of students not studying the language.

The Social Sciences

Alongside Russian language and literature, the fields in which Russian and Soviet studies are most developed in Australia are history and political science. Although history is one of the longest-established
disciplines in the arts faculties of our universities, it is only in the last 10-15 years that we have acquired a significant cadre of well-qualified specialists conducting teaching and research in Russian history. The reasons are to be sought in the factors outlined at the beginning of this chapter. By contrast, in the recently developed subject of political science, where curricula and scholarly interests were less entrenched, it proved easier to respond to the great upsurge of interest in the USSR, and such a cadre of specialists was already emerging in the 1950s.

The scholarly study of politics has a place in the European intellectual tradition at least as old as Aristotle. In Australian universities prior to World War II it was considered from different angles by philosophers, lawyers and historians, but there were still no separate chairs for the study of politics as a distinct empirical field of scholarship. With one or two exceptions the situation was much the same in Britain at this time, although in the United States political science had been a well-established discipline since early in the century, while the closely related subject of political sociology already had a strong tradition in continental Europe, particularly in Germany and Italy. When departments of political science (also sometimes called “politics”, sometimes “government”) were establishing themselves in the late 1940s, they naturally reflected their local origins, with prime attention being devoted to the structure and operation of Australian political institutions, the British background, and the history of political thought.

At the same time, however, courses on the political systems of certain major foreign countries were introduced, usually those which had impinged most massively on world events in the immediate past, namely the USA, the USSR and Germany. The study of these three systems also had the merit of linking contemporary history with important strands in modern political thought: liberal, Marxist and fascist. As the War receded into the past, Germany dropped out of our curricula, and in several universities it became the normal pattern for students of political science to spend half of their second year studying the United States and half studying Soviet Union. There were also cases where politics students could devote the whole of their second or third year to studying the Soviet system (of course they would normally be studying two other subjects as well as political science in any one year).

This pattern extended into the 1960s, but by this time the predominance of American and Soviet politics was being challenged by the introduction of courses on the politics and government of Asian countries, particularly Japan and China. Various intellectual currents also made themselves felt. The vogue for “political development” and for comparative studies, against the background of greater diversity among
socialist systems all claiming to be "Marxist-Leninist", led in several universities to the replacement of courses specifically on the USSR by courses on "comparative communism". Then came the great wave of political radicalisation and "student revolt" which swept Australian universities along with those of other western countries from the mid 1960s to the early 1970s. The very concept of objectivity in the social sciences was challenged, and their ideological role in the struggle to transform society was asserted. In this context courses on the USSR, China and "comparative communism" sometimes became a battleground between various left-wing sects contending for influence among students. For several years the strength of Maoist illusions tended to distract student interest from the USSR. These trends affected not only political science, but history, economics, and sociology as well, and they impeded the scholarly study of specific socialist countries.

Over the last decade the ideological fever has subsided, and the damage has been largely repaired. There is now a widespread interest in understanding the history and actuality of "developed socialism" in the USSR, and there are more specialists in the field than ever before. This last point deserves closer attention. In the first years after the War, courses on Soviet politics were taught by several gifted scholars with a close familiarity with the relevant western literature but a primary interest in other fields and untrained to work with Russian-language sources. The pioneer Australian specialists in the Soviet political system were two graduates of the University of Melbourne, L.G. Churchward and the present writer. Churchward's primary interest was originally the United States, but in 1945 he took over a course on Soviet politics which had been developed at Melbourne during the War by the New Zealand scholar I.F.G. Milner. Churchward later "retooled" to specialise in Soviet politics, learning Russian, and resumed teaching the course after a period in which it was taught by Hugo Wolfsohn. It was not long before he was publishing scholarly works in the field. Meanwhile, having graduated in political science and Russian, I had presented a Master's thesis on "The Soviet View on Southeast Asia" (the first thesis in an Australian university based on Soviet Russian-language sources), and after completing a Doctorate in the London School of Economics and Political Science, began to teach at the Canberra University College in the mid 1950s (from 1960 the Australian National University). From the 1960s the cadre of specialists in Soviet politics was augmented from three main sources. First there were Australian graduates who, like myself, learned their Russian as students and subsequently did postgraduate studies overseas (e.g. Graeme Gill, now at the University of Sydney). Secondly there were scholars born and wholly educated overseas, mostly in Britain.
or the United States (e.g. R.F. Miller and G.J. Jukes, now at the ANU, J. Miller, at La Trobe University, Melbourne, Leslie Holmes, University of Melbourne and Vendulka Kubalkova, from Czechoslovakia, until recently at the University of Queensland). Finally, there were Australian graduates, who also did their postgraduate work on Soviet politics in Australia, in all cases at the ANU. The first of these was J.W. Cleary, who completed his PhD in 1968 and taught at the University of Queensland until his tragic death in 1975. A more recent example is J. Besemeris, a graduate of the University of Melbourne who subsequently did postgraduate study at Oxford and worked for five years in Yugoslavia and Poland, before taking his PhD at the ANU, later holding a series of government and academic positions. Despite these advances, almost two-thirds of the political science departments in Australian universities still lack a specialist on the USSR.

Until the 1960s most courses on the Soviet political system were historically oriented. They usually began with lectures on Tsarist Russia, Marxism in Russia and the revolutions of 1917, and then considered political and social developments under War Communism, the NEP, collectivisation and industrialisation, the War, etc., though sometimes the periodisation was based on the primacy of different party leaders, viz. Lenin-interregnum-Stalin-interregnum-Khrushchev. In some cases considerable attention was paid to the structure and roles of the party and the principal institutions of the Soviet state. Intellectual approaches varied. Churchward, a member of the Communist Party of Australia, viewed the Soviet system sympathetically, in terms of Marxist concepts. More common was a sometimes rather crude model of "totalitarianism". In the last two decades various concepts evolved by western political scientists in the study of other political systems have been widely used in courses on Soviet politics: "political development", "political participation", "pluralism", "corporatism", etc. In general there has been more emphasis on the diversity and interplay of interests, and courses may touch on such special aspects as industrial and agricultural administration, party guidance of culture, theory and practice of nationality policy, foreign relations, etc. Courses may include some comparative lectures on other socialist states, but often concentrate exclusively on the USSR. Usually they may be taken in the second or third year of a political science major, and occupy a semester, although there are exceptions, e.g. the full-year course taught at La Trobe University devotes the first semester to the USSR and the second to the People's Republic of China and certain East European countries. Student numbers usually average between 30 and 70, but at Melbourne University they ranged from 120 to 160.

In addition to courses on the political systems of particular countries,
university departments of government or political science also offer courses of a comparative, theoretical or thematic kind, which not infrequently touch substantially on the USSR. This is notably the case in the sub-field of international relations, as might be expected. The leading example here is the University of Queensland, where in addition to her course on Soviet Politics, Dr Kubalkova taught four other courses (Introduction to International Relations, Foreign Policy of the Great Powers, Conceptions of World Politics, and International Communism), all of which devoted substantial attention to the USSR.

The study of Russian and Soviet history in Australian universities has now reached a level comparable with the study of Soviet politics and government. However, its development has been more recent and more dependent on scholars brought from overseas. Although such distinguished Australian historians as Manning Clark and Norman Harper had a long-standing interest in Russian history and sought to promote its teaching, their main interest lay elsewhere and it was not till the 1960s that the first specialists on Russia began to appear in our history departments. In 1963 Israel Getzler, a graduate of Melbourne University who was to receive his London University doctorate for his political biography of Julius Martov, introduced a course on Russian history in the University of Adelaide in collaboration with Dr Prajot Mukherjee. Three years later Dr Getzler moved to La Trobe University, where he established studies in Russian history which have persisted under a succession of specialists ever since. In 1967 Daphne Gollan, a history graduate of the University of Sydney, completed at the ANU her MA thesis on the Bolshevik party organisations inside Russia before World War I, this being the first Australian postgraduate research work on a Russian historical topic based on original Russian-language sources. Gollan assisted Professor Clark in teaching a course in modern Russian history, and on her appointment as lecturer, took over responsibility for the course herself. At Monash University George Kertesz introduced a Russian history course in 1968; this was taken over the following year by Melbourne University graduate Ian Cummins, who has taught it continuously since then, expanding it from a semester to a full-year course in 1977.

It was not till the 1970s, however, that Russia became an important field of historical study in Australia. Several trained specialists were recruited from abroad (from Britain David Christian to Macquarie University and E.P. Johnston to the University of Wollongong, from the USA T. Poole to the University of Queensland, F.S. Zuckerman to the University of Adelaide and L. Siegelbaum to La Trobe University, succeeding Dr Getzler on his departure for the Hebrew University of
Jerusalem). S.T. Leong, a Research Fellow in the ANU’s Department of Far Eastern History and author of a work on Russo-Chinese relations in the early post-revolutionary years, began teaching both Chinese and Russian history at the University of Melbourne, while at the University of New England Jennifer Crew, who had studied history and Russian at the University of Melbourne, introduced her course on modern Russian history. There were further developments in the 1980s. On the return of Lewis Siegelbaum to the United States, he was replaced by Melbourne-born Adrian Jones, who had written his MA thesis on a topic from the early Soviet period at La Trobe University, and was now a doctoral candidate of Harvard University. S.T. Leong was appointed Professor of History at Murdoch University, Western Australia, and was replaced at the University of Melbourne by Russia-specialist Dr Stephen Wheatcroft from the University of Birmingham, England. On the retirement of Daphne Gollan, the ANU appointed as lecturer in Russian history Elizabeth Waters, also from the University of Birmingham.

At the time of writing there are specialists in Russian history working in nine of Australia’s nineteen universities. All are modern historians, and typically the principal course on Russian history focuses on the period from the 1860s to about 1940s (sometimes later). Social and economic development are usually given considerable attention alongside political history. Occasionally there are additional courses on earlier periods (e.g. Zuckerman on Medieval Russia, Christian on Muscovy and Imperial Russia). There have also been courses bringing together the study of Russian literature and history, while at the ANU a course is taught in which scholars from various disciplines collaborate to examine the economic, social, political and cultural development of the USSR since 1917. All told many thousands of Australian university students have studied Russian history for at least a semester over the last quarter century.

Before outlining Australian research in the area of Soviet politics and history we should digress for a moment to note the special role of the Australian National University in Australian scholarship. The ANU was established after the Second World War to serve exclusively the purposes of research, and its various research schools retained their separate status and character after creation of regular faculties in the university following its absorption of the Canberra University College. Two of these schools are of interest to us: the Research School of Social Sciences and the Research School of Pacific Studies.

As indicated by the very title of the latter school, which exists alongside a separate Faculty of Asian Studies, an extraordinary proportion of the research resources available for the social sciences at the ANU has
been devoted to studying the countries of Asia and the Pacific. This of course reflects the greatly increased appreciation both in government circles and the general public of the importance of these areas to Australia and our lack of adequate knowledge of them. On the other hand most of the departments of the Research School of Social Sciences were concerned primarily with Australia. There was little realisation that the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe were another blank spot in Australian scholarship, and so no structural units or even particular posts were earmarked for work on this area. If, nevertheless, some significant research on the Soviet Union has been carried out in these two research schools, its scale has been inadequate and its pattern haphazard. In particular, although each of these research schools has a department of economics and one has a department of economic history, none of these departments contain a single economist specialising on the USSR. By the same token, there is no specialist on Russia in any of the research departments of history.

At the time of writing the staff of these schools includes seven scholars who carry out research related to the USSR: the Research School of Pacific Studies has Geoffrey Jukes in its Department of International Relations and Paul Dibb in its Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, while the Research School of Social Sciences has Dr T.H. Rigby, Dr Robert F. Miller and John Miller in its Political Science Department and Professor Eugene Kamenka and Dr Andrzej Walicki in its History of Ideas Unit. The departments concerned have not only produced a major proportion of Australian research on the USSR in their respective fields, but have also played the primary role in training young scholars in these fields and in bringing leading overseas specialists to take up visiting appointments in Australia.

The situation just outlined explains why the contribution of the ANU to Russian and Soviet studies has been very important in the field of political science, but relatively modest in that of history. But what has been the overall pattern of Australian published research in these fields? Most obviously it has been rather heavily concentrated on the twentieth century. The chief exceptions are Christian's work on Russian diets, Walicki's on the history of Russian thought and Zuckerman's on the Okhrana.

Interest in the years of revolution and civil war is reflected, inter alia, in books by Gill and Rigby. These authors have also published a number of articles relating to the evolution of the Soviet political system from the 1920s on, and Rigby has published a monograph on the history of recruitment and composition of the CPSU. Gill is currently engaged in a major study of the political system up to the 1930s.

Other studies focus on aspects of the Soviet socio-political order as it
has operated over the last generation. Churchward has published a textbook on the Soviet political system which has been widely used in Britain and the United States as well as Australia.\textsuperscript{29} He has also written a monograph on the Soviet intelligentsia and more recently a general work on Soviet society.\textsuperscript{30}

Several short monographs on aspects of Soviet politics and administration have appeared in the Occasional Papers series published by the Department of Political Science in the ANU's Research School of Social Sciences.\textsuperscript{31}

A number of volumes have appeared based on papers presented at academic conferences called to discuss various often controversial topics. The very first publication in the Australasian Political Studies Association's (APSA) monograph series published a quarter century ago comprised conference papers presented by L.G. Churchward and T.H. Rigby on the direction of Soviet political development.\textsuperscript{32} A later conference collection edited by Dr Marian Sawer offers a variety of views on political participation in the USSR and other socialist countries.\textsuperscript{33} A volume on aspects of the career and policies of the Soviet political leader N.S. Khrushchev was also based on a discussion held at an APSA conference.\textsuperscript{34} Special discussions organised at the ANU have also given rise to collective volumes.\textsuperscript{35}

Australian research on Soviet foreign policy and defence has been largely concentrated in the ANU's Research School of Pacific Studies, and in particular its Department of International Relations, its Centre for Strategic and Defence Studies, and its Peace Studies Centre, all of which concern themselves not only with Australian and regional problems, but also with global questions, including the policies of the "superpowers" and their mutual relationships.\textsuperscript{36} Studies focusing specifically on the USSR include an important recent monograph by Paul Dibb.\textsuperscript{37} J.T.G. Jukes has written a number of significant works, including a study on the role of the Soviet Union in Asia, and accounts of the major battles between the Soviet Union and Germany during the Second World War.\textsuperscript{38} Vendulka Kubalkova, for some years a Research Fellow in the ANU and later lecturer at the University of Queensland, has co-authored with A.A. Cruikshank a number of theoretical works on international relations concerned largely with the USSR.\textsuperscript{39}

As compared with history and political science, the development of Russian and Soviet studies in the field of economics has so far been relatively modest. The chief reason is the preoccupation of our economics faculties with the theory and practice of capitalist market economies, which of course answers the professional needs of economists.
trained to work in Australian governmental and private organisations. Nevertheless some progress has been made over the last two decades. Perhaps the most significant achievement is that half of our universities now offer courses on the economic development of the USSR. In a couple of cases these are comparative courses dealing also with Western Europe or the United States, but most of them focus on Russian and Soviet economic development from about the 1860s to more or less the present day. (The University of New South Wales offers in alternate years courses on the Economic and Social History of Russia 1700-1917 and on Soviet Economic History since 1917). It is true that most of these courses are taught by scholars whose main research interest lies in some other direction, but their importance is that they offer a substantial proportion of our economics students their only opportunity of studying the Soviet economic system and its historical development. Here and there courses on such topics as “Marxism and Economics”, “Marxian Political Economy”, “Socialist Economic Systems”, “Soviet Economic Theory” or “Comparative Economic Systems” give more or less substantial consideration of the theory and/or practice of the Soviet economic system. Such courses are often taught by economists with a strong professional interest in centrally-planned economies of the Soviet type, such as Dr I. Gordijew and Mr I. Bernasek of Macquarie University, Dr L. Haddad and Mr J. Halevi of the University of Sydney, Dr T. Riha of the University of Queensland, Dr L. Csapo of La Trobe University and Dr A. Schnytzer of Griffith University.

A number of difficulties conspire to discourage the young Australian scholar wishing to specialise on the Soviet economy, among them the indifference of most of his or her fellow economists, the poverty, outside Canberra, of specialised library holdings, and the near total neglect of the Soviet economy in the research schools of the ANU (not to mention the necessity of acquiring the necessary language skills, which of course, they share with fellow social scientists in other fields). So far very few have surmounted these obstacles. One is Dr Gordijew, who in 1975 presented at the University of New South Wales his dissertation on “Sources of Investible Funds for Soviet Industry, 1961-1970” and has since published some dozen scholarly papers on various aspects of the Soviet economy. Another is Dr Haddad of the University of Sydney, who wrote his PhD thesis at the ANU on Soviet Foreign Trade (1967) and has also published several articles on the Soviet economic system. B.M.J. McFarlane, although Professor of Political Science in the University of Adelaide, is primarily interested in the political economy of socialism, and his publications include a number of papers on the Soviet economy.

Two other political scientists who have contributed substantially to
the study of the Soviet economy are Paul Dibb and Robert F. Miller. The most distinguished specialist to work in Australia on the economic system of the USSR and related socialist countries has been Professor Josef Wilczynski, who was born in Poland, did his university studies in England, and taught for many years in Canberra in the economics department of the Faculty of Military Studies of the University of New South Wales. His nine books and dozens of articles and shorter monographs won him a wide international reputation, and his early death in 1984 was a serious loss to Soviet economic studies in Australia.

There are a few sociologists in Australian universities who take a serious scholarly interest in Soviet society in the context of general social theory, although Dr Jan Pakulski of the University of Tasmania is the only one currently engaged in teaching and research with a substantial empirical orientation. The disciplines mentioned - history, political science, economics and sociology - account for the overwhelming majority of Australia’s social scientists working on Russia and the Soviet Union. Among the scattering of scholars in other disciplines, however, some are engaged in work of considerable importance. Dr R.F. Price of the School of Education at La Trobe University has taught since 1973 a course at the (postgraduate) level of Bachelor of Education on “Marx and Education in Russia and China” and has published a number of significant studies in this field. Alice Tay, Professor of Jurisprudence in the University of Sydney, pioneered the teaching of Soviet Law in Australia at the ANU from the 1960s and later in her present University, and has written extensively on this subject, as well as on Chinese law. Dr A.D. Grishin of the ANU’s Fine Arts Department has worked on both medieval and twentieth century Russian painting. And as a final example, Dr J.F. Besemer, while known primarily as a political scientist, has published important work on demographic trends and policies in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Taking the social sciences as a whole, one must observe that teaching and research on Russia and the USSR remain uneven in scale and quality between different disciplines, and in some fields are still relatively underdeveloped. Yet parts of our work have commanded considerable international attention and if one recalls that a quarter century ago our universities contained altogether barely three or four specialists in the field it is fair to conclude that in this period Australian social scientists have at last “discovered” Russia.

Scholarly Contacts

Constant communication and interaction between scholars is a condition
of progress in any field of intellectual endeavour. In Australia such scholarly contacts must contend with "the tyranny of distance" - the dispersal of a relatively small population over a very large area remote from the main centres of world science and culture. Modern transport and communications have eased but not removed the problem. It is no wonder that Australian scholars are such inveterate participants in both domestic and international conferences, and that Australian universities have evolved arrangements which allow nearly all their academic staff to spend periods of study and research overseas. Australian scholars publish a substantial part of their work in the journals of their own scholarly associations, or with local publishers, but like their colleagues in other smaller countries, tend to offer some of their best works to overseas (mainly British and American) journals or publishers, in order to bring it more quickly to the attention of the international scholarly community.

The pressures inducing these patterns are felt with particular force by those specialising in the study of foreign countries, including our Australian Russianists and "Sovietologists", who, as we have seen, are still rather few in number and dispersed among a variety of disciplines and localities. One response has been the formation of special "panels" at the conferences of the "discipline" associations, notably at those of the Australian Universities Language and Literature Association, the Australian Political Studies Association, and the Australasian Association for European History. A further step was the formation of their own interdisciplinary associations. The Australian and New Zealand Slavists Association (ANZSA) was formed in 1966 and in 1986 had a membership of twenty-eight, the majority specialising primarily on Russia and most working in the fields of language or literature. Then in 1975 the Australasian Association for Study of the Socialist Countries (AASSC) was established and now has a membership of nearly two hundred, of whom about two-fifths are interested primarily in the USSR. The most recent breakdown of AASSC members by discipline showed that thirty-seven per cent were specialists in politics and administration, fifteen per cent language and literature, fourteen per cent history, fourteen per cent economics, six per cent sociology and five per cent international relations. Both of these associations hold regular conferences and publish their own newsletters, usually twice a year. Finally, there now exists a national interdisciplinary journal. This grew out of Melbourne Slavonic Papers, founded in 1967 on the initiative of Nina Christesen. In 1970 it became the official organ of ANZSA and nineteen issues appeared up to 1986. In that year representatives of ANZSA and AASSC began to explore the feasibility of superseding Melbourne Slavonic Papers with a joint interdisciplinary journal, and in 1987 the first issue
of the *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies* appeared.

Meanwhile Australian scholars have presented papers at all World Congresses of Slavists and International Congresses on Soviet and East European Studies. Dr T.H. Rigby was one of the founders of the International Committee on Soviet and East European Studies and Professor Boris Christa is one of its current members.

Of fundamental importance to Australian students of Russia and the USSR is, of course, the feasibility of visiting the USSR, studying in its institutions of higher learning, conducting research in its institutes, libraries and archives, and holding discussions with Soviet colleagues. Naturally, Soviet Australianists have a reciprocal interest, and meanwhile there are many other fields of intellectual endeavour where Soviet and Australian scholars have overlapping research or teaching concerns and can benefit from the exchange of ideas and experiences. It is on this basis that substantial academic exchanges have developed between the USSR and Australia over the last quarter century. In many respects these resemble the exchange arrangements which the Soviet Union maintains with a number of other western countries, but they differ from most of the latter in that until recently they have proceeded by way of bilateral agreements between particular institutions rather than overall agreements at the national level. Indeed, up till the late 1970s they were channelled predominantly through the direct exchange between the Moscow State University (MGU) and the ANU.

The first contacts between the latter universities date from 1959, and within two years had blossomed into an agreement for the reciprocal exchange each year of up to three junior scholars for up to a year. In 1963 it was augmented by provision for two visits of senior scholars annually for periods of about six weeks to take place in each direction. These opportunities were put to good use by both sides. Up to 1979 eleven senior Soviet scholars were guests of the ANU while twelve senior Australian scholars visited MGU. The prohibitions were less balanced in the case of junior colleagues: seventeen from MGU to ANU and forty-three from ANU to MGU. The difference was apparently accounted for in large part by the extensive use of the exchange by Australian specialists in Russian language and literature, whereas few Soviet specialists in English and literature in English prefer to visit Australia rather than, say, the United States or Britain. Of the fifty-five visitors from ANU to MGU, twenty-four were Russianists, fifteen other specialists in humanities or social sciences, seven physical scientists, one biological scientist and eight from mathematics, statistics or computing. For some years MGU also seconded a Russian-language teacher to the ANU. In a few cases both sides allotted places in the exchange
to scholars whose primary affiliation was with some other scholarly institutions, but the great majority were scholars based in MGU or ANU themselves. Thus, invaluable though it was, this exchange could not really substitute for an overall national-level exchange.

In 1967 Professor Malakhovsky, Head of the Oceania Division of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, spent some time in Canberra under the MGU and ANU exchange, and largely on his initiative this led to a fruitful continuing relationship between the Institute and the ANU. In 1970 the Institute’s director, Academician B.G. Gafurov, held discussions in Canberra with ANU representatives, and signed an agreement under which a number of scholars were exchanged between these two institutions in the following years.

During this period certain other Australian Universities evinced interest in establishing similar bilateral arrangements with Soviet partners, and an agreement was in fact reached between Leningrad University and Monash University. Unfortunately, however, a practice of exchanges never eventuated.

In 1975, after extended discussions, an agreement on cultural cooperation was reached between the governments of the USSR and Australia, and this was later broadened to include a limited program of scholarly exchanges. The first scholarly visits were to have been made in 1980. Unfortunately, they never took place. The Australian Government of Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser suspended the operation of the agreement as part of a package of measures taken to express Australia’s opposition to the introduction of Soviet troops into Afghanistan. The Government also requested the universities and other cultural and educational institutions to discontinue temporarily their bilateral exchange with Soviet partners, and since they made it clear that they would deny entry visas to Soviet scholars the continuance of such bilateral exchanges became in practice impossible.

Strong opposition to this policy soon emerged, and the Government was urged to drop it by a variety of bodies, including the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee (representing the universities), the Australian Political Studies Association, and the Australasian Association for the Study of the Socialist Countries. It should be said that the great majority of opponents of the Australian Government’s suspension of academic exchanges with the USSR were also highly critical of Soviet actions in Afghanistan; they argued, however, that suspension was not in Australia’s national interests, and pointed out that similar measures had not been taken on previous occasions of serious disagreement between Australia and the USSR (e.g. during the Vietnam War), nor had any other western
governments, including those of the USA and the UK, suspended all scholarly exchanges in connection with developments in Afghanistan.

In the event, it was not until after the Australian elections of 1983 that the Prime Minister of the new Labor Party Government, R.J. Hawke, announced that it would drop all measures obstructing cultural and scholarly exchanges on the grounds that they were an inappropriate manner of expressing opposition to Soviet policies in Afghanistan. Much damage had meanwhile been done. It was not until 1985, following the negotiation of a program on Cultural Cooperation, that the first exchanges of scholars under the government-level agreement took place. Exchanges resumed between ANU and the Soviet Institute of Oriental Studies, and the institute also initiated a similar exchange with the University of Queensland. In 1984 a series of annual discussions on international issues was initiated, alternately in Moscow and Canberra, between the representatives of the ANU and the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Finally, in March 1987 an agreement was signed in Moscow to restore the bilateral exchange between MGU and ANU. This provides for reciprocal visits of senior scholars for a total of up to eight months a year each way, and of junior scholars for a total of up to twenty months a year each way. Such contacts seem bound to expand in the future, as they reflect an appreciation both of the practical reciprocal benefits they bring, as well as the importance of maximising human contacts and mutual understanding between the citizens of different countries, whatever their differences of interest, outlook or socio-political arrangements.

In this chapter we have attempted a general account of the development and present state of scholarly activities in Australia relating to Russia and the Soviet Union. The account is far from complete. Considerations of space have dictated that we focus on the central institutions of Australian scholarship, namely the universities. Yet there are quite a number of other tertiary educational institutions providing courses of Russian history, Soviet education, government, economic development, etc., and they contain several scholars doing substantial original work, such as Dr Ross Chambers of the Riverina College of Advanced Education (history of Russian thought), Dr Alexander Kouzmin of the Canberra CAE (administration) and Dr June Hearn of Victoria College, Toorak (political economy). But serious intellectual enquiry and debate are not confined to academic institutions, nor are contributions to knowledge a monopoly of full-time scholars, and Australian public awareness and understanding of Russia would be immeasurably poorer were it not for the contributions of gifted writers, diplomats and journalists through the medium of serious journals, the information
media, and such voluntary associations as the Australian Institute of International Affairs. Nor has our account been exhaustive even so far as the universities are concerned. For one thing, it is impossible even to mention all the scholars whose work has in one way or another advanced the study of Russia in this century. One thinks, first, of the many in junior teaching positions whose contributions are often essential to the maintenance of effective courses. But there are more senior scholars, too, who have slipped through our analysis of teaching courses and published research, while nevertheless doing much to stimulate interest in Russia within their own discipline (e.g. Professor Henry Mayer and Dr Peter King of Sydney University's Department of Government), as controversialists (e.g. Dr Frank Knopfelmacher of the University of Melbourne) or through a major scholarly interest secondary to their main one (e.g. leading poet and professor of English at the Australian National University A.D. Hope) - and one could cite many others.

And finally, we have said nothing about the contributions which Australian graduates have made or are making to teaching and research on Russia in other countries, mostly in Britain, Germany and North America. Perhaps the best known are Professor Sheila Fitzpatrick (Soviet history, University of Texas) and Katerina Clark (Soviet literature, Yale University), both graduates of the University of Melbourne, but there have been several others in a variety of fields.

Enough has been written, however, to demonstrate that the study of Russia and the USSR is now firmly established in Australian universities, providing courses in a variety of disciplines attended all told by some thousands of students each year, generating a substantial amount of significant scholarly publication, commanding a measure of influence and respect overseas, and contributing to a more objective and better-informed awareness of the USSR among the Australian public.

A 1990 Postscript

The two years since Australia's bicentenary have seen the most momentous changes in the Soviet Union since the 1920s. Whatever shocks and setbacks the near future may hold, Russia now seems set to follow the countries of Eastern Europe in throwing off Communist Party rule and normalising its relations with the rest of the world, while at the same time restoring to full strength its links with the national heritage.

This faces Russianists and "Sovietologists" around the world with the daunting task of accurately monitoring and interpreting these changes as they unfold, thus helping their own countries and fellow-citizens to relate effectively to the newly emergent Russia. How well placed are we in
Australia to meet this challenge?

It would be going beyond our brief to catalogue here all the relevant changes in personnel and in teaching and research programs that have occurred since the bicentennial year. In overall terms their scale, coverage and distribution remain much as we have described them above. Despite the gaps and weaknesses we have pointed to, this provides a reasonable basis for responding to a radically changed Russia, so long as existing points of strength are maintained and resources are marshalled and where necessary reinforced to focus on newly emergent problems. There are some encouraging signs. With the retirement of Boris Christa as Professor of Russian at the University of Queensland in early 1990, the Russian Department there could look back on twenty-five years of expansion and consolidation; it also took the opportunity to plan new teaching courses and research initiatives for the future - in the areas of intensive language courses and Soviet media studies, in the development of interdisciplinary courses in European studies, in the expansion of the Queensland Russian Archive and in forging new links with teaching institutions in the USSR. The University of Melbourne has appointed its Soviet specialist Dr Leslie Holmes as Professor of Political Science, signed an exchange agreement with the Soviet Institute of Oriental Studies and, in a development of great potential importance, has established, with substantial assistance from the Victorian Education Foundation, a Centre for Soviet and East European Studies, headed by economics historian Dr Stephen Wheatcroft. The Australian National University has launched a substantially funded Transformation of Communist Systems Project in which specialists on the USSR, China and other communist-ruled or ex-communist countries are co-operating in a program of research, conferences and publications.

Whatever its future as a "superpower", there is little doubt that Russia will remain a major force in Europe and Asia in the coming decades, and that the new Russia will go on enriching one of the great traditions in world civilisation. Australian universities will have a vital role in fostering an understanding of Russian political, economic and cultural developments and in maximising the benefits that may flow from them, as well, perhaps, as making some small contribution to assisting the positive processes of change and easing the pain and dangers these entail.
Notes


3. See Travers, Slavonic Languages in Australia since 1958, p. 5.

4. In certain departments those students with a native knowledge of Russian or its equivalent proceed directly to more advanced courses. At the University of Melbourne these constitute about twenty percent of first-year students.

5. Nina Christesen’s own publications have been concerned largely with L.N. Tolstoy and those of the late Dmitri Grishin with Dostoevsky. Nina Christesen has also a close interest in Soviet prose and poetry and another of her interests is Russian settlers in Australia, reflected in the series of short monographs, Russians in Australia.


7. Soviet Writers and Society constitutes one half of a course in Soviet Studies, the other half being taken in the Political Science or History department.


Baiba Metuzale-Kangere, author of *A Derivational Dictionary of Latvian* (Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1985), took her MA and PhD at Monash University in Latvian linguistics. Latvian has also been taught by Dr T.G. Fennell in the Linguistics Department of Adelaide’s Flinders University since 1968; annual enrolments are 25-30, and students in Sydney and Melbourne may undertake the course with local tutorial assistance.

The coming-of-age of Ukrainian studies at Monash University was marked by devotion of a special issue of the Canadian *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (no. 18, Summer 1985) to work by Monash scholars.

For examples former lecturer Dr Andrew Field (1968-74) specialised on the works of Vladimir Nabokov, while Dr Kevin Windle (1974-81) translated several works by contemporary Russian and Polish writers. One should add, however, that Dr A.G.E. Speirs (1966-83) was a specialist in Slavonic and Indo-European Philology.

Courses offered by the department not requiring a knowledge of Russian range from those surveying Russian civilisation in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, through general courses on specific writers (Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and Chekhov). There is also a course on Slavonic folk literature.

Courses in Polish were provided for a few years; these no longer exist, but ANU students may take Polish and other Slavonic languages by special arrangement with Macquarie University.

Rosh Ireland of the Russian Section is convenor of the interdepartmental field program on Drama, and is a joint convenor of the Field Program in Russian Studies, while Dr Liudmila Kouzmin is convenor of the Migrant Studies field program. Russian Section staff teach the large literary component of the History Department’s course, “The Legacy of Revolution on Russia and the Soviet Union since 1917”.

Russian Drama of the Nineteenth Century, Russian Drama of the Twentieth Century, Russia and its Writers.


Although I was in charge of Russian language and literature at this time, I also gave lecture courses on the Soviet political system.

years previously Hope Verity Fitzhardinge had presented her path-breaking MA thesis, “Russian-Australian Relations in the Nineteenth Century”, also at the ANU. Fitzhardinge went on to complete a PhD thesis on “The Establishment of the North-West Frontier of Afghanistan, 1884-1888” (ANU, 1968). A related PhD thesis was W.M. Hale’s “Afghanistan, Britain and Russia, 1905-1921” (ANU, 1966).


22. Dr Raymond Hutchings worked in the Economic History Department for three years during the 1960s.

23. As noted, there is a Russianist, currently Dr Elizabeth Waters, in the History Department of the Arts Faculty.


25. Walicki’s numerous works include A History of Russian Thought from the Enlightenment to Marxism (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1979). This was written before his coming to the ANU, where he has continued to publish extensively on the history of Russian and Polish thought. A further work to be noted in this connection is Ian Cummins, Marx, Engels and National Movements (London: Croom Helm, 1980), which contains a substantial section on Russia.


Apart from numerous articles and monographs on the development and administration of the Soviet economic system, Miller has published the standard work in English on the machine-tractor stations, namely *One Hundred Thousand Tractors. The MTS and the Development of Controls in Soviet Agriculture* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970).

*The Economics of the East-West Trade* (London: Macmillan, 1969); *The Economics of Socialism: Principles Governing the Operation of the Centrally Planned Economies under the New System* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1970; this book went through four editions and was translated into seven languages); *Socialist Economic Development and Reform* (London: Macmillan, 1972); *Profit, Risk and Incentives under Socialist Economic Planning* (London:

43. On the theoretical level, interesting and controversial work has been published in recent years by five scholars of Hungarian origin, namely Professor Ivan Szelenyi, Dr Agnes Heller, Dr Ferenc Fehér, Dr Maria Markus and Dr Gyorgy Markus. The first three have now moved to American universities.


46. It should be noted that while most AASSC members are scholars working in Australian universities, quite a few of them have only a subsidiary interest in one or other of the socialist countries and so do not conduct research using source materials in the language concerned.
This important collection of essays by leading Australian and Soviet specialists looks at the unique and surprisingly close relationship that has developed between the two countries over the past two centuries.

Russia and the Fifth Continent: Aspects of Russian-Australian Relations provides new insight into the successive phases of the “Russian-Australian connection” from the Russian “scares” of the nineteenth century to the establishment of diplomatic relations during World War II, from the bleak years of the Cold War to the emergence of a new Soviet interest in the Pacific under Gorbachev. This book also reassesses the generally under-valued contribution of Russian immigrants to Australian social, cultural and political life.

Essays range from trade and immigration to a survey, and bibliography, of Australian studies in the USSR. Among the contributors are the late Manning Clark, and the pioneer of Australian studies in the USSR, Kim Malakhovsky.