

Department of Humanities, Northumbria University

Honours Dissertation

**Russian Exiles in Britain, 1918–1926: The Politics and
Culture of Russia Abroad**

Daniel Harold

BA Hons History

2015

This dissertation has been made available on condition that anyone who consults it recognises that its copyright rests with its author and that quotation from the thesis and/or the use of information derived from it must be acknowledged. © Daniel Harold.

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of BA (Hons) History.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	3
Introduction	4
Chapter One: The Russian Refugees in British Politics and Society	10
Chapter Two: <i>Émigré</i> Political Activism in Britain	24
Chapter Three: Russian <i>Émigré</i> Culture in Britain	37
Conclusion	50
Bibliography	55

List of Abbreviations

BFO	British Foreign Office
CDP	Constitutional Democratic Party
FO	Foreign Office
HC	House of Commons
KP	<i>Kadet</i> Party (<i>Cadet</i> Party)
NHRC	National Hands Off Russia Committee
NRA	North Russian Association
RLC	Russian Liberation Committee (Former Russian Liberation Union)
RNC	Russian National Committee
RNU	Russian National Union
ROC	Russian Orthodox Church
RPC	Russia Political Conference
RRC	Russian Red Cross (Also known as Red Cross Society)
YMCA	Young Men's The Christian Association

It is worth noting that Russian exiles that are referred to in this dissertation used a variety of different ways to spell their own name throughout their life. This dissertation refers to exiles by their most common name published in English after 1918. For example Pavel Miliukov's name is spelt like this throughout, yet other spelling variations exist (e.g. Pavel Milyoukov, Paul Milukoff).

Introduction

‘Berlin housed the largest concentration of Russian *émigrés*, succeeded by Paris and then New York City, but every capital city had its Russian colony in the interwar period.’¹

(Robert C. Williams).

Although the preceding statement is true, many Russian *émigré* communities have been neglected by historians including the first wave of Russian refugees who resided in Britain. This dissertation aims to address the disregard of the exile community in London, and *émigré* activity within Britain following the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. First of all, this dissertation acknowledges that there has been limited coverage of the *émigré* community in London. Charlotte Alston provided a detailed review of the Russian Liberation Committee’s activity in Britain, while Vasiliï Zakharov provided a historical and biographical account on the *émigré* community as he ‘was a child in the thirties’, and knew members of the community that arrived in Britain during the first wave.² However, apart from these exceptions, the Russian refugees in Britain have simply been referred to as an exile community that ‘was consequently greater than its size and resources’.³ Marc Raeff acknowledges his research on Russia Abroad communities did not cover every *émigré* activity or institution, therefore neglecting the exiles in Britain, yet his study of the emigration is essential in order to understand the characteristics of a typical Russia Abroad community. Furthermore, his research is essential for understanding how close *émigré* communities remained with one another, even though they were geographically divided. This dissertation will argue the Russia Abroad in Britain shared similar

¹ Robert C. Williams, ‘The Emigration’, in Edward Acton et al. (eds.), *Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution 1914-1921* (London: Hodder Headline, 1997), p.508.

² Charlotte Alston, ‘The Work of the Russian Liberation Committee in London, 1919–1924’ *Slavonica*, Vol. 14, No.1 (2008), pp. 1–11; Vasiliï Zakharov, *No Snow on Their Boots: About the First Russian Emigration to Britain* (London: Basileus Press, 2004), p.7.

³ Catherine Andreyev and Ivan Savicky, *Russia Abroad: Prague and the Russian Diaspora, 1918-1938* (London: Yale University Press, 2004), p.185.

characteristics with other Russian refugee communities, while analysing the differences. It thus fills a gap in the historiography of Russia Abroad.

Despite the fact there has been a neglect within the historiography in regards to the first wave of Russian refugees that resided in Britain, there has been a vast amount of secondary literature published on several exoduses after the outbreak of the First World War, which as a consequence has led to the twentieth century to be labelled as the age of the refugee.⁴ Peter Gatrell has published several publications on refugees including displaced people within Russia, and how the political upheavals in 1917-21 produced additional refugees by displacing many internally, and externally to ‘escape consequences of revolution and civil war’.⁵ Gatrell further produced literature on refugees and thus addressed the international memory of exiled ‘White’ Russians, Armenians and other exoduses in the interwar period.⁶ Other historians including Tony Kushner have focused on refugee displacement within the twentieth century, yet played little attention to the small influx of Russian exiles during the first wave of emigration. Kushner briefly addressed a section of Sir John Hope Simpson’s report on *The Refugee Problem* (1939) and thus assumed the first wave of Russian refugees integrated into British society.⁷ This dissertation will argue in chapter one that Kushner and Simpson’s interpretations are not completely correct, while addressing why there was small influx of Russian refugees in Britain through the analysis of British Government policy. Furthermore, the first chapter aims to provide information to prove that the *émigrés* in Britain

⁴ Panikos Panayi and Pippa Virdee (eds.), *Refugees and the End of Empire: Imperial Collapse and Force Migration in the Twentieth Century* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p.1; James E. Hassel, ‘Russian Refugees In France and the United States Between the World Wars’ *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* Vol. 81, No.7 (1992), p.1.

⁵ Peter Gatrell, *A Whole Empire Walking: Refugees in Russia During World War I* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), p.194.

⁶ Peter Gatrell, *The Making of the Modern Refugee* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), p.52.

⁷ Tony Kushner and Katharine Knox, *Refugees in an Age of Genocide: Global National and Local Perspectives during the Twentieth Century* (London: Frank Cass, 1999), p.5.

remained isolated to an extent which corresponds with Raeff's interpretation. He suggested Russia Abroad communities resisted the integration process.⁸

Indeed, other historians have illustrated similar characteristics to Raeff's interpretation of how Russia Abroad communities functioned. John Glad produced a large edition of Russia Abroad communities, and individuals of the first three waves of Russian exiles in the twentieth century. He assessed individual cities of Russian communities, including a brief assessment on refugees in Britain.⁹ Although his text provided little on *émigrés* in Britain, it was useful for demonstrating the mass geographical area of exiled Russian communities. Other Russia Abroad literature must be acknowledged, including Catherine Andreyev and Ivan Savicky's text which addresses the Russian *diaspora* community in Prague. Their edition analyses how Prague developed into the capital of Russia Abroad academia, due to the role of the *émigrés* and the Czechoslovakian Government, which aimed to preserve Russian cultural heritage through literary and scholarly publications.¹⁰ Education was significant for maintaining Russian cultural identity and thus Russian faculties were founded in the early 1920s.¹¹ In regards to this dissertation, the secondary literature highlights the *émigrés'* belief in preserving Russian culture for the future, and how important education and *émigré* organizations were for maintaining culture.

Other historians have analysed the presence of Russian exile communities in countries such as France and Germany. Robert H. Johnston focused on the *émigré* community in Paris which became the political and cultural capital of the Russia Abroad communities.¹² Similar to Johnston's research, James Hassel provided a comparison between exile communities in Paris and New York, which demonstrated that the community of 6,000 in New York had similar

⁸ Marc Raeff, *Russia Abroad: A Cultural History of the Russian Emigration 1919–1939* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), p.4.

⁹ John Glad, *Russia Abroad: Writers, History, Politics* (Washington: Hermitage & Birchbark, 1999), p.212.

¹⁰ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.64.

¹¹ *Ibid*, p.89.

¹² Robert H. Johnston, *New Mecca, New Babylon?: Paris and the Russian Exiles, 1920–1945* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988), p.20.

characteristics to the 50,000 strong Russia Abroad in Paris.¹³ Hassel's journal article was essential for this dissertation, because it suggested that the smaller communities would contain similar features to larger communities and thus the *émigrés* in Britain could potentially share these characteristics. Similar to Raeff's research, Hassel provides some analysis on what were the prominent features of Russia Abroad: the presence of a Russian Orthodox Church, the presence of upper class and well educated refugees, the role of the *émigré* press and organizations.¹⁴ Furthermore, Robert C. Williams confirmed the importance of the church, the press and *émigré* organizations for preserving Russian communities in Germany.¹⁵ Williams demonstrated why there was such a large influx of refugees within Germany. This was due to the geographical location of Germany in comparison to other European countries, and the low value of the mark enabled cheap *émigré* printing.¹⁶ Orlando Figes further elaborates the importance of these *émigré* efforts to maintain their own community and indicates the importance of exile culture for resisting the integration process.¹⁷

All of the secondary literature previously listed briefly refers to *émigré* politics and Serguei Glebov has reviewed the role of political factions in Paris.¹⁸ Chapter two of this dissertation argues that political organizations within the refugee community in Britain shared an anti-Bolshevik political attitude. Previous political factions from Russia were in exile, yet the general political motive was to oppose the Bolshevik ideology, as the *émigrés* wanted to return to the motherland without facing political persecution.¹⁹ This unified political stance was evident in most exile communities, and before the Russian Civil War was concluded a vast amount of propaganda was produced, and directed at the Allied powers, to encourage further

¹³ Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.58.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Robert C. Williams, *Culture in Exile: Russian Émigrés in Germany 1881–1941* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972), p.121.

¹⁶ Ibid, p.112.

¹⁷ Orlando Figes, *Natasha's Dance: A Cultural History of Russia* (London: Penguin, 2002), p.537.

¹⁸ Serguei Glebov, "'Congressess of Russia Abroad' in the 1920s and Politics of Émigré Nationalism: A Liberal Survival', *Ab Imperio*, Vol. 1, No. 3/4 (2000), p.162.

¹⁹ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.8.

military intervention.²⁰ In the third chapter, this dissertation provides clarification as to whether Russian refugees in Britain maintained Russian culture, in an attempt to avoid the integration process, and to preserve their heritage for future generations in the hope of returning to Russia. This dissertation's overall aim is to fill the gap in the historiography in regards to the exiles in Britain. The Russia Abroad in Britain should share similar characteristics to other communities, which makes the secondary literature listed in this introduction essential for understanding how the community in London was maintained.

In order to discuss the politics and cultural activity of the Russian refugees in Britain, this dissertation aims to use a variety of primary sources. To clarify there was a small influx of Russian refugees, and to discuss why there were problems with data, this dissertation will address Sir John Hope Simpson's report of a survey *The Refugee Problem* (1939) along with some secondary sources.²¹ Furthermore, the use of *Parliamentary Hansard* is used throughout the dissertation to demonstrate government opinion, while *The Times* newspaper will be used to demonstrate British public opinion. Although these primary sources are essential for this dissertation, there are more important primary sources for addressing the political and cultural activity of the *émigré* community in Britain. This dissertation will show how various *émigré* organizations produced periodicals in an effort to persuade British public opinion, and to inform the *émigré* community in London of developments in Russia. *The New Russia* published by the RLC and the *Russian Outlook* published by a combination of Russian and English sympathizers of the refugee's common cause, are two of the most frequently used periodicals within this dissertation. Other primary sources such as Pavel Miliukov's individual publications will be addressed in the second chapter, while W. Chapin Huntington's text on *The Homesick Million* (1933) will be frequently referred to support this dissertation's evidence.²² Furthermore, Michael Glenny and Norman Stone's volume *The Other Russia* contains five

²⁰ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.121; Alston, 'Russian Liberation Committee', p.1.

²¹ Sir John Hope Simpson, *The Refugee Problem Report of a Survey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939).

²² W. Chapin Huntington, *The Homesick Million: Russia-out-of-Russia* (Boston: The Alpine Press, 1933), p.1

memoirs which will be referred to throughout, to demonstrate how the exiles lived within Britain, and to provide analysis of various organizations.²³ The memoir of Masha Leonidovna Pushchina (Lady Masha Williams) appeared within this collection and is a significant source for this dissertation. Additionally, an interview between Masha and Ian Skidmore of the BBC in 1989 is also crucial for this dissertation.²⁴ The interview confirmed particular events published in her memoir while adding additional information to this dissertation. Therefore, through the use of various primary sources this dissertation aims to fill the gap in Russia Abroad historiography, which has neglected the refugees in Britain.

²³ Michael Glenny and Norman Stone (eds.), *The Other Russia: The Experience of Exile* (London: Faber, 1991).

²⁴ 'Times remembered (1). Lady Williams', interview with Ian Skidmore BBC 4, 30 July 1987 (digitized at the British Library, Boston Spa), 8/12/2014.

Chapter One:

The Russian Refugees in British Politics and Society

Introduction

In order to understand why only 4,000–5,000²⁵ Russian exiles remained within the United Kingdom following the Bolshevik revolution and the Russian Civil War, this dissertation chapter will focus on Britain's immigration policy in the early twentieth century. This chapter examines why Britain adopted such a strict immigration policy, and how legislation caused fewer Russian *émigrés* to seek asylum in Britain in comparison to other nations. Historian Marc Raeff suggested that the common opinion amongst the first wave of Russian exiles which left Russia, was that they believed a return to Russia was inevitable.²⁶ They believed that their exile would be short term and Bolshevism would not last. This common belief amongst Russian communities from 'Paris to Paraguay' created a consciousness of non-integration, and a common opinion that assimilation was not an option.²⁷ Raeff acknowledges that he did not cover every *émigré* community in his research, yet he demonstrates how the assimilation process did not occur until after the Second World War.²⁸ This dissertation will elaborate on this issue and therefore address a gap in the historiography. Tony Kushner agrees with Sir John Hope Simpson's interpretation that the Russian *émigrés* in Britain were able to 'mix freely' amongst the English.²⁹ This chapter will demonstrate how Simpson's vague claim was true to an extent, yet the *émigrés* did maintain their own Russia Abroad community in London, thus corresponding with Raeff's general interpretation.

²⁵ Kushner and Knox, *Refugees in an Age of Genocide*, p.5; Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p. 339.

²⁶ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.4; Figes, *Natasha's Dance*, p.537.

²⁷ W. Chapin Huntington, *The Homesick Million Russia-out-of-Russia* (Boston: The Alpine Press, 1933), p.1.

²⁸ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.1.

²⁹ Kushner and Knox, *Refugees in an Age of Genocide*, p.5; Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.339.

The Problem With Data

In order to understand how *émigrés* were able to maintain a Russia Abroad community in Britain, there must be recognition of the number of Russian exiles across the world. The official estimate of how many exiles left Russia within the period 1917 to 1921 is around two million³⁰, but previous estimates concluded around one million.³¹ These earlier estimations were unreliable, thus problematic when considering where exiles settled. In most countries, unassimilated Russian refugees were recorded in significantly higher numbers than in Britain. The American Red Cross recorded in November 1920 that there were approximately 1,963,500 Russian refugees in Europe (including some countries in the Mediterranean), and around 1 million of these exiles were situated in Poland, 560,000 in Germany, and 175,000 in France.³² In Britain the same record states there were only 15,000 Russian refugees.³³ Other records show similar statistics and confirm that only a small influx arrived in Britain, especially when compared to France and Germany. However, with all historical records, there is a question of reliability. There can be no guarantee that there were more than 15,000 Russian refugees in Britain following the Revolution in Russia.

Sir John Hope Simpson, a former British liberal politician, examined the question of immigration and land settlement. His report of 1939 stated and questioned some of the statistics available.³⁴ Simpson noted that ‘no machinery for accurate statistical record existed’ so there would have been significant errors in records at the time.³⁵ Simpson preferred to use Dr. Izjumov’s figures, which indicated that there were between 635,600 and 755,200 Russian

³⁰ Glenny and Stone, *The Other Russia*, p. xvi.

³¹ Huntington, *Homesick Million*, p.1; Johnston, ‘*New Mecca, New Babylon*’, p.3; Michael Marrus, *The Unwanted: European Refugee in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1985), p.61.

³² Christopher Birchall, *Embassy, Emigrants and Englishmen: The Three Hundred Year History of a Russian Orthodox Church in London* (New York: Holy Trinity Publications, 2014), p.332; Eugene M. Kulischer, *Europe on the Move: War and Population Changes, 1917-47* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), p.54; Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.28; Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.82.

³³ Kulischer, *Europe on the Move*, p.54; Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.82.

³⁴ Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.82.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

exiles across Europe and near the East (January 1922).³⁶ Dr Izjumov used the Russian archives in Prague to calculate his data, and stated that there were only between 8–10,000 Russian *émigrés* in Britain.³⁷ These two statistics are problematic as it suggests that within two years 5–7,000 Russians who arrived in Britain had left. A third statistic by the League of Nations in August 1921 is even more problematic as the data claims that there were 1,444,000 exiles (in Europe and some Mediterranean countries).³⁸ These three statistics are significantly different, which suggests mistakes were made when recording the data. The one problematic aspect is that the League of Nations 1921 statistic did not record any Russian exiles in Britain at all.³⁹ In 1921 the League of Nations requested that Britain provided a census of Russian refugees, and according to information provided by the Home Office, there were 93,259 Russians living in the United Kingdom (September 30th 1921).⁴⁰ However, there was no record to indicate how many of these Russians were refugees. This explains why the League provided no information for their statistic on Britain in 1921.⁴¹ This lack of data makes it impossible to find out the exact number of Russian refugees living in Britain after the revolution. Simpson's report indicates that 15,000 refugees arrived in Britain, following the evacuation of 'Murmansk, after the fall of the Popular Government in Archangel', but that funds were raised for emigration to France and the Balkans.⁴² This might explain why some statistics provide a number of 15,000 Russian refugees, but Simpson believes that only around 4,000–5,000 remained in Britain.⁴³

Elina Multanen provides evidence to suggest that the British Foreign Office were unsure regarding the figure of Russian refugees, and perhaps there were more than 15,000 in

³⁶ Kulischer, *Europe on the Move*, pp. 54-55; Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, pp.80–2.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid

³⁹ Kulischer, *Europe on the Move*, p.54.

⁴⁰ Multanen, 'British Policy towards Russian Refugees in the Aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution', *Revolutionary Russia*, vol. 12, no. 1 (1999), p.60.

⁴¹ Kulischer, *Europe on the Move*, p.54.

⁴² Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.339.

⁴³ Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.339; Kushner and Knox, *Refugees in an Age of Genocide*, p.5.

1921.⁴⁴ After receiving a statement from the Russian Red Cross, Mr Evans in the FO felt ‘certain that there were more than 15,000 refugees’.⁴⁵ If the BFO were unsure, there is a question of reliability for all information regarding the numbers of Russian refugees in Britain. Subsequently, it can be assumed there were at least 15,000 Russian refugees in Britain between 1918 and 1922. However, this figure is inconclusive and not all of these refugees would have remained. Therefore, Simpson’s claim of 4,000–5,000 exiles remaining is potentially the most accurate.⁴⁶ What is conclusive about these irregular statistics is that few Russian exiles arrived in Britain compared to other nations. There must have been reasons for not attempting to create a new life in Britain, and this was to do with government policy in Britain.⁴⁷ In other countries, Russian exiles created much larger communities and this was linked to more lenient emigration policies.

British Policy Towards Russian Refugees

British immigration policy was a significant factor for the lack of Russian refugees in Britain following the Russian Revolution and Russian Civil War. Traditionally, Britain tolerated immigration and ‘between 1826 and 1905, no immigrant or visitor could be legally prevented from landing in Britain’.⁴⁸ In the mid-nineteenth century Britain acted as a ‘haven for political refugees and economic migrants from the continent’, with 50,289 refugees living in Britain in 1851, and 118,031 by 1881.⁴⁹ Bernard Porter stated how towards the end of the nineteenth century economic depression which started in the 1870s ‘finally knocked away... unquestioning endorsement of free access to the United Kingdom. From then on, attitudes

⁴⁴ Multanen, ‘British Policy towards Russian Refugees’, pp.60–1.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.339; Kushner and Knox, *Refugees in an Age of Genocide*, p.5

⁴⁷ Stefan Manz and Panikos Panayi, ‘Refugees and Cultural Transfer to Britain: An Introduction’, *Immigrants & Minorities: Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Migration and Diaspora*, Vol, 30, No.2/3 (2012), p.127; Stone and Glenny, *Other Russia*, xvi.

⁴⁸ Multanen, ‘British Policy towards Russian Refugees’, p.45.

⁴⁹ David Cesarani and Tony Kushner, ‘An Alien Concept? The Continuity of Anti-Alienism in British Society before 1940’, *Immigrants & Minorities*, Vol. 11, No.3, (1992), p.27.

towards aliens changed fundamentally'.⁵⁰ The mass immigration of Jews to the United Kingdom in 1881 and 1882, along with economic depression, created an ideology of protecting the Anglo-Saxon race by removing 'undesirable aliens', and consequently Britain adopted a policy reducing the influx of refugees.⁵¹ Britain's traditional liberalism was damaged by changing attitudes towards aliens entering Britain. Between 1905 and 1925 new legislation demonstrated Britain's lack of toleration.⁵² The 1905 Aliens Act enabled immigration officers to refuse entry to 'undesirable immigrants' who could not support themselves, and the right to 'expel any undesirable aliens'.⁵³ Additional Aliens Acts were passed in 1914 and 1919, with further restrictions added in the 1920 Aliens Order. The 1920 Aliens Order required future aliens to obtain a work permit from the ministry of Labour before acquiring employment in the United Kingdom.⁵⁴ These strict conditions are the reason the lack of 'White Russian' exiles in Britain.⁵⁵

Russian exiles were able to gain entry into other nations because of the League of Nations Nansen passport which was internationally recognised.⁵⁶ However, in Britain the strict immigration conditions discouraged the amount of Russian exiles trying to obtain asylum. Other countries such as France and Germany welcomed Russian refugees after suffering population and infrastructure losses due to the First World War. Consequently the French male population had been reduced by 10 per cent.⁵⁷ An influx of approximately 2 million immigrants and refugees strengthened the labour force in the agriculture, and industrial sectors in France.⁵⁸ Initially, estimates suggest 67,000-75,000 unassimilated Russian refugees

⁵⁰ Cited in *ibid*, p.28.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, p.28-29; Manz and Panayi, 'Refugees and Cultural Transfer', p. 126.

⁵² *Ibid*, p.31.

⁵³ Multanen, 'British Policy towards Russian Refugees', p.47.

⁵⁴ Cesarani and Kushner, 'An Alien Concept?', p.39.

⁵⁵ Stefan Manz and Panikos Panayi, 'Refugees and Cultural Transfer', p.127; Stone and Glenny, *Other Russia*, p.xvi; Multanen, 'British Policy towards Russian Refugees', p.45.

⁵⁶ Bruno Cabanes, *The Great War and the Origins of Humanitarianism, 1918-1924* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p.168; James E. Hassel, 'Russian Refugees In France and the United States Between the World Wars' *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* Vol. 81, No.7 (1992), p.18.

⁵⁷ Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.18.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, pp.18-23.

arrived in France by 1922.⁵⁹ However, statistics show that between 1921 and 1935 there was an increase up to 200,000 Russian refugees in France.⁶⁰ Understandably countries with more lenient immigration policies encouraged a larger influx of refugees. Britain was not a desirable nation for the Russian refugees due to strict immigration policies, and the requirement to obtain a labour permit further reduced to amount of *émigrés* which remained.⁶¹ Therefore, many Russian refugees tended to avoid Britain.

Britain's strict immigration policy did have limitations, which explains why initially 15,000 Russian exiles arrived in Britain. Traditionally, Britain allowed refugees asylum for political and religious persecutions, and the 1905 Aliens act still contained this clause.⁶² The immigration acts that followed removed this clause, but the Home Secretary Edward Shortt ensured 'decent political refugees' would be admitted into Britain.⁶³ The immigration control exceptions included an influx of refugees with upper class backgrounds, such as members of the Russian Royalty, aristocrats, politicians and academics. These exiles were categorized as 'desirable aliens'. Previously Britain had supported the Provisional Government, and prior to this the Russian Monarchy, which demonstrates why Britain made exceptions. Britain did consider intervening in the Russian Civil War, but alternatively adopted a policy where they supplied munitions.⁶⁴ Once Britain had concluded that direct intervention was not an option, they enforced a policy to reduce the amount of Russian refugees entering Britain.⁶⁵ Home Secretary Sir George Cave and Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour concluded that 'aliens should not be allowed to take refuge in the UK [unless in] special cases'.⁶⁶ King George V made a personal exception when he ordered HMS Marlborough to Yalta in April 1919 to evacuate

⁵⁹ Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.559.

⁶⁰ Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.22; Johnston, *New Mecca, New Babylon*, p.5.

⁶¹ Multanen, 'British Policy towards Russian Refugees', p.50.

⁶² *Ibid*, p.48.

⁶³ *Ibid*.

⁶⁴ Keith Neilson, "'That elusive entity British policy in Russia': the Impact of Russia on British Policy at the Paris Peace Conference", in Michael Dockrill and John Fisher, *The Paris Peace Conference 1919: Peace without Victory* (Palgrave, 2001), p.94.

⁶⁵ Multanen, 'British Policy towards Russian Refugees', p.50; Neilson, "'That elusive entity British policy'", p.68.

⁶⁶ Multanen, 'British Policy towards Russian Refugees', pp.53–4.

Empress Maria Fedorovna and Grand Duchess Ksenia, along with their families and friends.⁶⁷ This example suggests that ‘special cases’ had to be rich Russians who would not be a burden on British society. It can also be assumed King George V felt guilty for Britain’s lack of intervention in the civil war.⁶⁸ Therefore, the British Government made exceptions to provide hospitality to a small number of Russian exiles.

Another factor for allowing a small influx of Russian exiles into Britain was the fear of Bolshevism within British society and the British Government. Britain’s initial consideration to intervene in the Russian Civil War was to stop the spread of Bolshevism. The Allied Powers viewed Bolshevism as an international ideology which threatened European civilization.⁶⁹ Winston Churchill and Rex Leeper of the BFO wanted to intervene directly.⁷⁰ Once the Allies adopted a policy of non-intervention in regards to the civil war, there was still a fear of Bolshevism within British Parliament. Three years after Britain chose a non-military intervention policy, Gideon Murray presented the so-called Seditious Propaganda Bill (1922) in the House of Commons.⁷¹ This bill intended ‘to prevent the importation from overseas of money, valuable securities or property intended to be used for seditious propaganda and for purposes connected therewith’.⁷² Subsequently this bill was to protect British society from Bolshevik propaganda, and Murray believed ‘every constitutionally-minded citizen [would have supported him] in this effort to prevent this old country of ours from being politically and morally disorganized and Bolshefied, with all the inevitable accompaniments of pillage, murder, misery and starvation’.⁷³ However, the HC was divided when it came to passing the bill as the HC voted 221 for the bill and 77 against, and declared there was other ways to

⁶⁷ Ibid, pp.55–6.

⁶⁸ Ibid, p.57.

⁶⁹ John. Thompson, *Russian, Bolshevism and the Versailles Peace* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), pp.13–14.

⁷⁰ Neilson, “‘That elusive entity British policy’”, pp.77–83.

⁷¹ House of Commons Debate, 24 May 1922, *Hansard*, vol. 154, c.1209–17.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

tackle the problem.⁷⁴ Although the bill was not passed straight through the HC this clearly demonstrates the majority were in favour and thus fearful of the Bolshevik ideology. This demonstrates the fear within the HC even after Britain had opposed to adopt an intervention policy in Russia. Therefore, this opposition to the Bolshevik ideology influenced the ‘exceptions’ made for those Russian exiles who were granted entry into Britain.

Russian Exiles in British Society

This chapter has noted earlier on that the number of Russian exiles that remained in Britain is unknown, although approximately 15,000 were in Britain at one stage.⁷⁵ To reiterate, Sir John Hope Simpson claimed in his report that:

“The total of Russian refugees is probably not more than 4,000 to 5,000 in all. Many have been naturalized. They do not form an isolated group as in France, but mix freely with English people and are well on the way to complete assimilation’.⁷⁶

After the evacuation of Archangel, a refugee camp was set up in Newmarket (1919), which after a year ceased to exist.⁷⁷ The refugees were able to leave the camp and ‘mix freely’ with the British, or had the option to relocate abroad. Many moved to London, and became part of the Russia Abroad community in London, including Father John Lelioukhin who resided at the Russian Orthodox Church.⁷⁸ As noted before there was a small influx of Russian refugees, and the British clearly did not control their movement or keep any detailed records, thus allowing the exiles to ‘mix freely’. However, many of the exiles moved to London, to become part of the ‘Russian Colony’. The exiles had to obtain labour contracts, yet they did not have to stay within a specific job role, as they were free to ‘engage in business, or reside wherever

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Kulischer, *Europe on the Move*, p.54; Kushner and Knox, *Refugees in an Age of Genocide*; Simpson, pp.xvii-xxviii; Simpson, *The Refugee Problem*, p. 82; Hassel, ‘Russian Refugees In France’, p.3.

⁷⁶ Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.339; Kushner and Knox, *Refugees in an Age of Genocide*, p.5.

⁷⁷ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.332.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p.345.

they liked'.⁷⁹ In France, restrictions were implemented, as 50,000 *émigrés* had to sign labour contracts ensuring they could only work within the agriculture or industrial sectors.⁸⁰ In Britain, the authorities were less strict in comparison, thus integration into Britain could have been more common. Historians have suggested that most *émigrés* in Russia Abroad communities resisted integration and naturalization.⁸¹ Although historians have neglected *émigrés* in Britain, the community in London corresponds with the general concept that they resisted assimilation. Simpson's assumption that *émigrés* did not remain isolated was wrong, although they were able to acquire less restrictive job roles, which in the long term would help the integration process.

The role of exile organizations sheds light on the Russia Abroad community in London and the limits of the integration process. The next chapter of this dissertation will analyse the role of the Russian Liberation Committee and other politically-orientated organizations – yet this chapter must briefly mention their significance in regards to maintaining the Russia Abroad community in London. The RLC's publications of *The New Russia* frequently referred to the 'Russian Colony in London' which aimed to create a 'United Council' of 'Russian organizations in London in order to summarise their opinion on subjects political or non-political'.⁸² This article shows that five organizations became members of the 'United Council', these organizations were: the Russian Liberation Committee, Russian Luncheon Club, Russian Manufacturers' and Traders' Association, Russian National Committee and the Russo-British Bratstvo.⁸³ Although the RLC ceased to exist in 1924, and other political orientated periodicals such as the *Russian Commonwealth*, and the *Russian Outlook* stopped publishing after the failure of the 'Whites' in the civil war, other *émigré* organizations continued to coordinate the Russia Abroad community. The role of Eugene Sablin will be

⁷⁹ Pytor Petrovich Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', memoir in Glenny and Stone (eds.), *The Other Russia*, p.293.

⁸⁰ Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.25.

⁸¹ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.5; Figes, *Natasha's Dance*, p.537; Stone and Glenny, *Other Russia*, p.xvii.

⁸² Russian Liberation Committee, 'The Russian Colony', *The New Russia*, Vol.1, No.5. (1920), p.156.

⁸³ *Ibid*, p.157.

discussed in the last chapter, however he deserves to be mentioned as he allowed *émigré* institutions to use rooms of his 'Russian House' to coordinate the community.⁸⁴ By 1923 sixteen organizations joined together to form the United Council of the Russian Red Cross, and the Russian Charity Organization of Great Britain. Some of the members included: the Russian Academic Group, the Self-help Association for Refugees from North Russia, the Russian Relief Fund, and the Russian Orthodox Church Parish Council.⁸⁵

These organizations were instrumental for the *émigré* community, and for maintaining Russian cultural identity, which will be discussed in the final chapter. The large amount of organizations allowed the *émigrés* to maintain their own structures and services. They were able to provide funding for the church, and open a refugee hostel for the poorer refugees.⁸⁶ Often, *émigrés* would be able to acquire work within organizations, rather than working within the British community.⁸⁷ These organizations illustrate how exiles maintained a distance vis-à-vis British society in several respects. Vasilii Zakharov demonstrates how the first wave *émigré* community in London remained until approximately 1950, before the integration process took full effect.⁸⁸ However, various institutions lasted longer, including the Russian Arts Group, that continued performing in the 1950s,⁸⁹ and the Russian Orthodox Church which still exists along with the Russian Red Cross. Overall, these organizations demonstrate that a small number of the refugees remained in Britain, yet still remained isolated to an extent through *émigré* organizations. These features of Russia Abroad in London seem to confirm Raef's interpretation that the first wave *émigrés* resisted social integration. They also suggests that Simpson's analysis of Russian refugees in Britain was not entirely correct. This dissertation will

⁸⁴ Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', p. 297; Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.279; Glad, *Russia Abroad*, p.214; Zakharov, *No Snow On Their Boots*, p.138.

⁸⁵ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.274.

⁸⁶ Zakharov, *No Snow On Their Boots*, p.156.

⁸⁷ *Ibid*, p.130.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p.340.

⁸⁹ Zakharov, *No Snow On Their Boots*, pp.226–7.

continue to prove that the refugees in Britain behaved similar to Raeff's interpretation of other Russia Abroad communities.

Integration and Naturalization

Previously this chapter has discussed how integration into British society was possible, although the majority of the small influx decided to resist this process. From 1924 the Nansen passport was officially recognized by 54 governments as official documentation.⁹⁰ In *émigré* communities these Nansen passports allowed *émigrés* to resist the integration process, as they could remain 'stateless', yet live abroad. Pytor Petrovich Shilovsky a former member of the Russian Royal family and former Russian Count, Statesman and Governor of Kolstroma arrived in Britain in 1922.⁹¹ In his memoir, he recalls how he was advised to apply for a 'League of Nations passport'.⁹² He had previously arrived in Britain under exceptional circumstances, but after eighteen months he decided to demonstrate his outright opposition to the Bolshevik regime and to remain in Britain.⁹³ A large amount of the emigration in Britain, including Sablin, avoided naturalization, and made use of their Nansen passport, to demonstrate they opposed Soviet Russia while still remaining loyal to the motherland.⁹⁴ Although in the majority of cases, the *émigrés* remained loyal to their country, there were expectancies within the Russia Abroad community. In Britain it seemed that exiles were encouraged to integrate, as the government allowed them to acquire employment in any industry, and to 'engage in business'.⁹⁵ In France they imposed 'tedious restrictions on employment' which limited the *émigré* communities.⁹⁶ In comparison, the *émigrés* in Britain were

⁹⁰ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.xii; Cabanes, *Origins of Humanitarianism*, p.168; Glad, *Russia Abroad*, p.235.

⁹¹Pytor Petrovich Shilovsky, 'Things Fall Apart', memoir in Glenny and Stone (eds.), *The Other Russia*, p.54.

⁹² Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', p.290.

⁹³ Ibid, p.289.

⁹⁴ Zakharov, *No Snow On Their Boots*, p.137.

⁹⁵ Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', p.293.

⁹⁶ Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', p. 293; Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.25.

able to integrate more easily, and educational systems encouraged assimilation further.⁹⁷ Olga Petrovna Lawrence, the daughter of Shilovsky, recalled how when she applied for scholarships to attend Oxford University she was offered a £500 scholarship as long as she promised to become a British subject, when turned 21.⁹⁸ Olga recalled how her father stated ‘your life is going to be in England and not in Russia’, and consequently accepted the scholarship.⁹⁹

Further evidence of encouragement through British education systems is evident in Masha Leonidovna Pushchina (Lady Masha Williams) memoir and interview. Masha recalled how she was unable to gain a scholarship fund to get into Lady Margret Hall at Oxford because she was ‘a foreigner’, and that she had to borrow money from a rich man in Oxford called ‘Spalding’.¹⁰⁰ Masha’s family had to become naturalized later, in order for her to continue her time at Oxford.¹⁰¹ What can be assumed is that she needed more money, and the only way to gain the scholarship fund she needed was to become a British citizen. Masha’s family were very poor when they came to Britain as they lost everything, and she had to rely on British subjects to fund her university tuitions fees initially. She explains further that she remained in poverty while at university, and relied on her English friends to pay for her trips away, and to buy her ‘wine and cigarettes’.¹⁰² This demonstrates how Masha was not limited to the Russia Abroad community, and this meant the integration process would come more quickly to her. Natalya Leonidovna Dubasova (Masha’s sister) further demonstrates how the younger generation *émigrés* were gradually integrating into British society through education. In her memoir she explains how her Mother was very poor, and could not look after the

⁹⁷ Shilovsky, ‘Here Is Imperial Russia’, p.293.

⁹⁸ Olga Petrovna Lawrence, ‘Getting by in England’, memoir in Glenny and Stone (eds.), *The Other Russia*, p.300.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Lady Masha Williams, ‘Pride Among the Packing Cases’, memoir in Glenny, and Stone (eds.), *The Other Russia*, p.309; ‘Times remembered (1). Lady Williams’, interview with Ian Skidmore BBC 4, 30 July 1987 (digitized at the British Library, Boston Spa), 8/12/2014.

¹⁰¹ Williams, ‘Pride Among the Packing Cases’, p.310.

¹⁰² ‘Times remembered (1). Lady Williams’, interview with Ian Skidmore BBC 4, 30 July 1987 (digitized at the British Library, Boston Spa), 8/12/2014.

children, so they were sent to boarding school as the tuition fees were free. This allowed her mother to work extra hours while the children were at various boarding schools, including St Hilda's at Whitby in Yorkshire.¹⁰³ This shows that the *émigrés* were able to attend British schools, which meant they were taught the British curriculum, thus integrating through education. Overall, these memoirs and Masha's interview with Ian Skidmore show how in Britain exiles were able to integrate into British society if they were not determined to stay within the exile community in London. It is clear that Masha married an English man in the long term which demonstrates how she personally integrated into British society. Furthermore, the last chapter of this dissertation will present evidence to suggest the majority of the emigration did not integrate or naturalize until much later. This section does prove Simpson's interpretation was correct for those who wanted to naturalize. However, according to *Hansard*, 9,311 Russians became British subjects between 1916 and 1938, but the HC still could not clarify how many of them were Russian refugees as the only record they had was that 93,224 Russians lived in Britain in 1921.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, it is not possible to assume as Simpson did, that they were 'well on the way to complete assimilation'.¹⁰⁵

Conclusion

This dissertation chapter has examined why there was such a small influx of Russian exiles in Britain following the Russian Revolution. In Britain the immigration policy had become significantly stricter than it ever had been by 1905, and further legislation ensured fewer refugees could enter, thus discouraging Russian exiles to apply for entry into Britain. However, the British Government had former alliances with the Provisional Government and Russian Monarchy, thus exceptions were made and upper class Russians were granted entry. The

¹⁰³ Natalya Leonidovna Dubasova, 'A Woman of Resource', memoir in Glenny and Stone (eds.), *The Other Russia*, p.303.

¹⁰⁴ House of Commons Debate, 27 June 1938, *Hansard*, vol. 337 c.1547–8W.

¹⁰⁵ Simpson, *Refugees Problem*, p.339.

second conclusion in this chapter, demonstrates how organizations within the ‘Russian colony’ enabled exiles to remain isolated from British society. However, employment opportunities allowed some *émigrés* to break from the Russian Abroad community, which helped the gradual integration process. Although naturalization was viewed as betraying Russia, the younger generation were more likely to become naturalized in order to gain a better education, and to get out of poverty. This chapter has demonstrated that those who remained confined to the Russia Abroad community delayed the entire integration process, while those who were susceptible to British education, and employment were more likely to integrate. Overall many *émigrés* remained isolated, while others adopted a dual identity. Shilovsky confirmed this Russian-British dual identity, by stating that the younger generation in particular became British subjects, yet did not sever links with the nucleus of the Russian community.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ Shilovsky, ‘Here Is Imperial Russia’, p.293.

Chapter Two:

Émigré Political Activism in Britain

‘No Compromise with Bolshevism’¹⁰⁷

Introduction

In order to understand the political attitude of the Russian refugees in Britain, this section will briefly address other Russia Abroad communities’ characteristics to confirm whether the *émigrés* in Britain shared similar political beliefs. The previous political factions that were present in Russia were now in exile, and this initially caused a lack of unification within *émigré* communities. However, the ongoing civil war forced *émigré* political factions to cooperate in the interests of returning to Russia, and in the interests of Russian refugee communities. Marc Raeff’s study of Russia Abroad communities primarily focused on the cultural aspects of exile communities, yet he claimed most Russia Abroad communities preferred to remain unified through the absolute rejection of the Bolshevik regime, thus ignoring previous political disagreements.¹⁰⁸ This chapter aims to argue that the *émigré* community in London confirms the Raeff’s general representation of Russia Abroad, primarily through the analysis of *émigré* periodicals. In Britain, *émigré* organizations aimed to influence the British public, in order to persuade the government to intervene in the civil war, and to disregard the Bolshevik regime.¹⁰⁹ Although military intervention never became fully implemented in British policy, *émigré* political motives are still valuable to this dissertation.

¹⁰⁷ Russian Liberation Union, ‘Liberated Russia’, *Bulletin of the Russian Liberation Union*, Vol.1, No.11 (1919), p.1.

¹⁰⁸ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.8.

¹⁰⁹ Alston, ‘Russian Liberation Committee’ p.2.

Exile Political Unification Attempts Abroad

Despite the unified political stance against Bolshevism there were three main political factions in exile: the Monarchists, the Liberals (former Constitutional Democratic Party), and the Mensheviks.¹¹⁰ The ‘White Army’ contained various different political factions, yet liberals and monarchist ideas were arguably the most influential within the anti-Bolshevik effort.¹¹¹ Similarly in Russia Abroad communities there was a mixture of *émigrés* with different political beliefs, although according to members of the Russian Liberation Committee in London, approximately between eighty and ninety percent of the mass emigration shared monarchist ideas.¹¹² However, in certain circumstances there were exceptions to the generalization of political unification. In Germany, former members of political factions regrouped and were able to form close relationships with German political parties. For example, the Mensheviks, ‘the non-Bolshevik wing of the old Russian Social-Democratic Workers’ Party’, maintained links with other socialist factions, including the Independent Socialist Party.¹¹³ This example demonstrates how political factions may have shared an anti-Bolshevik opinion, but in certain circumstances political factions could integrate into their host nation’s political parties.

Before considering the political perspective in Britain, it is worth acknowledging the early attempt of political unification at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. While in London, Vladimir Dmitrievich Nabokov (1870–1922) – the father of the novelist – encouraged the British Government to allow Russia to have some form of representation at the conference.¹¹⁴ In January 1919, the Russian Political Conference was formed which included various *émigré* members, including Vasily Maklakov (1869–1957), a former leader of the Constitutional

¹¹⁰ Williams, *Culture in Exile*, pp.159-160.

¹¹¹ Evan Mawdsley, ‘The Civil War: The Military Campaigns’, in Edward Acton et al. (eds.), *Russian Revolution*, p.98; Evan Mawdsley, *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Pegasus, 2007), p.111; Robert Service, *The Penguin History of Modern Russia: From Tsarism to the Twenty-First Century* (London: Penguin Group, 2009), p.102.

¹¹² Glebov, ‘“Congress of Russia Abroad”’, p.177.

¹¹³ Williams, *Culture in Exile*, pp.188–9.

¹¹⁴ Thompson, *Bolshevism*, p.79.

Democratic Party.¹¹⁵ The RPC was one of the first attempts to form joint political representation of *émigrés*, and they maintained links with Admiral Kolchak's 'White' Government in Omsk.¹¹⁶ In Britain various *émigré* organizations were supportive of the RPC, and Kolchak's Siberian Government.¹¹⁷ Their support illustrates how political unification was essential for the emigration, as they wanted to return to the motherland. Although their attempt to be recognized as the official Russian representatives failed at the peace conference, this endeavour demonstrated how exiles could possibly become unified without official recognition in their host nations. Another attempt to unite all anti-Bolshevik forces in Paris occurred in 1921 through the first Congress of the Russian National Union, which was dominated by right-wing members of the former CDP.¹¹⁸ In 1923 they held a second congress,¹¹⁹ and in 1926 they held their last congress before accepting 'economic and social changes in Russia were irreversible'.¹²⁰ In the next section this dissertation will focus on the role of Pavel Miliukov (1859–1943) within the refugee community in London.¹²¹ Miliukov arrived in Paris in 1918 to potentially work with the *émigrés* at the peace conference, however Maklakov sent him to London as Georges Clemenceau's was unwilling to cooperate with him because of his collaboration with German forces in the Ukraine.¹²² The next section will also demonstrate Miliukov's role in the split of the CDP.

¹¹⁵ Alston, 'Russian Liberation Committee', p.2; Thompson, *Bolshevism*, p.73; Williams, *Culture in Exile*, p.84.

¹¹⁶ Alston, 'Russian Liberation Committee', p.2; Charlotte Alston, *Russia's Greatest Enemy? Harold Williams and the Russian Revolutions* (London: Tauris, 2007), p.148; Jonathan D. Smele, *Civil War in Siberia: The Anti-Bolshevik government of Admiral Kolchak 1918-1920* (Cambridge: University Press, 2006), p.184; Thompson, *Bolshevism*, p.72.

¹¹⁷ 'Denikin and Koltchak', *The Russian Outlook*, Vol. 1, No. 9 (1919), p.210; Russian Liberation Committee, 'Liberated Russia', *Bulletins of the Russian Liberation Committee*, Vol. 1, No. 30 (1919), p.1; Russian Liberation Committee, 'Admiral A. V. Kolchak', *The New Russia*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (1920), p. 65; Smele, *Civil War*, p.184.

¹¹⁸ Glebov, "'Congressess of Russia Abroad'", p.162.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid*, p.164.

¹²⁰ *Ibid*, p.182.

¹²¹ Raymond Pearson, 'Miliukov' in Edward Action et al. (eds.), *Russian Revolution*, p.168.

¹²² Thompson, *Bolshevism*, p.73; Pearson, 'Miliukov', p.172.

Pavel Miliukov's Contribution to Russia Abroad

To reiterate, Pavel Miliukov was involved in a substantial amount of political activity throughout different cities amongst the Russian exile communities abroad.¹²³ He was well known as a liberal leader, a historian and a publicist.¹²⁴ Prior his exile, he was the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Provisional Government in Russia, which had aimed to prevent Russia's exit from the First World War due to the alliance agreement.¹²⁵ Furthermore, he was the founder of the CDP known as the *Kadet* Party.¹²⁶ While in exile, he was a member of the Russian Liberation Committee, and lived in London from 1918.¹²⁷ He moved to Paris in 1920 but still remained active in the RLC through various publications. In the early 1920s, Miliukov had been criticized by sections of his own former KP, thus decided to engage in 'new tactics' by cooperating with the Socialist Revolutionaries.¹²⁸ As a consequence the KP became divided, on Miliukov's side they became left wing liberals while the opposing side, including V.D. Nabokov became more nationalist.¹²⁹ Although Miliukov became distrusted by members of his former party,¹³⁰ it seems that V.D. Nabokov still had respect for Miliukov. In Berlin 1922, an assassination attempt which targeted Miliukov failed due to V.D. Nabokov's bravery.¹³¹ He allegedly pushed Miliukov out the way, and confronted the armed 'Russian-fascists', thus was murdered himself.¹³² V.D. Nabokov was also a member of the RLC which demonstrates that in London, the *émigrés* were able to work together although their political opinions differed. The most effective resource for spreading *émigré* political influence was the *émigré* press. In 1924 Miliukov became the editor of the highly regarded and widely distributed *Posledine*

¹²³ Pearson, 'Miliukov', p.172.

¹²⁴ Figes, *Natasha's Dance*, p.546; Pearson, 'Miliukov', p.168.

¹²⁵ Pearson, 'Miliukov', p.171; Rex A. Wade, *The Russian Revolution, 1917* (Cambridge: University Press, 2000), p.81; Service, *Modern Russia*, p.36; Vera Tolz, *Inventing the Nation: Russia* (London: Hodder Education, 2003), p.173.

¹²⁶ Pearson, 'Miliukov', p.169; Wade, *Russian Revolution*, p.13; Service, *Modern Russia*, p.27.

¹²⁷ Alston, 'Russian Liberation Committee', p.2.

¹²⁸ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.xiii; Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.63; Pearson, 'Miliukov', p.172.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Vladimir Nabokov, *Speak Memory*, (London: Penguin, 2000), pp. 130 and 146.

¹³² Ibid.

Novosti, which continued publication until Hitler's Germany invaded Paris in 1940.¹³³ Once Miliukov became editor of the newspaper, it constantly consisted of a liberal democratic tone, which was similar to Miliukov's individual publications within the RLC.¹³⁴

Before addressing Miliukov's publications in Britain, it is worth noting his three significant independent publications, which were written in English. Similar to his publications in Paris, he adopted a liberal democratic political stance and thus outright rejected the Bolshevik regime. These texts act as a useful analogy when interpreting his publications in the RLC's periodicals. In 1905, his first independent publication illustrates his belief that democratic change was necessary in Russia, and that the Tsar could be overthrown.¹³⁵ When in exile, Miliukov reiterates his democratic attitude by changing his focus to the Bolshevik regime. He presents the Bolshevik ideology as a threat to Western democracy.¹³⁶ In *Bolshevism: An International Danger*, he signifies how true Russians did not choose Bolshevism,¹³⁷ and in his later publication *Russia To-day and To-Morrow*, he blames Bolshevik victory on a combination of errors; poor military tactics on behalf of the White Army, and the non-intervention policy adopted by the Allies.¹³⁸ In Britain, Miliukov developed his arguments further through a variety of publications within the RLC's periodicals and pamphlets. In *The New Russia*, which was a weekly review of Russian politics from February 1920 up to December 1920, he published an article that continued each week under the title 'Is Bolshevik Victory a lasting one'. Miliukov explained the indirect consequence of the Bolshevik victory over the 'counter-revolutionaries', and that their failure not only favoured pro-Bolshevik supporters but also

¹³³ Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.45; Huntington, *Homesick Million*, pp.204-205; Johnston, "New Mecca, New Babylon" p.35; Nina Berberova, *The Italics are mine* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1991), p.240; Pearson, 'Miliukov', p.172; Raef, *Russia Abroad*, p.82.

¹³⁴ Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.45; ; Huntington, *Homesick Million*, p.204; Johnston, "New Mecca, New Babylon", p.36; Pearson, 'Miliukov', p.172; Raef, *Russia Abroad*, p.83.

¹³⁵ Pavel Milyoukov, *Russia and Its Crisis* (Chicago: The University Chicago Press, 1905), p.552.

¹³⁶ Paul Miliukov, *Bolshevism: An International Danger Its Doctrine and its Practice through War and Revolution* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1920), p.7.

¹³⁷ Miliukov, *Bolshevism: An International Danger*, p.6.

¹³⁸ Paul N. Miliukov, *Russia To-day and To-Morrow* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922), pp. 123–4.

how others have begun to question if the Bolsheviks were a threat.¹³⁹ Miliukov questioned claims by W.T. Goode of the *Manchester Guardian* that since Bolshevism had survived difficulties unlike the previous 'Provisional and the Coalition' governments, there would have to be a 'constructive side' to their regime.¹⁴⁰ In the next three issues, Miliukov countered Goode's claim's and provided data from 'Red Newspapers' to prove that the Bolsheviks were a minority in Russia, and how they had been failing economically while their only success was through military action.¹⁴¹ Miliukov then returned to his overall opinion that the Bolsheviks are an international problem. He claimed the Bolsheviks aimed to 'invade the States bordering on Germany and Austria in the spring of 1919 in order to establish new 'Communist republics', and that 'Kolchak's and Denikin's offensive saved the border states'.¹⁴² This article aimed to highlight the Bolshevik threat internally and externally, while creating sympathy for the White Army generals who prevented the spread of Bolshevism. Miliukov shows that the 'Whites' acted in defence of democracy, while the Allies did nothing and as a consequence Bolshevik ideology could expand towards the West, thus illustrating Bolshevism is an international threat.

Miliukov's publications in *The New Russia* are important sources because they represent the general anti-Bolshevik attitude of the Russian exile community even after the defeat in the civil war. Miliukov's writings were published in English to gain sympathy from the British public, with the aim to influence Allied government which had begun to cooperate with the Bolshevik regime. His publications also made the refugees in Britain aware of the ongoing situation in Russia, and he also acted as a political figurehead of the exile community. He was recognizable due to his former position in the Provisional Government and his opinions were taken seriously amongst those in Russia Abroad communities, and this is obvious due to his

¹³⁹ Pavel Miliukov, 'Is The Bolshevik Victory A Lasting One?', *The New Russia* Vol.1, No.1 (1920), p.16.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Pavel Miliukov, 'Is The Bolshevik Victory A Lasting One?', *The New Russia* Vol.1, No.2 (1920), pp.51–5.

¹⁴² Pavel Miliukov, 'Is The Bolshevik Victory A Lasting One?', *The New Russia* Vol.1, No.4 (1920), p.108.

wide publications not only in London but also in France. The British government were aware of Miliukov's involvement in the RLC, because they previously had a positive relationship with him while he was foreign minister.¹⁴³ However, Miliukov and other political exiles had major limitations as they were no longer officially recognized. For example, Eugene Sablin, the former *chargé d'affaires* of the tsarist embassy, had unofficially remained positioned at the embassy until 1924 when the Soviet Government was recognized, and parliamentary Hansard demonstrates how he and his family had to vacate the premises.¹⁴⁴ Overall, the failure of the civil war and the recognition of the Soviet Government explains why political organizations ceased to exist after 1924. Political exiles in Britain were representing a lost cause, within a country that had a small influx of Russian refugees, which demonstrates why Miliukov remained in Paris after 1924. To reiterate, his publications in Paris were widely distributed which meant his influence still reached the London community.

Russian Émigré Political Organizations in London

Marc Raeff has illustrated the importance of the *émigré* press for maintaining a typical Russia Abroad community, and he provides examples of non-political organizations such as the YMCA Press which produced journals in Berlin and France.¹⁴⁵ As noted previously, Raeff claimed that within most Russia Abroad communities, refugees remained politically unified through the rejection of Bolshevism.¹⁴⁶ However, he does acknowledge in larger communities the *émigré* press had a wider target audience within their individual communities, for example in Paris there were approximately 50,000 *émigrés*.¹⁴⁷ This meant *émigré* publishers could influence exiles in favour of certain political wings within these larger communities.

¹⁴³ Pearson, 'Miliukov', p.171; Rex A. Wade, *The Russian Revolution, 1917* (Cambridge: University Press, 2000), p.81; Service, *Modern Russia*, p.36; Tolz, *Russia*, p.173.

¹⁴⁴ House of Commons Debate, 14 May 1924, *Hansard*, vol. 173 c.1312–3.

¹⁴⁵ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, pp.82–3.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid*, p.8.

¹⁴⁷ Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.25.

Furthermore, their publications were more likely to be distributed throughout other *émigré* communities because of their large publicity. For example, Miliukov's newspaper in Paris favoured a left wing liberal tone.¹⁴⁸ In contrast smaller exile communities had to appeal to a smaller target audience within their own community. In 1920, there were only 1,000 *émigrés* in Czechoslovakia.¹⁴⁹ In Prague the *Slavyanskaya Zarya* (1919-1920) had to provide a unified political stance, thus addressed the issue of intervention in the civil war.¹⁵⁰ This unified political stance against Bolshevism was arguably more focused upon in smaller communities, and that is why Miliukov's publications in the RLC focused on influencing the British public, while providing information to the *émigré* community in London. Therefore, this section will confirm the political unification attempts through *émigré* organizations in Britain.

In London, there were three major political orientated Russian *émigré* organizations: the Russo-British Bratstvo, the Narodopravstvo and the Russian Liberation Committee.¹⁵¹ All three initially focused on providing updates on the civil war, and produced anti-Bolshevik campaigns.¹⁵² This was due to the belief that the *émigrés* would return to Russia in the future. When the civil war was still ongoing, their main ambition was to help those fighting in the White Army, in the hope Britain and the allies would intervene to help their cause. *The Russian Commonwealth* was published by the Narodopravstvo between the years 1918 to 1920 and provides many examples of articles encouraging intervention. One of the main reasons the *Russian Commonwealth* gave for encouraging allied intervention, was that the Provisional Government remained loyal to the allies during the war.¹⁵³ It argued that those who signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk were not true Russians, and were still the enemy.¹⁵⁴ As one author argued the allies should not abandon the true Russians: as he pointed out Kerensky and other

¹⁴⁸ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.xiii; Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.63; Pearson, 'Miliukov', p.172.

¹⁴⁹ Kulischer, *Europe on the Move*, p.54.

¹⁵⁰ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.121.

¹⁵¹ Alston, 'Russian Liberation Committee', p.1

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ Alexander Onu, 'Russia's Honour and the War', in *The Russian Commonwealth*, Vo1, No.4 (1918), pp.86–8.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

former Russian politicians were living in Britain, forming new Russian political parties, and these Russian politicians were Britain's true allies.¹⁵⁵

However, not all the primary focus was on the events in Russia. Another aim by the organizations was to present proceedings within the *émigré* community. In *The Russian Outlook* and other periodicals, there were articles on unified political progress within the London community. The Russian National Committee (1919) was formed in London by political exiles in Britain who wished to unite together regardless of their previous political views.¹⁵⁶ The committee stated that 'Russian patriotism' had 'saved the country from disaster' in the past on more than one occasion, and that Russian culture was enough 'to warrant the union of all true Russians' against Bolshevism.¹⁵⁷ This proves that since the community in London was such a small group of exiles, they felt it essential to forget about previous political views and to unite as one political organization. This unification attempt is rather similar to the RNU in Paris. However, there must be acknowledgement that not all political factions were welcome, since the RNU disagreed with Miliukov's 'new tactics'.¹⁵⁸ In France *émigré* organizations could publish material for their individual target audiences, but in London it was essential for the small community to stick together, and this is why the main material produced was simply anti-Bolshevik and democratic.

As previously noted, Miliukov wrote for the RLC which was the most active *émigré* organization within London between 1919 and 1924.¹⁵⁹ There were several other significant members of the *émigré* community that were members of the RLC: Petr Struve (also part of the former KP), V.D. Nabokov, Mikhail Rostovstev (the founder of the committee), Ariadna Tyrkova-Williams, and her husband Harold Williams who later worked for *The Times* was

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ 'Articles of Incorporation of the Russian National Committee in London', *The Russian Outlook*, Vol.1, No.10. (1919), p.226.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Glebov, "'Congressess of Russia Abroad'", p.162.

¹⁵⁹ Alston, 'Russian Liberation Committee in London', p.1.

influential due to his links with the British press.¹⁶⁰ The committee had direct links with 'White' *émigré* sources: the Osmk Government, the Russian Committee in Finland, and a telegraphic link with Helsinki which provided updates from Petrograd.¹⁶¹ The high profile membership of the committee, and their foreign correspondents made their publications credible. The committee published a wide range of material: the *Bulletin of the Russian Liberation Union*, *The New Russia*, and *The Russian Life A Monthly Review*. They also published other anti-Bolshevik pamphlets such as John Cournos's publication which directly appealed to British readers by imagining London under Bolshevik rule.¹⁶² However, as previously noted, once the Russian Civil War was concluded the committee and other organizations lacked material to publish, which forced many to stop publication. The RLC's response was to publish *The New Russia*, a weekly newspaper with the intention to produce more anti-Bolshevik material without completely relying on the failing reactionary forces. However, the reduction in funds forced the RLC to publish *The Russian Life* as a monthly alternative. *The Russian Life*, provided information to the exiles within Britain, and appealed to the League of Nations with the intention to assist exiles at Constantinople.¹⁶³ Furthermore, *The Russian Life* aimed to present how the Bolshevik regime were making the effects of Famine worse in Russia, by neglecting those not directly within the Bolshevik regime.¹⁶⁴

These publications indicate how important the London community's contribution was for Russian refugees distributed in other areas of Russia Abroad. These appeals in various periodicals illustrate how all the Russia Abroad communities were figuratively one country without a geographical position, and that all Russia Abroad communities contributed to one another, whether it was with the distribution of literature or through charity appeals.

¹⁶⁰ Alston, *Greatest Enemy?*, p.150; Alston, 'Russian Liberation Committee', p.2.

¹⁶¹ Ibid, p.3.

¹⁶² Alston, 'Russian Liberation Committee in London', p.7; John Cournos, *London under the Bolsheviks: A Londoner's Dream on Returning From Petrograd* (London: The Russian Liberation Committee, 1919), pp.1–12.

¹⁶³ Russian Liberation Committee, 'Appeal to the League of Nations' *The Russian Life: A Monthly Review*, Vol.1, No.5 (1922), pp. 176–7.

¹⁶⁴ Russian Liberation Committee, 'What Russians live on' *The Russian Life: A Monthly Review*, Vol.1, No.1 (1921), pp. 30–1.

Furthermore, these examples of charity appeals and updates on Russia demonstrate how the *émigré* political organizations were focused on events outside their *émigré* community, which represents their urge to return to Russia. This agrees with Raeff's interpretation that the first wave of Russian exiles believed they would return to Russia, and that exile was just a temporary measure.¹⁶⁵ If the political *émigré* organizations had accepted they would not return, they would have focused on organizing the *émigré* community within Britain, rather than supporting Russians who were suffering within Bolshevik Russia. Overall, the political organizations of the Russia Abroad community in Britain represents similar characteristics to other organizations in other Russia Abroad communities. Therefore, this suggests the British *émigré* community was a Russia Abroad which shared a political stance of 'absolute rejection of the Bolshevik regime'.¹⁶⁶

Political Opposition in Britain

Although this dissertation focuses on the politics and culture of the Russian refugees in Britain, and has previously discussed the British policy towards the refugees, it is necessary to acknowledge that there was opposition to the *émigrés'* political ambitions. There was no direct public opposition towards exiles arriving in Britain, yet there was opposition to their anti-Bolshevik political stance. As noted throughout this chapter *émigré* political organizations expressed their encouragement of further military intervention. This was due to their desire to return to the motherland. In direct opposition to their cause was the 'National "Hands off Russia" Committee' which was founded in 1919, and later became the 'Anglo-Russian Parliamentary Committee'.¹⁶⁷ In Britain, a large number of the working class became sympathetic to the Bolshevik regime's 'workers revolution' who had in their opinion removed

¹⁶⁵ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.4.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p.8.

¹⁶⁷ 'British Property in Russia', *Times*, 19 June 1925, p.18

Russia's oppressors.¹⁶⁸ The NHRC often demonstrated at various cities in Britain. For example, 5,000 attended a 'Hands off Russia' meeting at St Andrews Hall in Glasgow.¹⁶⁹ They defended the Bolsheviks that had tried to establish law and order under exceptional circumstances, including the ongoing civil war, and the Allied Government initial trade blockade.¹⁷⁰ Another example of a popular demonstration place for the committee was Albert Hall in London.¹⁷¹ During a demonstration in March 1920 they announced how 'the anti-Bolsheviks were ten times more culpable than the Bolsheviks for any atrocities' within Eastern Europe.¹⁷²

Although the *émigré* periodicals rarely commented on the activities within Britain, they did pay attention to their opposition. *The Russian Outlook* frequently referred to the *Daily Herald* (which is now *The Sun*) as a Bolshevik sympathiser, which organized the 'Hands off Russia' propaganda campaign.¹⁷³ In October 1919, *The Russian Outlook* claimed the 'followers of the *Daily Herald* had a field day' at Albert Hall, and that they were supposed to be holding a rally about non-intervention by British troops, yet changed their tone to declare the Bolsheviks should be recognized as the 'de facto government of Russia'.¹⁷⁴ Another example of *émigré* discontent with the NHRC can be seen throughout the RLC's publications. Similar to *The Russian Outlook*, they demonstrate dissatisfaction with the *Daily Herald* which had in their opinion been providing the British public with false information, claiming that the Russian masses had 'full political rights and full personal liberty'.¹⁷⁵ The *émigrés* in Britain strongly disagreed with this interpretation of what was happening in Russia, and in retaliation *The New Russia* dedicated a section each week that reviewed British newspapers, thus disagreeing with the 'Hands off Russia' campaign. Overall, these periodicals illustrate the political struggle that

¹⁶⁸ Cesarani and Kushner, 'An Alien Concept?', p.37.

¹⁶⁹ 'Hands off Russia', *Times*, 1 December 1919, p. 11.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ 'Our Bolsheviks', *The Times*, 1 March 1920, p.16.

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ 'British Bolsheviks', *The Russian Outlook*, Vol.1, No.24 (1919), p.561.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ Russian Liberation Committee, 'Through British Eyes', *The New Russia*, Vol.1, No.12 (1920), p.374.

the *émigrés* in Britain encountered. At first they encouraged intervention, and then discouraged recognition of the Soviet Government, while disregarding the pro-Bolshevik's in Britain. To reiterate, the *émigré* political organizations ceased to exist after the Soviet Recognition in 1924. Therefore their struggle became failure.

Conclusion

Overall, this chapter has discussed various *émigré* political organizations that existed in Britain between 1919 and 1924. Their activity in London confirms Raeff's general point that Russia Abroad communities remained unified through the absolute rejection of Bolshevism.¹⁷⁶ There is also evidence that proves they worked together through the RNC, although the RLC remained the most active organization after 1920. Most other *émigré* publications stopped when the outcome of the civil war became an inevitable 'White' defeat. However, what can be established is that political organizations were essential for providing the refugees with a voice, and for informing the Russia Abroad community. This chapter further illustrates how there was a divide in Britain whether intervention should have been adopted in the Russian Civil War. There were probably more demonstrators at St Andrews in Glasgow '5,000' than there were *émigrés* living in London at the time.¹⁷⁷ This demonstrates how the pro-Bolshevik section in British society damaged the *émigrés'* political cause.

¹⁷⁶ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.8.

¹⁷⁷ 'Hands off Russia', *Times*, 1 December 1919, p. 11.

Chapter Three:

Russian *Émigré* Culture in Britain

Introduction

Previously, this dissertation has demonstrated there was an initial belief that *émigrés* would return to Russia, and this chapter will focus on the attempts to preserve Russian cultural identity through *émigré* institutions. Furthermore, this chapter will demonstrate how exiles in Britain influenced British culture to an extent. This dissertation has mentioned how the mass emigration consisted of highly educated exiles. One sixth had university diplomas, and two thirds were high school graduates.¹⁷⁸ These educated refugees played a significant role in preserving Russian culture in exile communities. Marc Raeff stressed the importance of preserving Russian culture through various *émigré* societies, and how ‘high’ culture was significantly important for maintaining Russian identity.¹⁷⁹ The ‘high’ cultural activities that Raeff refers to comprise Russian arts, literary writings, academic scholarship, religious institutions and various other informal organizations.¹⁸⁰ This chapter will confirm the presence of Russian *émigré* culture in Britain, and demonstrate how they were able to remain isolated in their community. Therefore, corresponding with Raeff’s interpretation and filling the gap in Russia Abroad historiography.

¹⁷⁸ Glenny, and Stone (eds.), *The Other Russia*, p.xvi; Huntington, *The Homesick Million*, p.2

¹⁷⁹ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.10.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

Émigré Religion

‘Russians who before the Revolution had assumed foreign ways, or had never gone to church, now, as exiles, clung to their customs and Orthodox beliefs’.¹⁸¹

Section (i): Russia Abroad Church

Historical background of the Russian Orthodox Church must be acknowledged in order to understand its significance in the community. First of all the ROC in Britain was the second oldest Russian church in Western Europe, existing in London since 1725.¹⁸² In 1919 the church in London became the first official parish church in exile.¹⁸³ Previously, the chapel had been located at the former Russian Imperial Embassy, but had to relocate to St Philips Church due to the increase in numbers of Russian refugees.¹⁸⁴ Spiritual guidance was provided by the church for the refugees, which had experienced the First World War, Revolution and the Russian Civil war within less than a decade. Between the relocation, St Mary-Le-Bow (an Anglican Church in London) was used for orthodox services, and Father Eugene of the ROC reported that Sunday congregation’s reached around 400 people.¹⁸⁵ Secondly, wider acknowledgement of the ROC’s history must be taken into consideration. During the reign of Peter the Great, he abolished the role of the Patriarch of the ROC, and thus elected a council while uniting the church and state.¹⁸⁶ However, the political climate in Russia allowed the ROC to reverse the decision. The *sobor* (All-Russian Church Assembly) in Moscow elected Patriarch Tikhon on 5 November 1917.¹⁸⁷ Further problems due to the political climate in

¹⁸¹ Figes, *Natasha’s Dance*, p.538.

¹⁸² Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.43; ‘Key Dates of the London Russian Orthodox Church of the Dormition of the Most Holy Mother of God’, <http://www.russianchurchlondon.org/en/parish_history/>, 20/4/2015; Zakharov, *No Snow on Their Boots*, p.279.

¹⁸³ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.28; ‘Key Dates of the London Russian Orthodox Church’, <http://www.russianchurchlondon.org/en/parish_history/>; Zakharov, *No Snow on Their Boots*, p.279.

¹⁸⁴ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.28; ‘Key Dates of the London Russian Orthodox Church’, <http://www.russianchurchlondon.org/en/parish_history/>; Zakharov, *No Snow on Their Boots*, p.285.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid*, p.343.

¹⁸⁶ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.118; Huntington, *Homesick Million*, p.134; Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.120; Zakharov, *No Snow on Their Boots*, p.285.

¹⁸⁷ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.118; Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.322; Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.122.

Russian led to a divide in the ROC abroad. In 1921 Tikhon announced Metropolitan Evlogy to coordinate affairs of the ROC in the west,¹⁸⁸ while the political situation in Russian was uncertain, and later the situation worsened as Tikhon was put on house arrest by the Bolshevik regime.¹⁸⁹ In Serbia, a *Sobor* was formed which distrusted the Bolsheviks' influence on Tikhon, who then mysteriously died and was replaced.¹⁹⁰ As a consequence Evlogy claimed complete independence of authority in the West, thus officially splitting the ROC in 1926.¹⁹¹

The split in authority of the church directly split the ROC in London. On one side the liberal *émigrés* were supportive of Evlogy's original appointment from Tikhon, while the monarchist *émigrés* supported Metropolitan Anthony.¹⁹² However, this division was limited as the close-knit community in London remained civil by sharing facilities, and supporting the church with a charity concert each year.¹⁹³ The decision to raise funds for the church, while sharing facilities expresses how important the London parish was for *émigré* life. The religious institution itself was more important than who was the head of the entire orthodoxy. Sir John Hope Simpson claimed that out of the presumed 4,000 *émigrés* in Britain, at least 800 were members of the ROC in London.¹⁹⁴ This demonstrates how important the ROC was for the refugee community, and evidence in the National Archives indicates that Russia Abroad churches collectively remained in contact, and thus illustrates the close relationship between the *émigré* communities.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, Evlogy resided at the Daru Rue in Paris and remained

¹⁸⁸ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.119; Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p.43; Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.123; Williams, *Culture in Exile*, p.123.

¹⁸⁹ 'The Communists and the Russian Church', *The Russian Liberation Committee Pamphlet*, 1 June 1922, p.4.

¹⁹⁰ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, pp.118–119; Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.396; Hassel, 'Russian Refugees', p. 43; Zakharov, *No Snow on Their Boots*, p.290.

¹⁹¹ Ibid.

¹⁹² Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, 399–400.

¹⁹³ Ibid, p.402; Pytor Petrovich Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', p.295.

¹⁹⁴ Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.340.

¹⁹⁵ Diocesan administration of Russian Orthodox Churches in Europe 1921-1925', record RG8 0278, BMD Registers (digitised via <http://www.bmdregisters.co.uk/>).

in contact with the London parish, while occasionally performing church services in London.¹⁹⁶ This demonstrates again the strong relationship between exile *émigré* communities.

(ii) Orthodox Culture

Previously the Imperial Government, and then Kolchak's Siberian Government had supported the church financially.¹⁹⁷ However, when the church became an independent parish in exile, *émigrés* were required to make donations and apply for membership. Within a month 104 applications had been received.¹⁹⁸ In an effort to maintain cultural identity, an increasing number of exiles attended church proceedings, which caused the church to conduct services at St Mary-Le-Bow, before signing a contract to use St Philips (Another Anglican Church).¹⁹⁹ In order to preserve long term Russian religious culture the church kept expanding and offered 'religious instructions for children'.²⁰⁰ The efforts to provide religious instruction for children, demonstrates a clear attempt to preserve Russian culture, and Masha Leonidova Pushchina confirms the importance of ROC in her interview with Ian Skidmore. As an *émigré* child in London, she recalls that the 'centre of everything was the church' within the refugee community, and how the institution played a significant role for the *émigré* youth.²⁰¹ She discusses how the refugees had become so poor because of exile, which made religion significantly more appealing, as church was 'rich in gold, silver and lighted with candles, with beautiful Russian music' in the background.²⁰² Masha's description of the close relationship with the church, emphasises the importance of the church, and its role educating the youth. By 1923 Father John Lelioukhin conducted religious orientated lessons on Saturdays for the

¹⁹⁶ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.323; Huntington, *Homesick Million*, p.140.

¹⁹⁷ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.324.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹⁹ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.362; Zakharov, *No Snow on Their Boots*, p.285.

²⁰⁰ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.326.

²⁰¹ 'Times remembered (1). Lady Williams', interview with Ian Skidmore BBC 4, 30 July 1987 (digitized at the British Library, Boston Spa), 8/12/2014.

²⁰² Ibid.

émigré youth, and Father Vassily Timofeyeff coordinated summer camps for children, which involved the combination of Russian language, culture and religion.²⁰³ Academics present the importance of Russian language, religion, and education for maintaining Russian culture in various exile communities.²⁰⁴ Evidently, the church in London provided the *émigré* youth with all three cultural characteristics. Arguably the ROC in Britain has been one of the most successful institutions for maintaining Russian cultural identity, as the church still exists today after relocating several times.²⁰⁵ In 2015 educational lessons are still available for children.²⁰⁶ Several subjects are taught including; Russian language, Russian orthodoxy, Russian history and Russian geography, which all enable Russian's currently in Britain, to maintain their cultural identity.²⁰⁷ Therefore, efforts to maintain cultural identity in exile allowed the institution to develop into the present day cathedral.

Associational Life

‘All of the old Russia was to be found in this London microcosm.’²⁰⁸

(i) Eugene Sablin and *Émigré* Organizations

In Russia Abroad communities organizations, and figureheads of institutions played a significant role in preserving Russian cultural identity. In Germany, Sergie Botkin was the recognized head of the Russian delegation in Berlin, which looked after the interests of non-Bolshevik Russians.²⁰⁹ Another important *émigré* organization was the Zemgor, which originated in Russia, but moved to Berlin, and then Paris.²¹⁰ The Zemgor dealt with welfare

²⁰³ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.380.

²⁰⁴ Hassel, ‘Russian Refugees’, p.76; Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.10.

²⁰⁵ ‘Key Dates of the London Russian Orthodox Church’, <http://www.russianchurchlondon.org/en/parish_history/>.

²⁰⁶ ‘Parish School and Religious Instruction’, <<http://www.russianchurchlondon.org/en/school/>>, 20/4/2015

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

²⁰⁸ Shilovsky, ‘Here Is Imperial Russia’, p. 291.

²⁰⁹ Williams, *Culture in Exile*, pp.116–7.

²¹⁰ Johnston, ‘*New Mecca, New Babylon*’, p.54; Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.30; Williams, *Culture in Exile*, pp.116–7.

and education among the *émigrés*.²¹¹ In Britain there was no officially recognized organization by government unlike in Germany, yet as previously noted there were charitable organizations that coordinated the *émigrés* in Britain. In chapter one, this dissertation briefly mentioned Eugene Sablin, the former *chargé d'affaires* of the tsarist embassy in London.²¹² The HC were aware of Sablin's position, even though there was no official recognized government in Russia at the time.²¹³ The embassy's work rooms were used frequently by various organizations such as the 'Russian Relief Fund, the Russian Red Cross, and Lady Buchanan's Relief Committee'.²¹⁴ After the British Government had recognized the Soviet regime in 1924, Sablin purchased a private house known as the 'Russian House'.²¹⁵ He and his family lived upstairs, while he allowed *émigré* organizations to conduct business downstairs.²¹⁶ Sablin clearly believed there needed to be a central headquarters for the *émigré* community, and he created a presence of pre-revolutionary Russia within the house. The importance of imperial culture was demonstrated through 'enormous portraits' of Russian Emperors, and large prints of 'Moscow and St Petersburg', along with 'maps of imperial Russia'.²¹⁷ Overall, the need to capture Russian history within the house presents how the *émigrés* were determined to hold onto their past identity.

(ii) Organizations Preserving Culture

Previously political activism of the RLC has been discussed, and this section will elaborate on its role for preserving Russian culture through advertisements. One example in *The New Russia* illustrates how the Russian choir was advertised, which aimed to perform on the British

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.231.

²¹³ House of Commons Debate, 25 March 1920, *Hansard*, vol. 127, c.601.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Birchall, *Orthodox Church* p.279; Glad, *Russia Abroad*, p.214; Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', p.297.

²¹⁶ Birchall, *Orthodox Church in London*, pp.279–80.

²¹⁷ Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', p.297.

stage.²¹⁸ Other advertisements gave *émigrés* the chance to buy Russian language periodicals, including *Poslednija Novosti*, a Russian daily published in Paris, which was the same newspaper Pavel Miliukov edited from 1924.²¹⁹ Arguably Language was the most important cultural aspect of the community, because it allowed exiles to remain isolated. Other advertisements included the sale of *Russkaia Zemla*, which aimed to publish ‘masterpieces of modern Russian writers’, and to protect the ‘material interests of Russian authors who [were temporarily] deprived of the enormous literary market of Russia’.²²⁰ The availability of the *Russkaia Zemla* was significant for preserving Russian culture as Ivan Bunin was one of the main writers.²²¹ There was a demand among *émigré* communities for Russian classics of the Golden Age, and Bunin delivered poetry with ‘old-fashioned Russian virtues’, which made him very popular.²²² He became nicknamed the ‘Russian Moses’ of literature, who would lead the exiles back to the motherland.²²³ In 1933 Bunin went on to become the first Russian to ever win the Nobel Prize for Literature, which emphasized how unique Russia Abroad literature had become.²²⁴ The RLC advertisements allowed *émigrés* in Britain to maintain culture, as they were able to buy Russia Abroad literature. This had a wider impact, as *émigré* writers were able to reach the target audience they needed. Without wide distribution of *émigrés* publications, writers would not have been recognized. Subsequently Bunin may never have won the Nobel Prize, if it was not for *émigré* organizations like RLC. Furthermore the RLC and other *émigré* organizations recognized the importance of maintaining Russian culture in the long term through education. In *The New Russia*, an illustration magazine known as *Zelionaya Palotbka* was advertised, which

²¹⁸ The Russian Liberation Committee, ‘Russian Choir in London’, *The New Russia*, Vol. 2, No. 30 (1920), p.i.

²¹⁹ Berberova, *Italics are mine*, p.240; Figes, *Natasha’s Dance*, p.546; Johnston, “*New Mecca, New Babylon*”, pp.39-40; The Russian Liberation Committee, ‘Poslednija Novosti: Les Dernieres Nouvelles, Russian Daily’, *The New Russia*, Vol. 2, No. 27 (1920), p.ii.

²²⁰ The Russian Liberation Committee, ‘New Russian Publishing Company In Paris’, *The New Russia*, Vol. 3, No. 46 (1920), p.ii.

²²¹ Ibid.

²²² Figes, *Natasha’s Dance*, pp.540–1.

²²³ Ibid.

²²⁴ Berberova, *Italics are mine*, pp.282-283; Figes, *Natasha’s Dance*, p.541; Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.111.

aimed to educate *émigré* children about Russian culture.²²⁵ In comparison to the churches religious instructions for the children, it was apparent that the *émigré* organizations understood education was the most effective way to preserve culture.

Arguably there were more important institutions which maintained *émigré* culture in Britain. The Russian Red Cross was one of the most successful organizations in terms of coordinating the community in London. As previously mentioned the RRC was initially located in the former embassy, before moving to the 'Russian House'.²²⁶ Shilovsky recalls how they often held *bazaar*s to raise funds, which subsequently preserved Russian culture in the process.²²⁷ The large gatherings had characteristics of pre-revolutionary Russia, as former Royal family members like Grand Duchess Xenia Alexandrova often opened the ceremonies.²²⁸ The RRC often supported the ROC by organizing charity events, for example in *The Times* there is an advertisement that demonstrates RRC organized a charity concert in 1923 for the upkeep of the church under the patronage of Empress Marie Feodoronva along with Grand Duchess Xenia Alexandrova.²²⁹ The event had a variety of *émigré* musical performances, along with a performance by the Russian Choir.²³⁰ Furthermore, the RRC had raised £7,000²³¹ over a one year period to help refugees, and in 1924 they agreed to provide the ROC parish with 5 per cent of their earnings from certain charitable events.²³² Christopher Birchall claims in 1924 the parish received £1.18s.5d, which according to Birchall's calculations would be \$450 in 2014.²³³ Subsequently the RRC preserved Russian culture through charity events, and helped preserve orthodox culture in the process.

²²⁵ The Russian Liberation Committee, 'A Russian Fortnightly Illustrated Magazine for Children', *The New Russia*, Vol. 3, No. 36 (1920), p.iv.

²²⁶ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.375.

²²⁷ Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', p. 296.

²²⁸ Ibid.

²²⁹ 'Russian Christian Refugees in London', *The Times*, 22 May 1923, p.9.

²³⁰ Ibid.

²³¹ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.375.

²³² Ibid, p. 374.

²³³ Ibid.

Another important organization within Britain was the North Russian Association. Previously this dissertation demonstrated how 15,000 Russian refugees were evacuated from Archangel in 1919.²³⁴ In the 1920s *Obshchestvo Severyan* (NRA) was founded to unite those from North Russia and Siberia.²³⁵ The Russian *émigré* Vassily Zakharov recalls how the NRA was essential for maintaining pre-revolutionary culture.²³⁶ The importance of maintaining culture through the *émigré* youth is apparent yet again, through the role of the NRA, which organized events for the refugee children including various concerts and productions.²³⁷ Shilovsky reiterates Zakharov's description that the younger *émigrés* benefitted, as they were able to remain 'within the orbit of Russian interests and love for Russian culture'.²³⁸ Their cultural identity was preserved through theatrical performance, literary gatherings, and Russian education.²³⁹ Another organization that maintained Russian culture known as the Russian Musical-Dramatic Art Circle 'Lahd' held gatherings 'once a fortnight, when the best Russian and British artists' performed in London.²⁴⁰ However, this institution clearly demonstrates some social integration was gradually occurring, as they reviewed British artists too, this was probably due to the *Ballets Russes*, featuring on variety programmes.²⁴¹ Evidently various *émigré* activities present how significant preserving Russian culture was for the Russia Abroad community, and that they were unwilling to lose their pre-revolutionary world, because if they did, they would inevitable integrate into British society more quickly. Therefore, this evidence agrees with Raeff's interpretation.

²³⁴ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.332; Kulischer, *Europe on the Move*, p.54; Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.28; Simpson, *Refugee Problem*, p.339.

²³⁵ Birchall, *Orthodox Church*, p.376; Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', p. 294.

²³⁶ Ibid, p.377; Zakharov, *No Snow On Their Boots*, p.162.

²³⁷ Ibid.

²³⁸ Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', p. 294.

²³⁹ Ibid.

²⁴⁰ Narodopravst, 'The Russian Musical-Dramatic Art Circle', *The Russian Commonwealth*, Vol. 2, No.13 (1919), p.335.

²⁴¹ Lynn Garafola, *Diaghilev's Ballets Russes* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1998), p.331.

Arts and Letters

‘It was hard enough for non-writers to acclimatize themselves to life abroad, but exile cut the creative writers off from their audience.’²⁴²

(i) Academic and Literary Culture

Previously this dissertation has covered the importance of wide distribution of *émigré* literary and academic writings in order to preserve culture. Arguably one of the most important *émigrés* in Britain, in regards to maintaining Russian literary culture, was Prince Dimitry Patrovich Svytopolk-Mirsky (1890–1939), who fought against the Bolsheviks in general Denikins ‘White’ army before residing in Britain.²⁴³ Mirsky was appointed lecturer in Russian literature at King’s College in London (1922–1932), and had been writing for the English literary press since 1920.²⁴⁴ Furthermore Mirsky contributed frequently to the *Slavonic Review* from 1922, a journal which still exists in 2015.²⁴⁵ The institution was funded £2,000 by the Lloyd George government, while external funding was provided by the Czechoslovakian Government.²⁴⁶ President Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1850–1937) of Czechoslovakia was a Russophile, who aimed to prepare *émigrés* for their return to the motherland, thus provided funding to academic institutions.²⁴⁷ Masaryk also funded specific *émigré* writers, including Marina Tsvetaeva, a poet that Mirsky had a close relationship with.²⁴⁸ Mirsky had a wide range of connections in Paris, he associated with the literary *émigré* community, which is how he originally formed a relationship with Tsvetaeva.²⁴⁹ In London Mirsky was arguably more influential due to his position at the college, and he had connections with Ariadna Tyrkova-Willaims of the RLC.²⁵⁰

²⁴² Glad, *Russia Abroad*, p.14.

²⁴³ G.S. Smith, *D.S. Mirsky: A Russian-English Life, 1890–1939* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p.xii.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p.93.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁷ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.99; Smith, *Mirsky*, p.86.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁹ Berberova, *Italics are mine*, p.566; Smith, *Mirsky*, pp. 146–7.

²⁵⁰ Smith, *Mirsky*, p.88.

In 1926 he used his connections to arrange for Tsvetaeva's poetry readings in London.²⁵¹ Alexander Pushkin's classical literature of the Golden Age was regarded highly amongst the literary *émigrés*, including Tsvetaeva, as they celebrated his birthday as an official symbol of Russian literature.²⁵² Mirsky was essential for promoting Russian literature, especially Tsvetaeva's poetry; in February 1926 he wrote the first English written review of her poetry, and used his influence in the Anglo-Russian Literary Society to arrange an appearance at the School of Slavonic Studies at Kings College.²⁵³ Mirsky further preserved Russian literary culture through his individual publications, including the *Contemporary Russian Literature 1881–1925* which was published to present 'modern Russian literature to the English speaking public', thus preserving Russian culture in Britain.²⁵⁴ He analysed several significant writers before and after 1900 including Tolstoy, Bunin, Andreev and Tsvetaeva. Mirsky stated that Tsvetaeva 'poetry is all fire, enthusiasm, and passion', her acknowledgement in this publication alone was significant for her career.²⁵⁵ Overall Mirsky was a significant member of the *émigré* community in Britain. As a university lecturer he promoted Russian literature, as he travelled to various other universities, providing special guest appearances, as he was the only specialist in Russian literature within the country.²⁵⁶ His publications were arguably more important as the British were able to understand Russian literature, while his critiques were also published abroad, for example *The Link* in Paris frequently published his work from 1924, along with other *émigré* academia.²⁵⁷ Overall, his contribution illustrates Raeff's interpretation was correct to an extent, Russian culture was preserved, while Mirsky's work also favoured social integration as the British could access Russian literature in English.

²⁵¹ Ibid, pp.146–7.

²⁵² Figes, *Natasha's Dance*, p.540; Huntington, *Homesick Million*, p.212; Johnston, 'New Mecca, New Babylon', p.47; Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, pp.95–5.

²⁵³ Smith, *Mirsky*, pp.146–7; 'The Anglo-Russian Literary Society', *The Slavonic Review* Vol 1, No. 3, (1923), p.703.

²⁵⁴ Prince D. S. Mirsky, *Contemporary Russian Literature 1881–1925* (London: Routledge, 1926), p.viii.

²⁵⁵ Ibid, p.262.

²⁵⁶ Smith, *Mirsky*, p.94.

²⁵⁷ Berberova, *Italics are mine*, p.240 ; Smith, *Mirsky*, p.132.

(ii) *Émigré* Influence of British Culture

In order to understand how *émigré* culture survived through Russian arts in Britain, it is essential to acknowledge two influential *émigrés*. First of all this section will address how influential Theodore Komisarjevsky (1882–1954) was on British theatre productions, and how his work maintained Russian culture. Second of all this section will address the influence of Sergei Pavlovich Diaghilev (1872–1929). Komisarjevsky worked as a director in Moscow until 1919, but when he feared arrest he fled to Paris, and then to London.²⁵⁸ Komisarjevsky aimed to bring Russian culture to the British stage, thus produced modifications of the classical Russian playwrights by Anton Chekhov (1860–1904).²⁵⁹ In 1925–6 he staged four plays by Chekhov at the Barnes Theatre in London, which was a former cinema.²⁶⁰ Small theatre's allowed Komisarjevsky to develop theatrical performance, while attracting an 'immense number of playgoers' due to low prices.²⁶¹ He provided London with a special version of Chekhov that entertained the British public while maintaining Russian cultural performance.²⁶² His British productions became hugely admired and his version of *The Government Inspector* was transferred to the West End.²⁶³ His influence on British theatre demonstrates how Russian culture was preserved on the British stage, and how *émigrés* favoured Russian classics from the Golden Age. This corresponds with Raeff's interpretation that Russia Abroad exiles preserved classical culture as part of their identity, and metaphorically used this culture to maintain their heritage.²⁶⁴

²⁵⁸ Theodore Komisarjevsky, *Myself and The Theatre* (London: William Heinemann, 1929), pp.14-19.

²⁵⁹ Alexei Bartoshevich, 'Theodore Komisarjevsky, Chekhov, and Shakespeare', in Laurence Senelick (ed.), *Wandering Stars: Russian Émigré Theatre, 1905–1940* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1992), p.105; Stuart Young, 'Formless', 'Pretentious', 'Hideous and Revolting': Non-Chekhov Russian and Soviet Drama on the British Stage', in Rebecca Beasley and Philip Ross Bullock (eds.) *Russia in Britain 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), p.96.

²⁶⁰ Ibid; Bartoshevich, 'Theodore Komisarjevsky', p.105.

²⁶¹ James Agate, *A Short View of the English Stage, 1900–1926* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1926), p.114; Young, 'On the British Stage', p.96.

²⁶² Bartoshevich, 'Theodore Komisarjevsky', Chekhov, p.107; Young, 'On the British Stage', p.96.

²⁶³ Young, 'On the British Stage', p.100.

²⁶⁴ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.95.

Diaghilev's *Ballets Russes* were arguably the most successful non-religious *émigré* institution that preserved Russian culture. Diaghilev had left Russia long before the Bolshevik revolution, however the political turmoil during the first two decades of the twentieth century ensured his *Ballets Russes* did not return.²⁶⁵ Diaghilev expressed Russian culture through coordinated collaborations of respectable artists and composers.²⁶⁶ The *Ballets Russes* were very popular and toured London in the 1920s at a variety of places including the West End.²⁶⁷ In London Diaghilev identified himself with the former aristocrats and helped organize performances in aid of the Russian Relief Fund, which encouraged *émigrés* and British subjects to attend events, thus preserving Russian culture and helping other Russian refugees.²⁶⁸ The *Ballets Russes* gradually became 'Anglicized' during their time in Britain, and slashed prices to attract a larger British following.²⁶⁹ Diaghilev's attempts to glorify Russian culture was hugely successful, while influencing British theatrical culture in the process. After his death his legacy lived on through former members of the *Ballets Russes*; Marie Rambert founded the 'Young Ballet Club' in London, and Dame Ninette de Valois who went on to form 'The Royal Ballet'.²⁷⁰ Diaghilev's influence on British culture influenced other areas away from the stage. While the *Ballets Russes* were on tour at the London Coliseum in 1920, Diaghilev gave the British artist Laura Knight rare permission to draw and paint the dancers back stage, and she presented her work an exhibition in London.²⁷¹ As a consequence of Knight's work other British artists became inspired, thus became involved with stage productions.²⁷² Overall, the *Ballets Russes* were symbolic of *émigré* culture. They were an act of *émigrés* that adapted to other countries preferences, yet still preserved Russian culture.

²⁶⁵Geoffery Marsh, 'Serge Diaghilev and the Strange Birth of the Ballet Russes' in Jane Pritchard (ed.), *Diaghilev: And The Golden Age Of The Ballets Russes 1909-1929* (London: V&A Publishing, 2010), p.26.

²⁶⁶ Ibid, p.187.

²⁶⁷ Boris Kochno, *Diaghilev: And The Ballets Russes* (London: Allen Lane, 1971), p.160; Garafola, *Ballets Russes*, p.332.

²⁶⁸ Garafola, *Ballets Russes*, p.333.

²⁶⁹ Ibid, p.332.

²⁷⁰ Figes, *Natasha's Dance*, p.560; Jane Pritchard 'Les Ballets 1933', in *Les Ballets 1933* (Brighton: The Royal Pavilion, 1987), p.9; Marsh, 'Ballet Russes', p.196.

²⁷¹ Marsh, Diaghilev, p.192.

²⁷² Ibid, p.199.

Conclusion

‘Here is Imperial Russia, here we breathe its air.’²⁷³

The aim of this dissertation was to fill the gap in the historiography of Russia Abroad in regards to the first wave emigration in Britain. In the introduction this dissertation demonstrated how historians have previously signified how important the role of the ROC was for maintaining the exile community.²⁷⁴ Furthermore, how communities often consisted of upper class and well educated refugees. Throughout this dissertation evidence has been provided to demonstrate the community in Britain consisted of political exiles including Pavel Miliukov, and former Russia aristocrats and Russian Monarchy. The RRC, along with Grand Duchess Xenia Alexandrova and other exiled Royal family members, played a significant role in maintaining Russian culture through participation in public events and supporting the church. Maintaining Russian culture was an effort to remain isolated from the British society, yet the overall aim was to prepare for the potential return to Russia once the Bolsheviks were no longer in power. Evidently, this never happened until the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. Consequently, the younger generation of the first wave, such as Masha and her sister, adopted a dual identity. Many of the younger generation became naturalized through British education and employment opportunities, yet remained as part of the Russia Abroad community.²⁷⁵

In the third chapter this dissertation has shown how Russian cultural identity in Britain was preserved through various *émigré* institutions, and how some individuals played a key role in maintaining the Russia Abroad in Britain. The ROC in London was arguably the most important institution as it provided a central meeting point for the entire community, and culturally it preserved traditional Russian values. The role of ROC presents one of the most

²⁷³ Shilovsky, ‘Here Is Imperial Russia’ p.297.

²⁷⁴ Hassel, ‘Russian Refugees’, p.58; Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p. 124.

²⁷⁵ Ibid, p.293.

common measures to preserve cultural heritage, and that was through education. Andreyev and Savicky demonstrated the importance of Russian education through various Russian faculties in Prague.²⁷⁶ Although in Britain the community was too small to form large educational institutions, the role of educating *émigré* youth was evident throughout. The ROC provided religious instruction for children, while the NRA set up unofficial Russian educational programs, and the RLC enabled the refugees to purchase Russian children's illustration magazines.

Furthermore, the distribution of *émigré* literary texts allowed the exiles in Britain to maintain cultural heritage through classical Russian publications of the Golden Age. Bunin and Tsetaeva, along with other influential exiled writers of Russia Abroad, reproduced similar material. To reiterate, Mirsky was largely influential for promoting publications by Tsvetaeva, while the RLC advertised publications by Bunin. Although the emigration in Britain preserved Russian culture in an effort to maintain the Russia Abroad in London, there were other circumstances where *émigrés* influenced British culture. The legacy of Komisarjevsky and Diaghilev demonstrate two individuals who gradually integrated into British and European societies in an effort to promote Russian culture. Diaghilev's *Ballets Russes* were arguably the most influential as the Royal Ballet in Britain was formed as a consequence. Other examples of *émigré* integration can be seen through the younger generation attending British schools. However, in most circumstances the refugees in Britain maintained their cultural identity through the use of *émigré* organizations, and remained loyal to the Russia Abroad community in London. Therefore, this dissertation strengthens Raeff's overall interpretation.

Chapter two of this dissertation aimed to establish the role of political organizations in the Russia Abroad in Britain, and to clarify whether their political opinion corresponded with Raeff's interpretation. He claimed that there was a unified political stance amongst the mass

²⁷⁶ Andreyev and Savicky, *Russia Abroad*, p.64.

emigration, that they outright rejected the Bolshevik regime.²⁷⁷ This dissertation analysed the role of political *émigré* organizations and the influence of Pavel Miliukov. The evidence in *émigré* periodicals and Miliukov's individual publications seems to confirm Raeff's interpretation. Although exiles had different political preferences, the general ambition of exile organizations was to oppose the Bolshevik regime. Throughout the Russian Civil War, the RLC was essential for providing anti-Bolshevik propaganda in English to influence British public opinion. However, once the 'Whites' were defeated, they changed their attitude to challenge the Soviet Government's authority. The RLC published articles to suggest Bolshevik leadership was more of a tyranny, which did not correspond with Western democratic values. *The Russian Outlook* and other periodicals opposed the 'Hands off Russia' campaign and the British newspapers that sympathized with the Bolshevik cause. Although further military intervention was not implemented due to the split in government and public opinion, these periodicals were essential for this dissertation. Political unification was initially preserved through the RNC in Britain, yet due to the limitations of this dissertation there has been no clarification on whether this organization survived after 1924. What can be assumed is after 1924 all political organizations ceased to exist as the RLC, the most active organization stopped publication in 1924.²⁷⁸ Overall, evidence in chapter two clarifies a unified political rejection of the Bolshevik regime and thus corresponds with Raeff's interpretation.

In chapter one, this dissertation aimed to provide whether the refugees were accepted into British society and whether they resisted social integration. Raeff suggested most exiles resisted integration. However, British Government policy only required exiles to obtain an employment permit, yet did not limit refugees to certain employment sectors. Refugees gradually integrated into British society through employment, although they did not break away from the Russia Abroad. Educational systems encouraged naturalization, yet this did not

²⁷⁷ Raeff, *Russia Abroad*, p.10.

²⁷⁸ Alston, 'Russian Liberation Committee', p.2.

mean exiles left the Russia Abroad.²⁷⁹ This demonstrates how the younger generation of the first wave adopted a dual identity. Chapter one clarified how integration was circumstantial as *émigré* organizations maintained the Russian community by co-ordinating events, and preserving Russian culture. Eugene Sablin is one example of an *émigré* who did not naturalize and kept his Nansen passport. There is no statistic available to demonstrate how many exiles kept their Nansen passport, or became naturalized. This is demonstrated in chapter one when *Parliamentary Hansard* proves members of the HC were unaware of the number of naturalized refugees.²⁸⁰ Although chapter one was limited due to poor documentation of emigration on behalf of the British Government, what can be concluded is the strict British immigration policy adopted in the first two decades of the twentieth century limited the number of Russian exiles to less than 15,000. Furthermore, those who became part of the Russia Abroad in London maintained cultural identity even if the younger generation did adopt a dual identity. This chapter illustrates how exiles could integrate if they wished, however unlike Simpson's and Kushner's assumptions, most resisted full assimilation. Therefore, this dissertation strengthens Raeff's interpretation.

Overall, this dissertation has confirmed that the small influx of Russian refugees did form a Russia Abroad which shared characteristics of Raeff's interpretations, through the use of a variety of primary sources. Integration was circumstantial, whilst the exile community preserved Russian culture through various institutions, which allowed the refugees to remain isolated. Political unification attempts were made to form the RNC and various *émigré* periodicals shared an anti-Bolshevik campaign which lasted until the recognition of the Soviet Government. Although there was a lack of political organization in Britain after 1924, the exile population still shared the anti-Bolshevik political opinion. What can be concluded is that this dissertation has provided a valuable insight of the first wave of Russian refugees in Britain,

²⁷⁹ Shilovsky, 'Here Is Imperial Russia' p.293.

²⁸⁰ House of Commons Debate, 27 June 1938, Hansard, vol. 337 c.1547–8W.

and as a consequence has filled the gap in Russia Abroad historiography to an extent. Furthermore, evidence within this dissertation illustrates Russia Abroad communities remained in contact with one another, through the church, through distribution of academia and through the movement of *émigrés*. This highlights the value of historiography on the British Russia Abroad. Additionally, this dissertation has raised wider issues to be addressed through further research. Raeff claimed most Russia Abroad communities ceased to exist after the Second World War, however there is evidence to suggest the community in London still existed as late as the 1950s. This dissertation was limited to focus on the initial influx before 1926, which leaves a thirty year period where the refugees would have gradually integrated. Further research could be conducted to shed light on the process by which the *émigré* community integrated into British society.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Digitized British Library Recording

'Times remembered (1). Lady Williams', interview with Ian Skidmore BBC 4, 30 July 1987 (digitized at the British Library, Boston Spa), 8/12/2014.

Hansard / Parliamentary Papers Online and then list the dates of debates:

House of Commons Debate, 25 March 1920, vol. 127, c.60.

House of Commons Debate, 24 May 1922, vol. 154, c.1209–17.

House of Commons Debate, 14 May 1924, vol. 173 c.1312–3.

House of Commons Debate, 27 June 1938, vol. 337 c.1547–8W.

Memoirs

Dubasova, Natalya Leonidovna, 'A Woman of Resource', memoir in Glenny, Michael, and Stone, Norman (eds.), *The Other Russia: The Experience of Exile* (London: Faber, 1991), pp. 302–304.

Lawrence, Olga Petrovna, 'Getting by in England', memoir in Glenny, Michael, and Stone, Norman (eds.), *The Other Russia: The Experience of Exile* (London: Faber, 1991), pp. 298–301.

Shilovsky, Pytor Petrovich, 'Here Is Imperial Russia', memoir in Glenny, Michael, and Stone, Norman (eds.), *The Other Russia: The Experience of Exile* (London: Faber, 1991), pp. 289–297.

Shilovsky, Pytor Petrovich, 'Things Fall Apart', memoir in Glenny, Michael, and Stone, Norman (eds.), *The Other Russia: The Experience of Exile* (London: Faber, 1991), pp. 54–63.

Williams, Lady Masha, 'Pride Among the Packing Cases', memoir in Glenny, Michael, and Stone, Norman (eds.), *The Other Russia: The Experience of Exile* (London: Faber, 1991), pp. 305–310.

Newspapers

'British Property in Russia', *The Times*, 19 June 1925.

'Hands off Russia', *The Times*, 1 December 1919.

'Our Bolsheviks', *The Times*, 1 March 1920.

'Russian Christian Refugees in London', *The Times*, 22 May 1923.

Websites

Diocesan administration of Russian Orthodox Churches in Europe 1921-1925', record RG8 0278, BMD Registers (digitised via <http://www.bmdregisters.co.uk/>).

'Key Dates of the London Russian Orthodox Church of the Dormition of the Most Holy Mother of God', <http://www.russianchurchlondon.org/en/parish_history/>, 20/4/2015.

'Parish School and Religious Instruction', <<http://www.russianchurchlondon.org/en/school/>>, 20/4/2015.

Other Publications

Agate, James, *A Short View of the English Stage, 1900–1926* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1926).

Cournos, John, *London under the Bolsheviks: A Londoner's Dream on Returning from Petrograd* (London: The Russian Liberation Committee, 1919), pp.1–12.

Huntington, W. Chapin, *The Homesick Million Russia-out-of-Russia* (Boston: The Alpine Press, 1933).

Miliukov, Paul, *Bolshevism: An International Danger Its Doctrine and its Practice through War and Revolution* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1920).

Miliukov, Paul. N., *Russia To-day and To-Morrow* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922).

Milyoukov, Pavel., *Russia and Its Crisis* (Chicago: The University Chicago Press, 1905).

Mirksy, Prince D. S., *Contemporary Russian Literature 1881–1925* (London: Routledge, 1926).

Simpson, Sir John Hope, *The Refugee Problem: Report of a Survey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939).

'The Anglo-Russian Literary Society', *The Slavonic Review*, Vol 1, No. 3 (1923), pp. 703–704.

'The Communists and the Russian Church', *The Russian Liberation Committee Pamphlet*, 1 June 1922.

Theodore Kimisarjevsky, *Myself and The Theatre* (London: William Heinemann, 1929).

Periodicals

Bulletin of the Russian Liberation Union, nos. 1 to 52 (February 1919 – February 1920).

The New Russia, vols. 1 to 3 (January 1920 – December 1920).

The Russian Commonwealth, vols. 1 to 2 (November 1918 – January 1920).

The Russian Outlook, vols. 1 to 2 (January 1919 – September 1920).

The Russian Life A Monthly Review, nos. 1 to 6 (August 1921 – March 1922).

Secondary Sources

Journal Articles

Alston, Charlotte, 'The Work of the Russian Liberation Committee in London, 1919–1924' *Slavonica*, Vol. 14, No.1 (2008), pp. 1–11.

Cesarani, David, and Kushner, Tony, 'An Alien Concept? The Continuity of Anti-Alienism in British Society before 1940', *Immigrants & Minorities*, Vol. 11, No.3 (1992), pp. 25–52.

Glebov, Serguei, "'Congressess of Russia Abroad" in the 1920s and Politics of Émigré Nationalism: A Liberal Survival', *Ab Imperio*, Vol. 1, No. 3/4 (2000), pp.159–185.

Hassel, James E, 'Russian Refugees in France and the United States Between the World Wars' *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 81, No.7 (1992), pp.1–90.

Manz, Stefan, and Panayi, Panikos, 'Refugees and Cultural Transfer to Britain: An Introduction', *Immigrants & Minorities: Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Migration and Diaspora*, Volume, 30, No.2/3 (2012), pp. 122–151.

Multanen, Elina, 'British Policy towards Russian Refugees in the Aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution', *Revolutionary Russia*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (1999), pp. 44–68.

Books

Alston, Charlotte, *Russia's Greatest Enemy? Harold Williams and the Russian Revolutions* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007).

Andreyev, Catherine and Savicky, Ivan, *Russia Abroad: Prague and the Russian Diaspora, 1918–1938* (London: Yale University Press, 2004).

Bartoshevich, Alexei, 'Theodore Komisarjevsky, Chekhov, and Shakespeare', in Senelick, Laurence., (ed.), *Wandering Stars: Russian Émigré Theatre, 1905–1940* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1992), pp. 102–116.

Berberova, Nina, *The Italics Are Mine* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1991).

Birchall, Christopher., *Embassy, Emigrants and Englishmen: The Three Hundred Year History of a Russian Orthodox Church in London* (New York: Holy Trinity Publications, 2014).

Cabanes, Bruno, *The Great War and the Origins of Humanitarianism, 1918–1924* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Figs, Orlando, *Natasha's Dance: A Cultural History of Russia* (London: Penguin, 2000).

Gatrell, Peter, *A Whole Empire Walking: Refugees in Russia During World War I* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).

Gatrell, Peter, *The Making of the Modern Refugee* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Glad, John, *Russia Abroad: Writers, History and Politics* (Washington DC: Hermitage & Birchbark Press, 1999).

- Glenny, Michael, and Stone, Norman (eds.), *The Other Russia: The experience of exile* (London: Faber, 1991).
- Johnston, Robert H., *New Mecca, New Babylon: Paris and the Russian Exiles, 1920–1945* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988).
- Kochno, Boris, *Diaghilev: And The Ballets Russes* (London: Allen Lane, 1971).
- Kulischer, Eugene M., *Europe on the Move: War and Population Changes, 1917–47* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948).
- Kushner, Tony, and Knox, Katharine (eds.), *Refugees in an Age of Genocide: Global, National and Local Perspectives during the Twentieth Century* (London: Frank Cass, 1999).
- Lynn Garafola, *Diaghilev's Ballets Russes* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1998).
- Marrus, Michael, *The Unwanted: European Refugee in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1985).
- Marsh, Geoffery, 'Serge Diaghilev and the Strange Birth of the Ballet Russes' in Pritchard, Jane (ed.), *Diaghilev and the Golden Age of the Ballets Russes 1909–1929* (London: V&A Publishing, 2010), pp. 15-32.
- Mawdsley, Eva, 'The Civil War: The Military Campaigns', Acton, Edward, Cherniaev, Vladimir Iu, and Rosenberg, William G (eds.), *Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution 1914–1921* (London: Hodder Headline, 1997), pp. 93-105.
- Mawdsley, Evan, *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Pegasus, 2007).
- Nabokov, Vladimir, *Speak Memory*, (London: Penguin, 2000).
- Neilson, Keith, "'That Elusive Entity British policy in Russia': The Impact of Russia on British Policy at the Paris Peace Conference", in Dockrill, Michael, and Fisher, John, *The Paris Peace Conference 1919: Peace without Victory* (Palgrave, 2001), pp. 67-103.
- Panayi, Panikos, and Virdee, Pippa (eds.), *Refugees and the End of Empire Imperial Collapse and Force Migration in the Twentieth Century* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- Pearson, Raymond., 'Miliukov' in Acton, Edward, Cherniaev, Vladimir Iu, and Rosenberg, William G (eds.), *Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution 1914–1921* (London: Hodder Headline, 1997) pp. 168–175.
- Pritchard, Jane., 'Les Ballets 1933', in *Les Ballets 1933* (Brighton: The Royal Pavilion, 1987), pp. 9–18.
- Raeff, Marc., *Russia Abroad: A Cultural History of the Russian Emigration, 1919, 1939* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- Service, Robert., *The Penguin History of Modern Russia: From Tsarism to the Twenty-First Century* (London: Penguin Group, 2009).
- Smith, G.S., *D.S. Mirsky: A Russian-English Life, 1890-1939* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Smele, Jonathan D., *Civil War in Siberia: The Anti-Bolshevik government of Admiral Kolchak 1918-1920* (Cambridge: University Press, 2006).

Thompson, John, *Russian, Bolshevism and the Versailles Peace* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966).

Tolz, Vera, *Inventing The Nation: Russia* (London: Hodder Education, 2003).

Wade, Rex A., *The Russian Revolution, 1917* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Williams, Robert C., *Culture In Exile: Russian Émigrés in Germany 1881–1941* (London: Cornell University Press, 1972).

Williams, Robert C., 'The Emigration', in Acton, Edward, Cherniaev, Vladimir Iu, and Rosenberg, William G (eds.), *Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution 1914–1921* (London: Hodder Headline, 1997), pp. 302–314.

Young, Stuart., 'Formless', 'Pretentious', 'Hideous and Revolting': Non-Chekhov Russian and Soviet Drama on the British Stage', in Beasley, Rebecca, and Bullock, Philip Ross (eds.), *Russia in Britain 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp.87–112.