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Preface

This dissertation is a brief examination of New Zealand's position as a resettlement country for refugees from the Russian Empire / Union of Soviet Socialist Republics after World War II. Three groups of refugees will be examined. These will be elderly refugees who resided at Nansen Home, Lower Hutt, Russian Old Believers who settled in Southland, and Soviet Jews who were brought to New Zealand through the work of the New Zealand Jewish Community. Much of the onus on bringing refugees to New Zealand was on voluntary religious groups, but whether or not to accept refugees was the prerogative of the New Zealand government and public. One of the most important questions in this study is whether or not New Zealand's attempts at refugee resettlement can be considered a success.
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Refugees

Unrest and Worry
Fighting and Fright
And helpless people walk into the night.
Hearts filled with Sorrow
Fear fills their mind
Unspeakably much have they all left behind
All their possessions,
The lands that they own,
Uprooted, their sense of refuge has flown.
Weary and Hungry,
Footsore and Cold
Bewildered they're filled with reactions untold
Dear Ones are missing
Perhaps they are dead
Perhaps they were hurt in the dark as they fled
Dispised [sic], rejected
Disinterested, stared at,
What have they done to deserve all that
Yesterday Happy
Carefree and Strong
To-day [sic] degraded, a nuisance [sic], all wrong.
Herded in camps
They cannot go back.
How long will they stay in a comfortless shack
Dependant [sic] on others
For clothing and bread?
Although they are humbled, their pride is not dead
They have been stricken,
No more can they stand!
So open your hearts, yes, and open your land.
Give them a chance!
In kindness and hope
Bring your sick brothers right up that steep slope
Don't judge, don't despise,
In love do your best,
And then you will find that the Lord does the rest.

Source: Rev Dr I.W. Fraser's Papers, Presbyterian Support Services, Central Office, Wellington.
Introduction

"Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance." - Article 18, Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, 1948.1

“A whole nation of people, although they come from many nations, wanders the world, homeless except for refugees which may at any moment prove to be temporary.” - D. Thompson cited in M.R. Marrus, The Unwanted - European Refugees in the Twentieth Century.2

“Every refugee represents a failure of human rights protection somewhere in the world, which was not their fault and for which they should not be blamed.” - Amnesty International.3

“They are not to be seen as a faceless mass - each one is a unique individual with a life story, with its share of joy and pain, hopes and dreams.” - Amnesty International.4

New Zealand is predominantly a country of immigrants and the descendants of immigrants. Many of these immigrants came to New Zealand because they wanted to. However, other immigrants came to New Zealand because they were forced from their own countries and were desperate for somewhere else to live. These people are refugees. This dissertation will examine three groups of Russian refugees in New Zealand after the end of World War Two. There are many different types of ‘refugee’, such as displaced persons, national refugees and international refugees. A ‘displaced person’ is someone who has been forcibly removed from their own country to another and then abandoned there.5 A ‘national refugee’ is a person who has fled their home and is living in another part of the same country.6 An ‘international refugee’ is what is generally considered a ‘refugee’. There are several definitions for ‘refugee’. One definition is that a refugee is a person obligated by persecution or

4 Amnesty International, Refugee Campaign.
6 I.W. Fraser to A. Binzegger, 4/12/1978.
war to leave their home and seek asylum overseas. Another is that of 'a person who has fled from some danger or problem, especially political persecution'. The above two definitions are very broad, general meanings of the term 'refugee', but more complex and precise definitions have been suggested. After examining more precise definitions Michael Wenk defined various forms of refugees as follows:

(A) The "refugee" as:
   (i) an individual who was born in or was a resident of what is designated the country of his technical nationality and who, as the result of hostile and war-like activities, armed conflict, or natural calamity in the general area; or
   (ii) who owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, nationality membership of a particular social group or political opinion;
   (iii) is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear of persecution, unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or
   (iv) who, not having nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, unwilling to return to it.

(B) The "escapee" would be any refugee and his immediate family who, because of fear of persecution on account of race, religion, political opinion, or military operations, fled from the territory of his technical nationality and who cannot return or is unwilling to return thereto because of the said fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinion.

(C) An "expellee" would be any refugee and his immediate family who resided or is presently residing in an area other than his technical nationality and who was or is forcibly removed or forced to flee from his usual place of abode due to military operations or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinion.

(D) A "victim of hostilities" is one who, as a non-combatant national in an area of active or subsided belligerency of his own technical nationality, has been subjected to direct or indirect attack by hostile military operations, and who, as a consequence, has suffered the loss of:
   (i) his usual place of abode; AND
   (ii) his membership in a particular social group; OR the expression of his political opinion and belief; OR the expression of his religious affiliations.

The United Nations have also defined what a 'refugee' is:

any person who...owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence... is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.

Of all the proposed definitions the United Nations' definition and Wenk's are the most comprehensive and practical. In New Zealand the differences between different classifications

---

8 Collins Concise English Dictionary, p. 1125.
9 See Appendix A.
10 Wenk, p. 67.
11 Marrus, p. 11.
of refugee are mostly unknown by the general public. In literature related to this topic, definitions have been redefined numerous times which has led to confusion and the overlap of meaning of terms. For these two reasons it is perhaps safer to work within an already defined and accepted terminology, thus the United Nations' definition of 'refugee' will be used for this dissertation.

The phenomenon of refugees is a time old problem. The collapse of societies, religious persecution, economic and political upheavals have produced refugees throughout recorded history. In the nineteenth century the refugee situation changed dramatically with the hardening of national borders and the consolidation of regions into nation states. Although there had been refugees prior to this, the difference between them and the local poor of the asylum area was often barely noticeable. When nation states became more defined, and governments took over the traditional roles of the Church, and local institutions became nationalised, refugees were often left without a legal or social place within that society. Refugee movements of the nineteenth century are distinguishable from earlier movements due to the amount of time involved in each case. Later movements involved much longer periods of time and much larger numbers of people. Despite the length of time that refugees have been appearing there are no all encompassing theories in which to examine their situation.

Creating a theoretical framework in which to study refugees is a 'highly specialised, time-consuming task.' Often the result of this effort is a very particular theory, failing in the attempt to create a general theory. Many of these specialised theories have been created but this is a problem similar in nature to that of not having any theories. As each specialised theory defines its terms, the definitions of frequently used words, such as 'refugee' become blurred, and often cause confusion over the exact meaning of a term. These theories do, however, deal with specific aspects of the refugee phenomenon, such as employment, adaptation, and psychological problems. As well as a lack of distinction over the meaning of terms, there is debate over whether or not people are refugees. Refugees and migrants are often difficult to distinguish between. The primary distinction between is their motivation. Many migrants may actually be as much a 'refugee' as anyone with that label, psychologically, but they have been
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12 I.W. Fraser to A. Binzegger, 4/12/1978.
15 Marrus, p. 4.
16 Marrus, p. 4.
17 Marrus, p. 5.
21 Cohon, p. 255.
categorised differently for some reason, and may not be entitled to the same kind of support as a ‘refugee’. It is difficult to classify migrants into the categories of ‘refugee’ and ‘migrant’ as it has to be determined if the person has left their country due to a perceived threat or through their own free will. The term ‘perceived threat’ is used because the validity of a refugee’s fear comes through their own perception of the situation. The correctness of their perception cannot be tested, and interpretations of the same situation by two different people will produce two different reactions. All migration however, is effected by so-called ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors, which will be discussed later. In every theory proposed, the reality of the existence of refugees is a product of the lack of observance of human rights throughout the world. So far efforts to promote and protect human rights on an international scale have obtained a minimal outcome.

Conducting refugee studies is hampered by the difficult nature of collecting accurate statistics. In this type of study it is possible to obtain statistics for people in New Zealand but there is, at present, no possible way of telling how significant these figures are in terms of overall Russian refugees. Not only are statistics not known for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereafter USSR, but the number of people who would have become refugees if they had thought it possible, is unknown. Due to the difficulty of obtaining permission to leave the USSR many people who would have left, and become refugees, may have considered their chance of success too low to attempt to leave. Many legal emigrants from the USSR are classified in Western nations as refugees due to the circumstances surrounding their departure, and accurate statistics for these migrants are also difficult to obtain. Refugee numbers may also alter dramatically over a very short period of time which makes accurate statistics difficult to obtain.

A major refugee crisis occurred in the early 1930s due to the policies of the National Socialist, hereafter Nazi, government in Germany. Between 1933 and 1939 over one million

22 David, p. 71.
23 David, p. 71.
29 The term ‘Russian’ has been used in this dissertation to describe all refugees from the Russian Empire, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Commonwealth of Independent States. Although this terminology is not strictly correct its use does reduce confusion.
30 New Zealand Jewish Council, Soviet Jewry - A Question of Human Rights, Report no. 14. Wellington. 6/3/1984. Oral Interview, Participants B & C (Mr G. and Mrs B. Reyn), Wellington, 23/6/1997. Mr and Mrs Reyn are a married couple who immigrated to New Zealand in December 1978 with their two children. They became Soviet citizens when the borders of Europe were redrawn at the end of World War II.
people left Germany as refugees. They were refugees for political and 'ethno-religious' reasons. Many of these people were Jews. Attempts to resettle this large amount of people were seriously hampered by the Soviet and Nazi governments. The outbreak of World War II in September 1939 precipitated 'the most formidable displacements of population ever experienced in human history.' Millions of people were forced to move due to either the advance of the enemy, or occupying, army, or the destruction of their homes through bombing or fighting. This occurred during and immediately after World War II, to an immense extent.

In Western Europe refugee problems seemed to be less severe than in the East. Western powers, like the United States, were able to send relief in greater amounts and sooner than the USSR, which had itself been badly damaged during the war. People who had been forcibly moved during the war were able to return to their former homes with greater ease if they were under the protection of the Western powers, rather than the USSR. Refugee camps, where people waited to be allowed home or to find another, were often the site of epidemics. After World War II advances in medical technology meant that these diseases were less severe than they would have been in the past. This dramatically cut the mortality rate. However, this meant that there were more refugees to contend with than if diseases had run rampant. While authorities were trying to alleviate the refugee problem through resettlement, many new refugees resulted from post liberation conflicts in Eastern Europe. Also many European countries who had fought with the Allied powers in defeating Germany felt strongly against aiding Germany after the war with its refugee situation. At the end of the 1940s tension between the USSR and the United States had increased, resulting in more refugees, particularly people wanting to leave the Eastern Bloc. The number of refugees in the ensuing period was significantly less than that of immediately after World War II, but this was an important group of refugees. After World War II a significant amount of social, political, and economic change occurred on a global scale. Refugees became the symbol of these changes.

There have been many studies of refugees and immigrants undertaken, and this has produced a large body of literature on related subjects. However, a lot of this work is of a highly specific nature. Work can be found on the psychological aspects of refugee
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32 Binzegger, 'New Zealand’s Policy on Refugees', p. 11.
33 Binzegger, 'New Zealand’s Policy on Refugees', p. 17.
34 Binzegger, 'New Zealand’s Policy on Refugees', p. 11.
35 L.W. Holborn, Refugees: A Problem of Our Time - The Work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1951-1972, vol. 1, The Scarecrow Press, Inc., Metuchen, 1975, p. 23. In September: 1945 seven million displaced persons were being cared for by the Western powers, and a similar number by the USSR. 7.2 million of these people were Soviet citizens who had been prisoners of war or in labour camps. Marrus, p. 299.
36 Marrus, p. 304.
37 Marrus, p. 298.
38 Marrus, p. 301.
39 Marrus, p. 189.
40 Marrus, p. 358.
resettlement\textsuperscript{42}, the legal position of refugees\textsuperscript{43}, the importance of voluntary organisations in refugee resettlement\textsuperscript{44} and other very specific topics. The importance of religion to Russian refugee resettlement in New Zealand is quite high, and yet there are very few texts which deal with refugees and religion in any detail.\textsuperscript{45} Many general works on historical religious themes, however, do contain brief references to refugee resettlement. Much of the general work on refugee resettlement has been done within the framework of academic disciplines other than history, making a large body of the work important to understand the refugee phenomenon, but not specific to historic refugee movements.

In this dissertation three groups of Russian refugees in New Zealand will be examined. These will be the Nansen Home refugees, the Old Believers, and Soviet Jews. These groups will be examined with the aim of investigating New Zealand's contribution to the alleviation of the world-wide refugee problem. This was still a serious problem at least twenty years after the end of World War II. Two accounts specifically on Russian refugee resettlement in New Zealand have been written, I.W. Fraser, \textit{Elderly Refugees in New Zealand - The Story of Nansen Home} and R. O'Grady, \textit{The Old Believers - A New Zealand Refugee Programme}. Both of these books were written by religious ministers who were personally involved in their resettlement topic. Neither account was referenced and there was very little comparison to other


resettlement programmes, either in New Zealand or overseas. They were not analytical accounts and the issue of the programme's success was not addressed in either case. This dissertation will examine both Nansen Home and the Southland Old Believers settlement as well as Soviet Jewish refugee resettlement in New Zealand. No general history of refugee resettlement in New Zealand has been written which examines more than one resettlement programme. G. Fitzgerald has examined the involvement of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand, hereafter NCC, in resettlement work, but he did not compare it to other programmes.46 No comparative history examining Russian refugee resettlement in New Zealand has been undertaken, with the exception of this dissertation. For this reason this thesis is an important work when examining New Zealand's position as a refugee resettlement country.

To understand Russian refugee resettlement in New Zealand it is important to understand something of the situation in the Russian Empire / USSR prior to the refugees' departure. Shortly after the first pogroms in Russia many Jews began to leave the country. Alliance Israelite Universelle47 officials actively tried to dissuade Jews from emigrating as it was believed that an exodus from Russia would occur on an unmanageable scale.48 The outbreak of World War I led to a great increase of refugees from Russia, as did the Bolshevik Revolution and Civil War. The outflow of refugees continued until the Soviet government of the newly formed USSR49 tightened border controls in the 1920s.50 In 1945, after World War II had ended, nearly a quarter of the population within the defeated German Reich were refugees.51 Many of these were from the Soviet Union. By the end of 1945 over 2.75 million people were handed back to the USSR by the Western powers. A considerable proportion of these people were involuntarily and unwillingly repatriated to the Soviet Union.52 To hundreds of thousands of people this arrangement, and other post-war settlements, were unacceptable, and a new refugee crisis occurred as people wanted to flee their new Soviet leaders and officials.53 Their fear was not unfounded as considerable numbers of repatriated Soviet citizens were executed once they came under the care of the Soviet government.54 As the difference between East and West became more pronounced, and the Cold War intensified, refugees continued to appear. The USSR attempted to strengthen its borders and 'population exchanges'

47 The Alliance Israelite Universelle was a Jewish Organisation, based in Paris, which helped to move Jewish refugees out of Tsarist Russia in the late Nineteenth century. Marrus, p. 38.
48 Marrus, p. 39.
49 The USSR was officially formed in 1922. After the Bolshevik Revolution the country was known as Soviet Russia until the formation of the Union. For this dissertation the term USSR or the Soviet Union will be used for the period from the Bolshevik Revolution until the Union's collapse in 1991. M. McCauley, The Soviet Union Since 1917, Longman, London, 1981, p. 5.
50 Marrus, p. 53 & p. 59.
51 Marrus, p. 305.
52 Marrus, p. 10.
53 Marrus, p. 347.
54 Marrus, p. 316.
began, which led to an increase in refugee numbers. The Soviets executed policies which made it more difficult to leave the USSR, and when refugees did manage to leave illegally the Soviet government demanded their return. Even legal emigration from the Soviet Union became dangerous. To apply to leave the USSR was to invite police harassment, life threatening situations, and run ‘a gauntlet of bureaucratic... harassment.’ Western governments tended to classify most migrants from the Eastern bloc as refugees due to the nature of communist regimes and the circumstances surrounding their migration, which led to a belief, on the part of the migrant, that they could not return to their country of birth once they had left. However, many refugees from behind the Iron Curtain were unable to obtain assistance from the International Refugee Organisation or their country of first asylum. Despite this lack of assistance, much of the refugee problem in Europe after World War II had been solved, but the collapse of communist governments in Eastern Europe in 1989, and the Soviet Union in 1991, has led to a further outflow of people, both migrants and refugees.

Not only is the history of migration from Russia important to understand, but so is the position of religion in the Russian Empire and the USSR. At the beginning of the twentieth century the Bucharest Society of Jewish Artisans claimed that they wanted to ‘live like human beings’ and if it was not possible to do this where they were, then they would move. This sentiment, that Jews were not treated like people, was strongly felt by a number of Jews throughout Europe, including Russia. Many contemporaries and later commentators believed that Jews had been ‘practically driven out of the Russian Empire’. As well as Jewish emigrants from Russia many other religious believers fled from the country when the installation of a communist government seemed imminent. After a communist government was installed Churches all over the world began to worry about the effect communism would have on the church in Russia and other communist countries. Despite the constitutional guarantee of religion in Russia, it was a domestic goal of the Soviet government to destroy religion in their country. As religion provided the only legal alternative to communist ideology, it was seen as a major threat to the government, and religion came to be no longer a

55 Marrus, p. 302.
56 Marrus, p. 349.
57 Marrus, p. 358.
58 Marrus, p. 348.
59 Marrus, p. 353.
61 Marrus, p. 34.
62 Marrus, p. 28.
63 Marrus, p. 348.
private matter. The Soviet Communist Party was called on to use ‘the full force of the law’ to counter any illegal religious practices. In reality this meant that local authorities had been given permission to impair religious observance in any way whatsoever, even if it meant flagrant disregard for the civil rights of the believer, or the law. One of the few relaxations of persecution against the Church came during World War II. Stalin made concessions to the Church in order to gain its upmost support, which he believed to be important in that time of national crisis. This respite, however, was not permanent.

In January 1960 the Society for the Dissemination of Political and Scientific Knowledge, the body which controlled atheist propaganda in the Soviet Union, decided to implement a more active anti-religion campaign. It has been noted that one of the greatest failures of the Soviet regime was its atheist propaganda. In the long-run, every method used to promote atheism and limit religious belief by the Soviet government has failed. An example of the failure of Soviet atheist propaganda can be seen by examining the 1937 Soviet census. It was believed by officials that due to open terror and atheist propaganda only a small percentage of people would dare to profess their faith openly in a census. In the census of January 1937 a question was asked whether people were religious believers or not. The question did not specify a particular denomination or faith, rather asking only if people still believed in a deity. Many people could not bring themselves to deny their belief officially on paper, regardless of whether or not they were practising their beliefs. The census became a chance to openly fight back against religious restrictions for believers of all faiths. Officially it was believed that the census would prove the success of atheistic propaganda and would be evidence to the world of the USSR’s enlightenment as a modern nation without the superstition of religion. However, this was not to be the case and the 1937 Census became a victory for religion. It did not fulfil its purpose to ‘sound the death bell of religion’. Despite the eventual failure of atheism in the USSR, living in the Soviet Union while maintaining religious beliefs was a hard and dangerous pursuit.

Immigration of refugees into New Zealand has to be examined in light of this country’s political and social climate. In 1920 full authority of who would be allowed to immigrate to New Zealand was given to the Minister, and Ministry, of Immigration through the Immigration
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67 Bourdeaux et al, p. 3.
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69 Bourdeaux et al, p. 3.
70 Bourdeaux et al, p. 3.
73 ‘Religion in Russia’, p. 6.
Restriction Amendment Act. The ministry did not have to publicly announce its criteria for the acceptance of immigrants, which meant that it could set whatever requirements it wished. This would later be useful when trying to establish immigration criteria along racial lines to create a 'white' country while still adhering to the United Nations Charter with its points on racial equality. New Zealand immigration policy was still quite restrictive during the 1930s. Jewish refugees in particular, were thought of as 'unsuitable and unassimilable' at this point in time, by New Zealand immigration policy makers. One of the aims of immigration in New Zealand was assimilation. It was believed that pale-skinned Europeans would be able to assimilate more easily into New Zealand society than other immigrants, as they would not be physically different from other New Zealanders of European ancestry. Partly for this reason the Aliens Act and the British Nationality and Citizen Acts were passed in 1948.

The New Zealand Department of External Affairs has been a vital contributor in the management of immigration policy. This is due to the large number of applications for entry to New Zealand made at overseas New Zealand embassies and consulates. Foreign policy and immigration are also linked, but for the New Zealand government, defence of the country was not a major issue related to immigration. The public viewed New Zealand's defence position, vis a vis immigration, very differently. It was believed that immigration policies might endanger New Zealand's security. Therefore, immigrants were a potential threat to national security, affecting how the public treated them and, thus, the migrants' ability to settle and assimilate. Government officials did consider migrants' political affiliations before they were allowed entry, due to the concern of some Members of Parliament that Nazis or communists might migrate to New Zealand. This led to suspicion of East European migrants and refugees. Another factor concerning entry was the applicants' previous connections to New Zealand. The government was more willing to accept people who had relations or friends living in the country. However, the main three criteria for admittance to New Zealand were and are political, economic, and humanitarian considerations. One of these three factors has always been the dominating immigration concern of the New Zealand government. Which factor is dominant differs depending on which period is examined.

74 J. Mitchell, 'New Zealander's Attitudes to Non-British Immigration from 1946 to 1960', BA (Hons), History, University of Otago, 1996, p. 43.
75 Mitchell, p. 43.
76 Mitchell, p. 33.
77 Mitchell, p. 36.
79 Mitchell, p. 45.
80 Mitchell, p. 46.
82 Mitchell, p. 73.
83 Mitchell, p. 37.
85 Binzegger, 'New Zealand's Policy on Refugees', p.34.
means a relatively small intake, while economic predominance usually coincides with large
numbers of immigrants. It has been claimed that humanitarian acceptance of refugees into
New Zealand has been a significant part of this country's immigration policy. However it is
only one part of the motivation for immigration policy. The New Zealand government
wanted to be viewed by the international community as a country doing its share to alleviate
the world-wide refugee crisis after World War II. New Zealanders were also demanding an
increase in population due to a labour shortage. Natural increase was seen as a less viable
solution to the labour shortage than immigration. Officials could choose who would immigrate,
and they chose those people that could fulfil the economic needs of the country by entering the
work force on arrival. Officials wanted to ensure that migrants and refugees would assimilate
into New Zealand society. Racial distinction from the majority of the New Zealand
population was discouraged.

New Zealand's first large-scale acceptance of refugees occurred in November 1944. This first
refugee resettlement programme developed into a wider refugee programme which resulted in
the establishment of twenty two resettlement committees, at Department of Labour District
offices throughout the country. A quota system was also established, and kept under
review so that the country could admit the optimum number of refugees for New Zealand
resources. In general, New Zealand Labour Party governments have made more
contributions to refugee resettlement than National Party governments. However, although
government officials were responsible for who was accepted into the country, the New Zealand
public was responsible for who would be accepted into society. This may have been one
reason why the government considered the ability to assimilate such an important criteria for
immigrants. Voluntary organisations played an important role in the resettlement of refugees in
New Zealand. Many refugees had applied to enter New Zealand through these organisations,
while others were directly settled by voluntary efforts.

Voluntary organisations have played an important role in resettlement of many refugees
all over the world. During the nineteenth century Jewish voluntary organisations were
established through Asia to help Jewish refugees leave Russia. Their motives were not purely

80 Binzegger, 'New Zealand's policy on Refugees', p.34.
82 New Zealand Immigration Service, Acceptance of Refugees as Settlers in New Zealand, New Zealand
Immigration Service, Department of Labour, Wellington, 1989, p. 5.
83 Mitchell, p. 54.
84 Mitchell, p. 54.
85 Mitchell, p. 30 & p. 54.
86 Mitchell, p. 31.
87 Mitchell, p. 40.
90 Binzegger, 'New Zealand's Policy on refugees', p. 95.
91 Mitchell, p. 2.
humanitarian, as the refugees were seen as a threat to the status quo of Asian and Western European Jewish communities. The aim of the Jewish organisations was to move the refugees as far from Russia as was possible so they could establish new communities in the West, rather than interrupt the established pattern of the communities in the countries of first asylum.98 Their motives were not, however, entirely self-serving, and the establishment of this chain of voluntary organisations to move refugees out of Eastern Europe became important to later mass refugee movements.99

The main purpose of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, hereafter UNHCR, was to care for the legal and political rights of refugees. As such it was left to other organisations to implement resettlement programmes. Many of these organisations were voluntary.100 In New Zealand the NCC became one of the most important voluntary groups for refugee resettlement.101 The NCC was formed in July 1941, during a crucial period of World War II.102 It was a way of letting different Christian denominations work together103 and it soon became the main ecumenical organisation in the country.104 Initially, the NCC felt that the Inter-Church Council on Public and Social Affairs should be responsible for immigration and refugee resettlement, but by the end of 1948 the NCC executive, urged by the World Council of Churches, hereafter WCC, decided that the issue of immigration should be brought before the NCC Annual meeting.105 The support of the community was essential in the NCC’s resettlement programme.106 One way in which ordinary New Zealanders could help in resettlement was sponsorship.107 This gave immigrants someone to turn to for help in some of the more mundane, day-to-day things. Sponsors helped to ease the transition of assimilation into New Zealand by being a cultural and social point of reference.108 Willingness to help in this type of support was not overwhelming, but it was considerably more than what was needed. In 1964 the NCC were contacted by forty-two new potential sponsors but were only sent four new refugee dossiers from the WCC.109 The government insisted, in most cases, that sponsorship be arranged for refugees before they were allowed into the country. Many New Zealand churches showed an interest in sponsoring refugees, but for a number of reasons it was not always possible for these offers to come to

98 Marrus, p. 28.
99 Marrus, p. 39. The Alliance Israelite Universelle was one of these organisations.
100 Fitzgerald, p. 15.
101 The NCC was a voluntary organisation but its refugee resettlement office was staffed by paid employees.
102 A.H. MacLeod, ‘Brief Historical Sketch of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand’, Unpublished, April 1975, no page numbers.
104 Macleod, no page numbers.
106 New Zealand Immigration Service, pp. 6-7.
107 Fitzgerald, p. 20.
108 Fitzgerald, p. 20.
109 NCC Executive Meeting Minutes, Book V, 15/9/1964.
The official commitment of the New Zealand government to refugee resettlement has, in reality, been undertaken by voluntary organisations within the country. The government’s involvement in resettlement has been minimal. Although the majority of New Zealand’s resettlement work has been performed willingly by voluntary groups, it is only a small contribution in comparison to what had to be done, and what other countries were doing.

Even though New Zealand’s numerical contribution to alleviating the world-wide refugee crisis after World War II was low, it did make other important contributions. During the late 1950s the New Zealand government, in a break from its normal immigration policies, decided to allow handicapped refugees and their families to resettle in this country. Some countries had accepted certain individuals who were handicapped in some way, but this was usually done for the country of asylum’s benefit. New Zealand was the first country to accept a handicapped refugee and their family as a single unit. Not only was the acceptance of the whole family a unique practice in itself, but the New Zealand government also did not require sponsors for these families. Part of a sponsor’s responsibility was to make sure that the state was not burdened with refugees who could not look after themselves financially, and needed income support after their arrival. It was believed that if a handicapped refugee was able to immigrate with their family, then their family would provide for them. The UNHCR had been trying to convince governments all over the world to try this scheme for many years, but New Zealand was the first to respond positively. The government agreed in 1958 to accept ten families. By March 1959 this number was raised to twenty families. The disabilities these refugees had were physical, social or medical. These three types of disorders were all classified under the heading of ‘handicapped’. The government was willing to let them immigrate, but realised that public support was essential to successful refugee resettlement of any kind, especially that of handicapped refugees. The Prime Minister, Mr Walter Nash, who was later also the patron of the New Zealand Refugee Homes Board, hereafter NZRHB, said -

111 Fitzgerald, p. 76.
112 In January - April 1965 the WCC resettled 4,756 refugees. New Zealand received twenty three of these people, whereas Australia received 3,588. Brazil, Canada and the United States of America also allowed more refugees to immigrate than New Zealand. Lovell-Smith, p. 115.
114 Sweden accepted Tuberculosis infected refugees so that Swedish doctors could gain experience in treating the disease, and France accepted certain elderly refugees. Fraser correspondence to Binzegger, 4/12/1978.
115 Fraser to Binzegger, 4/12/1978.
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118 Fraser correspondence to Binzegger, 4/12/1978.
120 New Zealand Immigration Service, p. 4.
The extent to which any country can receive refugees depends upon the goodwill and assistance which the residents of that country are prepared to offer.\textsuperscript{121}

New Zealand's policy on handicapped refugees encouraged other, larger, countries to try the same scheme. The New Zealand government was praised for this by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. Felix Schnyder, when he visited the country, especially when such a small country had done what larger countries had not.\textsuperscript{122} The handicapped refugees admitted to New Zealand did not fit into the criteria imposed for other refugees by resettlement countries.\textsuperscript{123} Refugees who had fulfilled the criteria for overseas settlement were selected to leave European refugee camps. However, this meant that the majority of refugees left to be resettled were handicapped in some way. This put an unreasonable amount of pressure on countries of first asylum in Europe, as they were left with most of the sick, old, and dying refugees, while other countries were benefiting from the labour and skills of young, fit refugees.\textsuperscript{124} Between 1958 and the early 1970s over two hundred refugee families with handicapped members had been accepted from Europe to enter New Zealand.\textsuperscript{125} Airfares were paid for all of these families by the UNHCR.\textsuperscript{126} The Ministers of Health and Immigration jointly assessed each handicapped refugee's application for entry.\textsuperscript{127} Originally all handicapped refugees were dealt with as a classification, such as an amputee, an alcoholic, or mentally disturbed.\textsuperscript{128} However, a file system was later introduced, where every applicant was dealt with as an identity, rather than a classification.\textsuperscript{129} Other important steps taken by the New Zealand government were to consider families as single units\textsuperscript{130}, and to raise the age of individuals eligible for resettlement to fifty years old.\textsuperscript{131} These changes of policy led to a lessening of old refugees who needed to be cared for in a special home for the elderly.\textsuperscript{132}

The New Zealand public played a determining role in whether or not immigrants and refugees would be accepted into New Zealand society. An acute housing shortage during the 1940s and 1950s meant that any new immigrants would be viewed with hostility, as they were
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more competition for houses. Migrants, voluntary and involuntary, had to contend with not being accepted, and even hostility, from the New Zealand public during this period. In time these feelings eased slightly, but in general, members of the New Zealand public did not have much experience with people from overseas. This led to some cases of suspicion and xenophobia. Refugees who had come to New Zealand because they had been forced to move, rather than making the decision for themselves, were often considered suspect and unable to assimilate. The incorporation of refugees and immigrants into the greater society was and is dependent on the country’s policies concerning immigration and the public attitude. One of the New Zealand government’s most important policies for immigration was assimilation. The public was greatly concerned about this also. Very little was done by the public in order to aid assimilation, and responsibility for it resided in the immigrants themselves. Assimilation was to occur regardless of the cost to the immigrant in terms of culture and identity. Immigrants were seen, by some, as a threat. There were two aspects to this threat. Firstly, it was believed that immigration would lead to a lowering in the relatively high standard of living in New Zealand. This would come from competition in the work force, and in housing. Immigrants were seen as threatening ‘moral standards’ and creating a criminal class. Secondly, immigrants who settled in their own communities would not assimilate into New Zealand society, and this was perceived as threatening. It was believed that they would take the benefits of New Zealand, but would not contribute to society, by keeping themselves separate. However, the New Zealand public did support refugee resettlement on humanitarian grounds. They also contributed an average of four shillings for every person in the country to World Refugee Year. This was the second highest contribution per capita out of ninety-seven countries, second only to Norway. The generosity of the New Zealand people can be seen when examining the contributions of voluntary organisations such as the NCC, the NZRHB, and the New Zealand Jewish Community. These three examples will be examined in later chapters.
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Nansen Home

"The Nansen Home is of special significance because it brings no obvious return to our country. It is disinterested concern which receives these aged refugees."
- Rev. A. Quigley, 26/6/1963, cited by I.W. Fraser, Elderly Refugees - The Story of Nansen Home, Lower Hutt.¹

"The whole story of the Nansen Home is one of generous giving of time, labour and goods and of willing co-operative effort among tradesmen, business firms and residents." - The Evening Post, 10/6/1963.

"This isn't an institution, it's their home and they feel they belong for the first time in half a century." - The Defenceless Ones - White Russians in New Zealand.²

The idea for the opening of a home for elderly refugees in New Zealand originated in early 1958 when Rev. Dr. Ian W. Fraser, a Lower Hutt Presbyterian minister, took a tour of Europe while awaiting a berth as the chaplain of the Captain Cook.³ During this tour he saw first hand the plight of European refugees in camps⁴, and the responses of those people in constant contact with them. In West Germany Protestant church congregations would 'adopt' a church congregation in East Germany. The West Germans sent small parcels to individuals in the East German congregation. This was done to avoid difficulties with officials over sending large parcels. The Eastern minister informed the Western congregation of anything which was especially needed and members of the Western congregation arranged some sort of relief for this need, if it was possible. This relief could be medicine, clothing or a number of other things. For the Eastern congregation the fact that someone was remembering them, praying for them, and caring for them meant a great deal.⁵

¹ I.W. Fraser, Elderly Refugees in New Zealand - The Story of Nansen Home, Lower Hutt, Nansen Home, Lower Hutt, 1985, p. 3.
² New Zealand National Film Unit, The Defenceless Ones - White Russian Refugees in New Zealand, Pictorial Parade no. 196 (1967).
³ The Captain Cook was a ship which took 1,000 immigrants to New Zealand on each voyage. Its operation was a joint venture between the New Zealand government and the Churches of New Zealand. I.W. Fraser, Journey into the Shadows - Report on a Pilgrimage to Europe, Presbyterian Bookroom, Christchurch, 1958, p. 7.
⁴ Rev. Fraser visited Camp Friedland (West Germany), Marienfeld Camp (West Berlin), Volkstrasse (Berlin), and Camp Haid (Austria). He also visited centres for aid to refugees including the Hillsweck Centre (West Berlin), a voluntary kitchen (Vienna), and a resettlement village in Finland, forty miles from Helsinki. I.W. Fraser, Journey into the Shadows, pp. 41-43. See Photo Section, p. 35.
⁵ Fraser, Journey into Shadows, p. 22.
In Italy Rev. Fraser was shown through a hotel which had been bought by members of the Waldensian Church\(^6\) as a home for seventy elderly Russian refugees. This was one of two Waldensian refugee homes. The other home had been set up to help a younger group of refugees.\(^7\) Rev. Fraser was deeply moved by the efforts of this small Italian church, especially in regards to its aid to the elderly. Many countries only aimed to help the healthy, young refugees as they would be able to make a contribution, usually economic, to the country of asylum. Older people were often bypassed as it was believed they would be a hindrance to the community, rather than enhancing it. Rev. Fraser was very critical of this approach, claiming that aid to refugees should be given with humanitarian intent, rather than being viewed as an opportunity to improve a country's economic situation through immigration. He thought second asylum countries should forfeit the right of selection, which countries of first asylum were forced to do.\(^8\) As second asylum countries chose the 'best' candidates for resettlement, the first asylum countries were left with a large number of 'non-economic' refugees.\(^9\)

On his return to New Zealand, Rev. Fraser proposed at the 1959 Annual Meeting of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand (NCC) that a home be set up for '100 aged of chronically ill refugees'.\(^10\) This proposal was endorsed by the NCC and the search began for a suitable building.\(^11\) After it became apparent that a building for housing a hundred elderly refugees could not be found, and that the cost of constructing a building especially for this purpose was too high, it was suggested that the number of refugees the home could accommodate be reduced.\(^12\) This meant that a building should have been easier to find or construct. It was proposed that a building to house twenty-five people should be sought. By the end of 1961, however, the NCC Executive decided that it could not take financial responsibility for the refugee home at any point. £200 was donated by the NCC. from its 1961 Christmas appeal, to the establishment of the home on the understanding that it would not be responsible, either then or in the future, for the homes running.\(^13\) Rev. Fraser was determined that the idea for the refugee home would come to fruition, and if the NCC would not take an active role, other means would have to be found. For this purpose the New Zealand Refugee Homes Board (NZRHB) was established by Rev. Fraser and like minded associates at the end of 1961. By August 1962 the NCC Executive Committee felt the need to meet with the

---

\(^{6}\) The Waldensian Church was founded, at the latest, in the Twelfth Century. Prior to the reformation they professed the importance to the general population of being able to read the Bible for themselves, and had rejected the authority of the Pope. They were persecuted for these beliefs and those congregations that were not killed retreated into the Waldensian valleys in Italy. Fraser, *Journey into Shadows*, p. 41.

\(^{7}\) Fraser, *Elderly Refugees*, p. 5. Fraser, *Journey into the Shadows*, pp. 41-43.

\(^{8}\) The country of first asylum is the first country that refugees enter after leaving their home country. Second asylum countries are usually those countries which accept refugees for permanent resettlement from a first asylum country.


\(^{11}\) NCC Annual Meeting Minutes, 21/7/1959.

\(^{12}\) NCC Annual Meeting Minutes, 26-27/7/1961.

\(^{13}\) Executive of the NCC Meeting Minutes, Book V, 17/7/1962.
NZRHB to discuss its apprehension over the entire enterprise. However, responsibility for the home had already been undertaken by the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand. The Presbyterian Church later indicated that it was not willing to undertake the financial responsibility on its own. As the NCC and no other individual churches would help, greater involvement was undertaken by a group of individuals, and a Trust was set up for this purpose, which was registered 26 September 1962.

A building was found on Waterloo Road in Lower Hutt, and the NZRHB was given permission by the City Council for the site to become New Zealand's first, and only, home for elderly refugees. Permission was only given after public submissions concerning the home were addressed as the site was in a Residential A zone. A petition, signed by eight of the nearby residents, was organised by one neighbour, which was taken to the City Council. The Council decided to allow the Homes establishment on two conditions. Firstly, the proposed addition of a second wing to the building should not be on the Western side of the property. Secondly, a six foot, six inch concrete wall be erected on the boundary of the property and its Western neighbour. These conditions were met. The second condition was more difficult to implement than the NZRHB at first realised, due to financial constraints. Estimates for the wall came to £2,000. When the company who supplied the material for the wall learned of the NZRHB's financial situation they made a cut to their costs, as a donation to the Home, and the fence eventually cost only £300 to erect.

The seventy year old site was able to be purchased in 1962 with grants from the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the NCC, the Council of Organisations for Relief Services Overseas, hereafter CORSO, and the New Zealand public. The UNHCR had told the NCC, when they were still involved in the project, that they would make a grant of 1,500 dollars per resident if a new building was erected, or 1,000 per resident if a building was leased. Alterations and refurbishments needed to be done to the building. Refurbishment of the house was undertaken by local Lions and Rotary Clubs with donated time, services and products from local businesses. However, it was not a strictly local affair, with donations of goods and money coming from all over the country, including a television set from Rangiruru Girls High School in Christchurch and money from a special tournament at the Musselburgh Indoor Bowling Club of Dunedin. When finances were examined after the refurbishment was completed it was found that, due to voluntary help, only £500 had been spent on furniture and fittings.

---

14 Executive of the NCC Meeting Minutes, Book V, 28/8/1962.
15 NCC Annual Meeting Minutes, 24-25/7/1962.
16 Fraser, *Elderly Refugees*, p. 12.
17 Fraser, *Elderly Refugees*, p. 12.
18 Fraser, *Elderly Refugees*, pp. 11-12.
19 Donations for the purchase of the home were made in the following amounts - UNHCR £4,000, NCC £4,000, and CORSO £2,000. 'New Zealand Refugee Homes Board - An Introduction', Rev Dr I.W. Fraser's Papers, Presbyterian support Services, Central Office, Wellington, no page numbers. See Photo Section, p. 36.
21 The *Evening Post*, 10/6/1963. 'Nansen Home', 18/2/1964. 'The Defenceless Ones'.
Nansen Home was officially opened on 30 May 1963 with the support of the Anglican, Baptist, Presbyterian, Methodist, Salvation Army, Roman Catholic, Brethren, Congregational, and Churches of Christ denominations.\textsuperscript{22} The home was named after Mr. Fridtjof Nansen, the Norwegian North Pole explorer who later became the High Commissioner for Refugees for the League of Nations.\textsuperscript{23} Among the invited guests were Dr. Felix Schnyder, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Mr Odd Nansen, son of Mr. Fridtjof Nansen, Mrs Irina Vanteeva, Mrs Natalia Kozutina, and Mrs Karolina Markovskaya, the latter three being the first residents of the Home. While it operated as a refugee rest home thirty-five refugees lived at Nansen Home at various points in time. Most of these residents were ethnically Russian and all had resided in the Russian Empire. Twenty-five of the residents were female, and twenty had left Russia because of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, and the Civil War that followed. The dates that the residents left the Russian Empire vary, due to the nature of the Revolution and the time it took for the revolution to spread through out the country.\textsuperscript{24} For twenty-five of the residents their first country of asylum was China, especially the city of Harbin. The next largest group, eight, found asylum in the Philippines. The refugees who had found initial asylum in China were once more forced out of their homes by political events when the Communists came to power in China in 1949. The Chinese Communist government compelled all foreigners to surrender their property, including businesses, to it. The refugees who came to Nansen Home from China had fled Russia to avoid Communist rule and were not particularly willing to live under it in China, especially as they would be under constant suspicion as foreigners. Under these conditions they became refugees once more. Many refugees, however, did not leave China until the government forced all White Russians\textsuperscript{25} to leave immediately, due to possible industrial collapse and crop failures in 1962.\textsuperscript{26} Up until this point in time they had been used as forced labour and had to survive on strict rations.\textsuperscript{27}

At the end of the 1960s, a group of Russian refugees were discovered in Manila by Rev. Ron O'Grady, a New Zealand minister of the Associated Churches of Christ, interested in refugee resettlement. These refugees were living in ‘very bad conditions’.\textsuperscript{28} Rev. O'Grady believed that a suitable place could be found at Nansen Home for some of these refugees if they wished to leave the Philippines. Between 1971 and 1975 eight refugees from the Philippines

\textsuperscript{22} See Appendix B for the number of adherents to these denominations in New Zealand in Censuses 1956-1981. See Photo Section p. 37.


\textsuperscript{24} The Russian Empire was over 8.6 million square miles in size, with a population of nearly 129 million people.

\textsuperscript{25} For this dissertation the term “White Russian” refers to those people who opposed Bolshevik rule, rather than people from Belarus.

\textsuperscript{26} Untitled Article, Rev Dr I.W. Fraser's Papers, Presbyterian Support Services, Central Office, Wellington.

\textsuperscript{27} Untitled Article, Rev Dr I.W. Fraser's Papers, Presbyterian Support Services, Central Office, Wellington.

\textsuperscript{28} NZRHB, ‘Nansen Home’, Lower Hutt, c1970.
arrived at Nansen Home. These refugees had arrived in the Philippines by being aboard Russian Navy vessels based at Vladivostok in the early 1920s. These ships had been manned by White sailors and, as the Red Army approached Vladivostok, these sailors decided to leave quickly, taking with them whoever was onboard. These ships arrived in Manilla in January 1923. The last refugee to enter Nansen Home was Galia Alinsod (nee Fedoseva) who arrived from the Philippines on 23 September 1975. By this time only thirty-five refugees had lived at the home, but the need for a home specifically for elderly refugees was alleviated in New Zealand. The New Zealand government had altered its policies concerning refugees entering the country. After 1958, elderly refugees who belonged to a larger family unit which was looking for resettlement were classified as a part of that unit. Prior to this refugees had been classified as individuals. New Zealand was the first Western country to adopt this type of approach. Due to New Zealand's adoption of this policy other Western countries followed suit. Although this policy was enacted before the home was opened there was still a need for the home until this type of policy was enacted by other countries. It was not until a number of countries had adopted this policy, and elderly refugees were leaving refugee camps with their families, that the continuing need for Nansen Home could be examined or estimated.

All of the residents were extremely pleased to come to New Zealand, although some were quite wary in the beginning. On their arrival at the home in 1963 the first three residents were absolutely convinced that they would be made to work to live in such a comfortable home. All three women had lived hard lives, and could not accept that they would not have to work. Two of the women had left Russia to escape the Bolshevik Revolution, while the other woman was fostered out, at age six, to a family friend in Harbin, China, after the death of her mother. Born in 1877 Irina Vanteeva had worked as a nurse and a housekeeper until she was seventy-nine, when she lost her housekeeping job and was forced to beg when she could not find further employment. In 1962 she left China for Hong Kong, and arrived at Nansen Home when she was eighty-six. Natalia Kozutina, born in 1895, was also trained as a nurse and later employed as a domestic, until she was sixty-one. Her son, Grigorii, moved away from his mother and, because she was illiterate, they lost contact. Thus Natalia was left alone and destitute. She came to Nansen Home at the age of sixty-eight. Karolina Markovskaya was born in 1903 and, in a pattern that was to continue throughout her life, her mother died when she was young. She was brought up in a wealthy family friend's household, and at age sixteen

29 See Photo Section, p. 38.  
30 The term "Red Russian" refers to any people who supported the Bolsheviks.  
31 Fraser, *Elderly Refugees*, p. 54.  
35 Fraser, *Elderly Refugees*, pp. 28-29.  
was employed in a hospital. At age eighteen she married Mihail Markovsky. Their first child, a son, died very early. Six years after they were married Mihail died fighting for the White Army. Karolina earned money doing domestic work after her husband’s death. Her only daughter, Natalia, also lost her first child, and while Natalia’s daughter was in Karolina’s care she developed pneumonia and died at age seven. Natalia blamed her mother for her daughter’s death. She too became ill, and died of tuberculosis. Karolina had outlived her entire family and had no one to look after her. She entered Nansen Home at age sixty.  

Experience had taught these women to be wary, even of those situations which looked promising. Even after the situation at Nansen Home was explained to them by an interpreter they were positive there was, or was going to be, the threat of ‘No work, no food’, and they were quite concerned that they were imposing on their hosts. After a period of time the residents came to realise that at Nansen Home the threats which had previously been a constant in their lives had been removed. By 1965 residents were well aware of their situation but they had not forgotten the struggle which their lives had been. On 29 May 1965, a CORSO collector, in a house-to-house appeal, stopped at the home, without realising where they were. They were understandably overwhelmed when, between fourteen of the residents, ‘several 10s notes’ were donated.

For many of the residents health problems became apparent shortly after their arrival. Most of the residents initially showed obvious physical signs of malnutrition, and their refusal to waste food highlighted the psychological damage of this ailment. One woman entering the home weighed only 5st 8lbs. Other health issues also arose once refugees settled into the new environment. One possible explanation for the appearance of new health problems is that while life was such a struggle many ailments were neglected, and not treated, or they were inhibited by the stress of the refugee lifestyle. However, once their stress levels were reduced these medical conditions began to surface, and issues which had previously been ignored were able to be treated. Psychological problems are often associated with refugees, and the residents of Nansen Home were no exception. The lifestyle of a refugee is incredibly stressful and often psychological conditions occur. These may arise while the person is still a refugee or afterwards. Development of psychological problems after resettlement may be a mechanism, or a failure, of adaptation to the new environment. Having the stress of the refugee lifestyle suddenly lifted may cause some refugees disorientation and paranoia. These types of problems are usually expected to settle over a period of one to two years, but at Nansen Home problems of this sort which arose were alleviated within six months of arrival. Health issues at Nansen

---

37 Fraser, *Elderly Refugees*, pp. 29-30.
40 I.W. Fraser, ‘Nansen Home’, 18/2/1964.
41 Fraser, *Elderly Refugees*, p. 18.
43 ‘Refugee home to be extended this year’, Rev Dr I.W. Fraser’s Papers, Presbyterian Support Services, Central Office, Wellington, Newspaper clipping, no reference given.
Home are interesting to examine in light of New Zealand government policy. All refugees were
made to take a medical examination before entry to New Zealand was granted. For many
refugees this examination was an ordeal as it could have resulted in their rejection from possible
asylum due to ill health. During the course of the examination, medical conditions which were
considered insignificant by the medical profession and the population of the asylum country,
such as corns, were viewed by the refugee as deadly serious conditions. For the refugee there
was anxiety that these insignificant conditions would prohibit them from a country of asylum.44

Leonid and Anastasia Reikovsky were two refugees who benefited from the compassion
of the New Zealand government and the NZRHB.45 The official dossier of Anastasia, prepared
by a counsellor working in the refugee camp that Anastasia lived in claimed that ‘She is a
strong-willed woman and it is not only natural that the great hardship experienced during her
past life in addition to the long years in camp have influenced negatively both on her health and
her character’.46 This testimony was a considerable understatement. Anastasia was blind and
asthmatic, she had an ulcer, her lungs were quite unhealthy, and she suffered from a number of
other minor medical complaints. Rev. Fraser claimed that if anyone would be declined entry on
medical grounds, it would have been Anastasia.47 In fact, her application for asylum had been
rejected for health reasons. The NZRHB took the records of this particular applicant to a
prominent, well respected, Lower Hutt doctor, Dr. V.I.E. Whitehead, where they were re-
examined. The application, with a medical report from Dr. Whitehead, was resubmitted for
consideration, and Anastasia and Leonid were accepted into New Zealand. Dr Whitehead
considered Anastasia’s health so bad that she would only have a few months to live, but he
believed that being admitted to Nansen Home would fill the remainder of her life with warmth
and peace.48 His recommendation was that she should be allowed the opportunity to live at
Nansen Home and, regardless of her health, that it was ‘not reasonable’ to deprive her of
this.49 The Secretary of Immigration, Mr Howard Thompson, was personally interested in the
Home, and told Rev. Fraser that, with Dr. Whitehead as a medical referee, the Department of
Immigration would overlook the medical criteria of refugee applicants, if the home was
prepared to accept them. Rev. Fraser believed that ‘at last our applications were being treated as
refugees should be.’50 Leonid and Anastasia had married in 1950 in the refugee camp where
they had met. The couple spent eighteen years in a refugee camp. For thirteen of these years
they had been married. Although Leonid would have been able to find a country for
resettlement he refused to leave his wife behind.51 They applied to every country they could for

44 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 19.
45 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 33. See Photo Section, p. 37.
46 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, pp. 32-33.
47 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 33.
48 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 33.
49 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 33.
50 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, pp. 19-20.
51 ‘Happiness at Last’, Rev Dr I.W. Fraser’s Papers, Presbyterian Support Services, Central Office, Wellington,
Newspaper cutting, no reference.
resettlement but every country to which they applied turned them down because of Anastasia’s health. When their second application to New Zealand was accepted they were justifiably relieved. However, during the journey Anastasia contracted pneumonia and had to be hospitalised in Sydney. At this point Anastasia believed she would never get to New Zealand. The doctors attending her in Sydney felt that the depression she was experiencing, over not being in New Zealand was a greater risk to her life than the flight to Wellington. The couple arrived in Wellington and entered Nansen Home on 17 June 1963 where they lived happily until their deaths. Anastasia died on 9 June 1964, nearly a year to the day after they arrived at Nansen Home. Leonid died eight years later.

Life at Nansen Home gave the refugees a place to call home, and in some cases this was an experience unparalleled in the preceding fifty years. The NZRHB believed that residents would be at a disadvantage in the wider community if they could not speak English. Mrs Ferrier was employed by the Matron for an hour a week to teach the residents English. However it soon became apparent that, although the residents had learnt some short phrases, they were not acquiring general language skills in English and the classes were stopped. Of the thirty-five residents at the home, twenty-six were literate in their own language, six were illiterate, and the status of the remaining three is unknown. Of the twenty-six who were literate, many of them had little structured schooling. The residents' overall lack of scholastic training may have been an impediment to their learning of English. The NZRHB and NZRHB Women’s Auxiliary Committee tried to exhibit as much New Zealand culture as they could to the residents, despite this language difficulty. The Women’s Auxiliary Committee took them to Russian films and encouraged interaction with other members of the Wellington Russian-speaking community. The residents met other Russian speakers through the Russian Orthodox Church in Pirie street, Wellington.

Although the church fulfilled an important social role it also fulfilled the religious needs of many of the home’s residents. A few of the residents were Roman Catholic but the remainder were Russian Orthodox. Marie Warren’s papers stated she was Roman Catholic, but she claimed to be a Mormon. Some Wellington Mormons tried to involve her in the local Mormon community by visiting her and taking her to services. Through her own choice Marie’s involvement with the Mormons lasted only a few weeks. Some of the NZRHB had been sceptical of the sincerity of Marie’s belief in Mormonism. It was suggested that her

52 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 35.
53 The Defenceless Ones.
54 NZRHB Minutes 21/5/1964.
55 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 23.
56 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, pp. 28-58.
57 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 23.
59 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 25.
60 One of the residents, arrived 28/7/1971. Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 32.
conversion to Mormonism was made on the belief that she would benefit financially from it. It was also suggested that the Mormon insistence on abstinence from tobacco, tea, coffee and alcohol had been detrimental to her faith. When she died in 1981 she was buried as a Roman Catholic. Shortly after the home was opened people from ‘certain sects’ approached the home’s staff, and the NZRHB, with the hope of being able to try and convert the refugees to their beliefs. The NZRHB did not allow these people to visit the home. They believed that the residents had been refugees because of their belief in their principles, whether they be political or religious. Most of the residents were already believers in a faith of their own choosing, and the NZRHB considered it entirely inappropriate for these sects, or anyone else, to come into the residents refuge from years of hardship and persecution with the intent of pressuring them out of their religion. Rev. Fraser was ‘surprised and disappointed’ that the situation of the residents was misunderstood so badly in the community that anyone would try to do something ‘so insensitive’. Although Nansen Home was initially a project of the NCC, and later a Presbyterian Church venture, refugee admittance to the home was not based on religious distinctions. The NZRHB actively encouraged the residents to maintain their own faiths. When the journey to the Russian Orthodox Church in Wellington city for services became too arduous for the residents the NZRHB arranged for Fr. Godyaew, the Russian Orthodox priest, to conduct services for the residents at the home.

Unbeknownst to the staff of Nansen Home, or the NZRHB, most of the earlier residents of the home were Russian peasants, and it was not until Theodor Antoshevshy arrived in September 1964 that the New Zealanders involved with Nansen Home realised this. Theodor had not belonged to the peasant class when he lived in Russia, and his previously held social position made a difference, for the better, when he arrived at Nansen Home. He was a gentle and polite man and the other residents followed his example, becoming more polite and well mannered after his arrival. With Theodor’s arrival, the atmosphere of Nansen Home changed dramatically for the better. Although Nansen Home was a rest home for the elderly the refugees insisted that they be allowed to do some of the housework. This was done, not under a sense of compulsion, but rather from a sense of belonging. It may also have been to give the residents something to do. To them Nansen Home was not an institution, it was their home. Because Nansen Home staff wanted to foster a feeling of belonging in the refugees, all the home’s facilities were open for the use of the residents, including the kitchen. Some visitors
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expressed surprise at this.70 As often happens when a group of people live together in close quarters, the residents occasionally annoyed one another. When this occurred the residents would often loudly verbally abuse each other. These shouting matches were rarely serious and were often forgotten about after a matter of minutes. Another problem at the home was alcoholism, although not a large one. Two cases of alcoholism occurred in the home. These were serious enough to require admittance to hospital, and the involvement of Alcoholics Anonymous.71 For a period of time four of the residents drank to excess together regularly, and bothered other residents and staff by being disorderly.72 In the first years the home was open, holidays such as Easter and Christmas were commemorated on two separate occasions. The dates for celebrating these holidays were different in New Zealand and Russia, and both dates were initially observed. By the time the residents had been naturalised73 they decided to celebrate holidays on the date recognised in New Zealand.74 Three of the residents of the home, Ekaterina Shpilevsky, Fenoida Haight, and Alexandra Shaouy, felt that they were not old enough to be living the life of relaxation which had been provided for them, despite being in their sixties. They believed they were still able to make a contribution to society and were able to gain employment in the Griffins Biscuit factory in Lower Hutt, where they boxed biscuits. This job gave the women something to do with their time, and earned them extra spending money.75

Nansen Home is now a senility unit under the auspices of Presbyterian Support Services. The need for a special home for elderly refugees in New Zealand abated for two primary reasons. Firstly, elderly refugees were no longer viewed by the New Zealand government as individuals if they were part of a larger refugee family unit. This policy helped to keep families together, which would have otherwise been separated, and has been seen as a significant part of New Zealand's immigration policy. It was also an important step for worldwide refugee policy as New Zealand was the first country to take this approach. The second main reason for the home's decline was that the refugees it was designed to house were only seen as having a remaining life expectancy of approximately ten years.76 As residents died, and resettlement requirements changed, the need for the home decreased. It was decided by the NZRHB that the home should be handed over to Presbyterian Support Services as a rest home for elderly New Zealanders, while still providing a home for the remaining refugees until their death.

70 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 22. 'Refugees Happy', Rev Dr I.W. Fraser's Papers, Presbyterian Support Services, Central Office, Wellington, Newspaper clipping, no reference given.
71 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 22.
72 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 21.
73 At this time an applicant must have been in New Zealand for five years to become a New Zealand citizen.
74 Fraser, Elderly Refugees, p. 26.
75 'Still keen on their work', Rev Dr I.W. Fraser's Papers, Presbyterian Support Services, Central Office, Wellington, Newspaper clipping, no reference given. See Photo Section, p. 40.
76 'Nansen Home' 18/2/1964.
Nansen Home made an important contribution to New Zealand’s refugee effort. Although the number of people it was able to house was very limited, it marked a significant change in the attitudes, and policies, of the New Zealand Government. When the government was originally approached with the Nansen Home idea it stated that, financially, it would hold no responsibility for the project, and would make no contributions to the home’s operation. In time this view altered and the government gave each resident an allowance of £3-10 a week, which was enough to cover a large part of the running costs of the home. 15/- was also granted for discretionary spending by the residents. The three women who worked at the Griffins factory received no financial aid from the government, and paid their board from their wages. The government also allowed the NZRHB to influence which refugees would be permitted to come to New Zealand and live at Nansen Home. Not all applicants were approved by the government, as security measures were always a concern, and a small number of applicants were turned down apparently for this reason, but through the NZRHB’s influence medical restrictions for Nansen Home applicants were relaxed.

Despite its closure, or perhaps because of it, Nansen Home can be viewed as a success. Rev. Fraser’s intention was to help, in some small way, to alleviate the desperate need of elderly refugees in Europe. His subsequent actions were performed with humanitarian need as his primary focus. The publicity his actions received helped to make the nation aware of what could be done about the refugee problem. Mr Thomas P. Shand, National Party Member of Parliament and Minister of Labour and Immigration, claimed at the celebration for the opening of Nansen Home’s new wing and its second anniversary in 1964 that it would have been a tragedy if the government had intervened in the creation and running of Nansen Home. He said it allowed ordinary citizens to unite for a humanitarian cause, independent of the state. This statement was repudiated by another one of the invited guests, Mr Odd Nansen, who reprimanded Mr Shand over the New Zealand government’s lack of involvement. Both Mr Shand and Mr Nansen made significant points. Firstly, the lack of government intervention had meant that the community was free to act to establish the home on a voluntary basis. If the government had established a home for elderly refugees, it would have been more likely to have been an institution rather than a home. A government institution would have taken the initiative away from the community. Thus, members of the community would not have felt that they had a stake in the success of the home. The community effort and participation in the refurbishment and redecorating of the home would not have ever occurred if the home was government run. The opening of Nansen Home had helped to bring the Lower Hutt community together. Secondly, the New Zealand government was making a lacklustre effort in alleviating the international refugee crisis. New Zealand’s contribution to easing the position of refugees was

---
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78 Despite the residents all having resided in the Russian Empire the idea for the home was not based on relief for Russian refugees only.
less than impressive. In comparison to Australia, New Zealand had taken sixteen times less refugees on a population basis.\(^7\) New Zealand initiatives in refugee resettlement were often made by private individuals rather than the government, and many of these were voluntary efforts, like the NZRHB. Although Nansen Home was established by a voluntary organisation it did help to shape government policy, at least in regard to medical criteria, and by being one of New Zealand’s first steps in humanitarian aid towards refugees, it raised the consciousness of the New Zealand public, and it helped to clear the way for efforts made at a later date.

\(^7\) ‘Home for Elderly Refugees’ (2), Rev Dr I.W. Fraser’s Papers, Presbyterian Support Services, Central Office, Wellington, Newspaper cutting, no reference.
Old Believers in Southland

The name 'Old Believer' is a misleading translation of their [sic] Russian title, which means 'devotee of the old rite'. M. Bordeaux, Opium of the People.¹

The opening of Nansen Home in Lower Hutt marked a significant step forward in refugee relief work in New Zealand provided by voluntary church affiliated groups. While the National Council of Churches (NCC) was not prepared to underwrite Nansen Home, it was eager to participate in the work being done by the office of the United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees (UNHCR), and the World Council of Churches (WCC).² Until 1964 the NCC had only worked towards resettlement in specific cases³, but in 1964 it established a permanent resettlement office in Christchurch. Between 1964 and 1977 this office became New Zealand's primary agency for resettlement.⁴ The office was staffed by a full-time resettlement officer, and financial security for the office was provided by the WCC.⁵ The office officially closed in 1977.⁶ Prior to the establishment of the resettlement office the NCC had generally left issues concerning immigration to the Inter-Church Council on Public Affairs.⁷ In 1948 it decided to take a more active role in resettlement, but this role was still limited, until 1964.⁸ In early 1964 Miss Anne Bonde began work in Christchurch as the NCC's resettlement officer.⁹ Miss Bonde had been working with the WCC in refugee resettlement for twelve years and her fourteen months of work in New Zealand were invaluable and critical to the establishment and development of the NCC's resettlement office.¹⁰ One aspect of her job was to train someone as her replacement. Rev Ron O'Grady, a minister of the Associated Churches of Christ and the NCC's Assistant General Secretary, was chosen as her successor.¹¹

---

⁵ Fitzgerald, p. 17.
⁶ Fitzgerald, p. 17.
⁸ Brown, Forty Years On, p. 76.
⁹ "Miss" was the title Anne Bonde used while in New Zealand. In her own country, Sweden, she was a Baroness. M. Lovell-Smith, No Turning Back: A History of the Inter-Church Aid Work of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand 1945-1983, National Council of Churches, Christchurch, 1986, p. 111 See Photo Section, p. 53.
¹⁰ Lovell-Smith, p. 111 & p. 113.
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In early 1965 Rev. O'Grady replaced Miss Bonde as the NCC resettlement officer. One of the first resettlement operations in which Rev. O'Grady participated was the resettlement of a group of Old Believers in New Zealand in the mid-1960s. To answer the question of who these Old Believers were, one must look back into history to the seventeenth century. Although a reformation of the Orthodox Church has never occurred, there have been five separate periods when a split occurred within the Eastern Church. One of these splits occurred during the 1660s. This split was known as 'Raskol'. Patriarch Nikon tried to implement reforms of the Russian Orthodox Church to make its practices closer to those of the Greek Orthodox Church. Nikon maintained that the Russian Orthodox Church had given rise to a number of corruptions of Christianity which had to be eradicated from the Russian Church, and that the Greek model should be followed more closely. However, Archpriest Avvakum disagreed with his Patriarch and founded the Old Believers Church. The Old Believers continued to practise the old, unreformed rites.

Although this dispute may seem an inconsequential matter to many Western thinkers, being only a matter of representation, to the Russian Believers this was fundamental to their belief and form of worship. The split between Nikon and Avvakum was aggravated by Tsar Alexei Mikailovich. Tsar Alexei believed that by making Russian Orthodox practices more like that of the Greek Orthodox Church the split between the two churches would be able to be healed. However, this was not to be the case. Avvakum was the last of the church leaders who opposed Nikon to be defrocked. This was to be done in front of Nikon and the Tsar, after which Avvakum would be exiled to Siberia. In the middle of the ceremony Alexei decided not to defrock Avvakum and gave Nikon an order to this effect. Avvakum's place of exile was also changed to Tobolsk, which was far closer than what had been planned. After this had occurred Avvakum believed that the Nikonian reforms would not go ahead. In 1664 he was recalled to the Tsar's court and it became obvious that he still did not accept Nikon's reforms. Three years later Avvakum and the other Old Believers were excommunicated.
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The Old Believers have remained faithful to the practices of Orthodoxy which existed prior to Nikon's reforms. Icons produced after the seventeenth century are not recognised by present day Old Believers.\(^{22}\) Despite the banning of the Old Believer faith by the Soviet government\(^{23}\), the Old Believer Cathedral, Pokrovsky Cathedral, in Moscow has been allowed to retain its valuable icons.\(^{24}\) This is in stark contrast to the situation of other legal, and illegal, churches which have had to surrender icons of any value to the state, to be displayed in art galleries or stored in archives.\(^{25}\) One of the problems for the Old Believers was the issue of the priesthood. Only priests ordained before the Nikonian reforms were recognised. This led to a split within the Old Believers between the Priestly (Popovtsy) and the Non-Priestly (Bespopovtsy). The Priestly faction were eventually incorporated back into the established church. The remaining Old Believers moved to Siberia in the seventeenth century, where there were fewer people to persecute them for their faith.\(^{26}\) There they created an 'island of faith' in the 'sinful and hostile world'.\(^{27}\) Today the Old Believers call themselves 'Old Ritualists' (Staroobriadtsy), and are known by the Russian Orthodox Church as 'Splitters' (Raskol'niki). They are not strictly speaking schismatics, although they are a minority group. They are severely reduced in numbers due to splits within the group.\(^{28}\)

When the Soviet population advanced further into Siberia persecution came with it. In the early 1930s a severe economic depression occurred in the USSR. This forced thousands of Old Believers, and other Soviet citizens, into the North of China.\(^{29}\) Although the Communist system in the USSR was considered just another persecution after three hundred years of Tsarist victimisation\(^{30}\), the emergence of a Communist government in China in 1949 once again forced the Old Believers to move. The Chinese Communist government tried to coerce the Old Believers into being repatriated to the Soviet Union.\(^{31}\) A number of them refused and began seeking another country in which they could live. Temporary asylum was found in Hong Kong with the help of the UNHCR, while they looked for permanent settlement elsewhere. From 1952 onwards the WCC had resettled 1,500 Old Believers from China. 1,100 (73%) of these people had been settled in one of two Old Believer communities in Parana, Brazil.\(^{32}\) As there were handicapped refugees in some of the remaining Old Believer families, the UNHCR
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\(^{31}\) 'Coming this Month', Church and Community, vol. 22, no. 5, (July 1965), p.5.
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offered financial grants to help settle these refugees. The Old Believers who settled in Southland came from the Sinkiang Province in China.

The settlement of the Old Believers in Southland was one of the first attempts at group resettlement by the NCC. Because of the nature of the Old Believers community it was considered unwise to settle the newcomers throughout the country. It was thought that the Old Believers would be better able to settle into New Zealand society if they could, in some way, maintain a link with their old lifestyle. As the group consisted of farmers, their wives and families settlement in a rural area seemed appropriate. It was believed by some of the people involved in the resettlement that the major centres would be too far removed from the Old Believers rural experience, and that the cities would be too impersonal. Small towns were considered too small to provide employment for such a large number of job seekers. Six possible centres were considered. They were Hamilton, New Plymouth, Palmerston North, Hastings, Nelson, and Invercargill. As well as being in a rural area there were other criteria for a suitable settlement site. These included the need for the area needed to possess an active branch of the NCC, employment opportunities, and some key lay people who would be active in the resettlement process. Invercargill fulfilled all of these criteria, and the members of several Invercargill churches had been enthusiastically interested in the settlement of Russian refugees for some time.

Although the entire group of Old Believers was to be settled in Southland, Mr T.P. Shand, the Minister of Immigration, stated that the establishment of an exclusive religious community would not be sanctioned by the New Zealand government. If the refugees decided to form such a community it would only be permissible after they had lived within New Zealand for a reasonable period of time. For this reason the group was separated into family units. It was expected that the Old Believers would assimilate into the Southland community.
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given time. Officials believed that once they assimilated, they would not want wish to reform their community, and separate themselves from the rest of society. Mr Shand felt that even if the Old Believers did reform their community, they would at least have learnt something about the rest of society, and it was believed that this was in the best interests of the individuals of the Old Believer community.45 Their assimilation into New Zealand society was stated as one of the aims of the resettlement programme.46 This aim caused some controversy after a Compass programme was shown on New Zealand television publicising this fact. However, the plan to separate the community continued. The price of land in Southland also played an important part in the decision to settle the Old Believers throughout the district. By the 1980s many of the Old Believer families had left Southland, and some had even left the country. This might have been due to the separate settlement programme the New Zealand government insisted on. Prior to settlement in Southland, the Old Believer community had remained together for approximately three hundred years, and their unity had helped to define their identity.

Before Miss Bonde departed from the service of the NCC she helped Rev. O'Grady with the organisation of the Old Believers' resettlement. After Southland was decided upon as the destination for the group, Miss Bonde and Rev. O'Grady flew to Invercargill to begin the organisation of the resettlement programme, and to familiarise themselves with the city. They were met at the airport by the Very Rev. Stuart C. Francis, the Chairman of the Southland Branch of the NCC. One of the most important issues during the visit to Invercargill was deciding who was going to be the coordinating supervisor of the programme in Southland. It had been decided that the responsibility for this should be administered by an involved lay Church member.47 Mr V.C. Wallace Wright was selected for this role.

Mr Wallace was the manager of Invercargill's largest book shop at that point in time, and was only two years away from retirement. He was an elder of St. Paul's Presbyterian Church and was involved with Rotary, St. John's Ambulance, and the Crippled Children's Society. Mr Wright's reply to his selection as the Southland coordinator was to grunt and then ring his wife. He discussed the issue briefly with his wife and then agreed to participate. After he accepted his role Mr Wright fully committed himself to the success of the resettlement programme. He believed that it was important for the welfare of the refugees that they be able to move into a home, and employment, when they arrived. He realised that some members of the Southland community would want to know more about the Old Believers and the resettlement project, so he wrote a booklet, approximately thirty pages in length, to answer what he thought would be the main questions.48 Mr Wright thought that the best way of getting people involved was to contact the ministers of various churches. After he had interested the
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ministers in the scheme he established a committee within the church, for the local area, and tried to involve other local churches, across denominational lines. In some churches he found great enthusiasm for the project, but most needed quite a lot of encouragement before they could be persuaded to participate. By September 1966, twenty-six churches had become involved in the project in the fourteen different areas where the fourteen families had been settled.49

The first part of the Old Believer group arrived in New Zealand on 14 July 1965 at Christchurch airport, and arrived in Invercargill on 15 July 1963.50 In the ensuing weeks seventy-three Old Believers arrived in Southland. Another group of seven arrived in January 1967. Some families accepted for resettlement were not able to come to New Zealand until 1978.51 In Christchurch the first few families52 were met by NCC representatives, television and press reporters, and members of the local Russian community, who, although Russian Orthodox, shared some common bonds with the new arrivals. Two interpreters were also provided. Press accounts had so far been quite favourable, but the NCC realised how fickle public opinion could be. One of the interpreters present at the arrival was a refugee herself, and the other was Mr Yakov Erofeef. Mr Erofeef, his wife and daughter constituted the entire Old Believer community in New Zealand prior to the refugees' arrival, and the NCC had depended upon them for most of their information on the Old Believers.53 Mr Erofeef also had been willing to visit Southland to help the refugees settle into their new homes.54

The reception that the first group of Old Believers received on their arrival in New Zealand openly surprised them, and moved several to tears.55 As they emerged from the plane which had brought them from Christchurch to Invercargill they were welcomed by a group of approximately 100 people. All the girls were given dolls, the boys were given other small toys, and all the members of the group were greeted in Russian. Many of the New Zealanders who acted as sponsors for the refugees had been given the opportunity to take a Russian language course while awaiting the Old Believers' arrival, and in some cases they had travelled substantial distances to attend.56 The first class began in Invercargill in June 1965, and was attended by thirty people. Classes were held in St. Paul’s Presbyterian Church, Invercargill, on Sunday afternoons, and phrases which would be useful for interaction in the home and in rural employment were taught, such as "It's in the woolshed", and "Go and get the truck".57 Initially some students travelled especially to Invercargill for the classes from Gore, a distance of approximately sixty kilometres. A class of twenty-eight students was started in Gore a
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fortnight after the Invercargill class began. The course was viewed as a link between the Old Believers' arrival, when very few, if any, could speak English, and their eventual fluency in the language. It was conducted by Mr E.E. Henry, a member of the Southland Education Board, and Mr J. Rodionov, a young Russian who had settled in Invercargill. Lists of basic vocabulary items were drawn up and distributed among the refugees, to enable them to learn the English terms for essential items. These lists contained the days of the week, monetary terms, and basic food items in both English and Russian.

The support for the resettlement programme from the Southland community was immense. Church committees were established to examine any foreseeable difficulties for the Old Believers, and donations of food, furniture, utensils, and clothing were made. The resettlement of the Old Believers was publicised throughout Southland and became an important topic of discussion. Although the resettlement programme was church based it was not only church members who were making a contribution. The minister of a Southland Baptist church received a telephone call from one woman who, although not a church member, wanted to make a contribution to the resettlement. She donated a few 'bits and pieces', including a spin-dry washing machine. Mr Wright had persuaded a number of prominent citizens to act as advisers if required. Their expertise included areas ranging from law and insurance to farming. It was estimated that in the week prior to the Old Believers' arrival 1500 Southlanders were involved in the resettlement. However, not all of the reaction to the resettlement was positive, and some people were suspicious and hostile. But, on the whole, community support was positive, and many Southlanders believed this type of programme should be pursued in other areas of the country also. However, the NCC were aware of the need for continuing interest in the community over the fate of the Old Believers if the programme was to be considered a success.

One of the problems for this group of Old Believers while looking for a country of asylum was the inclusion of a young child with hydrocephalous, a blind man, two epileptics and people with various other medical complaints within the group which made its hopes of resettlement slim if its members wanted to remain together. Fortunately for these refugees the New Zealand Government had implemented reforms to immigration policy which meant that handicapped refugees could come to New Zealand. Refugees who were handicapped, either physically, socially, or medically, would be allowed into New Zealand with their family and would not require a New Zealand sponsor. This was a first for New Zealand and the world.
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Before New Zealand's implementation of this policy only a very small number of refugees with serious medical problems or disabilities had a realistic chance of resettlement, anywhere in the world. Those refugees with conditions like these were only admitted to countries where there was some benefit to the country of asylum. One case of this type of situation was the resettlement of refugees with tuberculosis in Sweden. Allowing these refugees to immigrate meant that Swedish doctors would gain experience in dealing with this disease, as incidents of it in the Swedish population were low.64 Not only were several of the Old Believers medically unfit, but most, if not all, were also socially handicapped.65 Their religious practices distinguished them from the rest of the New Zealand population and from those of most Western countries. The men all had long beards66, and their manner of dress and their customs were very different from New Zealand practices.67 The UNHCR described the Old Believers as 'one of the most colourful refugee problems to face UNHCR since its inception'.68

Some of the older Old Believers who were settled in Southland did not really comprehend where they were69, or that their life of homelessness was over. Their entire lives had been spent in a Europe where they had no place to call home and with which to identify.70 The Old Believers did realise, however, that they had been settled away from their friends and community, and that they were far away from any other Old Believer community.71 The younger Old Believers were more able to meet people through their employment, or through their children, but the older ones were often quite removed from this, and thus, quite lonely.72 Although some older members felt isolated, they were not really interested in learning more about New Zealand.73

In May 1970 Father Godyaew of the Russian Orthodox Church in Wellington visited Southland to meet with the Old Believers. This gave the Old Believers a chance to discuss any problems they were having.74 Although their New Zealand sponsors were still available and willing to help with any problems they were not fluent in Russian, despite attendance at the Russian language classes. Father Godyaew's visit allowed the Old Believers to discuss their problems with someone who was fluent in Russian, and who was in a position to be able to faithfully translate their problems to someone who could help.75 Their problems were mainly

64 I.W. Fraser to A. Binzegger, 4/12/1978
65 O'Grady, Old Believers, p. 1.
66 Old Believer men did not shave as they believed humans were created in the image of God, and as such men's beards were a part of this image. To shave a man's beard was to commit a sacrilege. NCC(Southland), 'Proposal for Re-settlement in Southland of a Group of Russian "Old Believers"', no date given.
67 O'Grady, Old Believers, p. 1.
68 O'Grady, Old Believers, p. 1.
69 NCC (Southland), 'Report for year 1969-1970'.
70 O'Grady, 'Homeless No More', p. 4.
71 'Coming this Month', p. 5. NCC Annual Meeting 29-30/7/1966.
73 NCC (Southland), 'Report for year 1969-1970'.
74 NCC (Southland), 19/10/1970.
75 NCC (Southland), 19/10/1970.
able to be solved within the Old Believer community itself. A committee existed within the community which could rule on any problems or disputes. The basis for its decisions was the Old Believers' version of the Bible. This committee was able to settle all but the most serious of problems.⁷⁶ One of the community's major problems was the lack of a religious leader in Southland. This was reported to the NCC who attempted to find a suitable person to fulfil this need.⁷⁷

Another major problem was that of permanent employment. This was a problem for two reasons. Although the Old Believers were known as being 'industrious, conscientious and independent people'⁷⁸ and employers were happy with their Old Believer employees' work⁷⁹, the Old Believers did not seem to realise the benefits of staying in a permanent job in comparison to seasonal employment.⁸⁰ The other part of this problem was that many of the younger Old Believer adults, two years later, were aware of the benefits of permanent employment, but did not want to remain casual unskilled labourers.⁸¹ These young men wanted to enter trades, but two to three years of secondary education appeared to be the minimum requirement for admittance to such training. Most, if not all, of these men did not have this prerequisite due to their background.⁸² Some members of the community moved to Canterbury due to better weather and employment prospects.⁸³

The question needs to be asked as to whether or not the Southland Old Believer settlement was a success. The answer to this question depends on the perspective from which it is examined, and what constitutes success. From the New Zealand government's perspective the resettlement was a success. As a humanitarian effort the Old Believer settlement, although small, made New Zealand feature favourably in the eyes of the international community and the UNHCR. The government was quite willing for this to occur, especially if it did not have to carry the financial burden of the resettlement programme. As the resettlement was carried out by the NCC, and government officials ensured all refugees were sponsored by New Zealand citizens, the government did not have to contribute to the cost of the scheme, nor did it have to look after the refugees through Income Support and Social Welfare, as the Old Believer adult males all had jobs and sponsors were meant to take care of their welfare. For the NCC the resettlement programme was also a success. The organisation believed that it was making a contribution to the world refugee crisis, and that it was being viewed in high esteem by the WCC. The programme's stated aim of assimilation, which was also an overall government

⁷⁶ NCC (Southland), 'Annual Report for the year ending September 30, 1969.
⁷⁷ NCC (Southland), 'Monthly Meeting of the Executive', 8/12/1967.
⁷⁸ NCC (Southland), 'Proposal for Re-settlement in Southland of a group of Russian "Old Believers"', nd.
⁷⁹ NCC (Southland), 'Report for year ending 30th September, 1968.'
⁸⁰ NCC (Southland), 'Monthly Meeting of Executive', 8/12/1967.
⁸¹ NCC (Southland), 'Annual report for the year ending September 30, 1969'.
⁸² NCC (Southland), 'Annual report for the year ending September 30, 1969'.
⁸³ NCC (Southland), 'Annual Report for the year ending September 30, 1969'.

51
immigration policy, eventually had been achieved, regardless of the cost to the Old Believer identity. Those people who had not assimilated had left the country to join other, larger Old Believer communities elsewhere. Old Believers were also enjoying a measure of previously unknown material prosperity. Many of the younger families had bought cars, televisions and other luxury goods. They were also moving into ‘good standard homes’ which were closer to the houses of other Old Believer families and their work places. The New Zealand public also considered the programme a success. It considered integration into New Zealand a major part of the resettlement process and was glad to see this achieved. Members of the Southland community believed that the Old Believers resettlement was such a success that it should be repeated all over the country.

However, from a humanitarian point of view, the scheme was not as much of a success as was commonly believed. The Old Believers had lost their sense of identity through being assimilated into New Zealand society. What had been resisted for three hundred years in a hostile climate in Europe was achieved in a single generation in the hospitality of New Zealand. Those Old Believers who had not lost their identity left the country, usually heading for Canada. The Old Believer scheme had not resettled a large number of people, so numerically it did not do much to alleviate the world refugee crisis. During the 1980s some of the remaining families that had been bought out, and had stayed in Southland, were shown the Compass programme on themselves which was aired on New Zealand television in the mid-to-late 1960s. During the programme it was stated that assimilation was one of the aims of the scheme. This angered a number of the people to which the segment was shown. Ultimately the success of the Southland Old Believers resettlement is up to personal interpretation and perception. In the context of this dissertation it will be regarded largely as a questionable failure.

85 See Appendix C.
86 Untitled Film.
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Soviet Jews in New Zealand

It would not be far wrong to regard Russia as the classical home of antisemitism [sic]. L. Schapiro, in L. Kochan, The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917.1

Jews are at once neither a people with a fixed set of beliefs, a nation, a race or a culture and yet all these things and more. N. Simms, in P. Donovan, Religions of New Zealanders.2

The Soviet regime is intolerant of all minorities and of all non-conformists, but the Jew is more vulnerable than most to this intolerance. L. Schapiro, in L. Kochan, The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917.3

Jews have held a unique position in Russian and Soviet history. After the Diaspora many Jews moved northwards from the Middle East, settling in areas of what was to become the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). Throughout Europe’s history, Jews have been separated from so-called Christian citizens, and Russia was no exception. Prior to the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 the Russian Empire’s population was largely constituted of people who were socially homogeneous. As such they were quite conscious of any cultural or ethnic practices at variance with their own. This awareness occurred on an official and popular level.4 One aspect of Russian society, for the majority of the population, was membership in the Russian Orthodox Church. As Jews were not Russian Orthodox members, or even Christians, they were marked out from the rest of the population. It has been argued that this was a major element in official and mass anti-Semitism in Russia.5 Official persecution of the Jews, under both the Tsars and the Soviets, was sanctioned through such discriminatory practices as pogroms. During the early twentieth century many Jews joined revolutionary movements in the belief that life under a governmental system of the people’s own making would be better for ethnic Jews than under the Tsar’s rule. However, the Bolshevik revolution did not lead to the political and social freedom which had been envisaged. Persecution against the Jews continued under the communist system, as their ‘dual allegiance’ to the Soviet Union

3 Schapiro, p. 6.
5 Schapiro, p. 1.
and the Jewish state was seen as a threat by the Soviet government. This resulted in all Jews being viewed with suspicion.

On 14 May 1948 the State of Israel was proclaimed by David Ben-Gurion in Tel Aviv. On 16 May 1948 the Soviet Union recognised the new State. One of the first laws to be enacted in Israel was the Law of Return. This law allowed for the ‘unlimited ingathering of the Jewish people’ from all over the world. The ‘ingathering’ included Jews from the USSR, as this was one of the three largest remaining communities of Jews in the world. Jewish movements within the USSR had always maintained, since the formation of the Jewish State, that their underlying aim was to obtain the right to leave the Soviet Union and go to Israel. However, just because the Israeli government was prepared to accept Soviet Jews, it did not mean that the USSR was particularly eager to let them leave. A small number of Jews were allowed to leave the USSR. The number of people to do so was only a small percentage of the people who applied to leave. Accurate statistics for Soviet migration are reasonably difficult to obtain. The Soviets rarely released any figures concerning how many people applied to leave, but as applications had to be made in conjunction with the Israelis, a comparison of Soviet and Israeli records regarding migration is useful. There are a number of discrepancies between the Soviet and Israeli records. One Soviet explanation for these discrepancies is that large numbers of applicants decided, after applying to emigrate, that they did not want to leave the USSR and go to Israel. This explanation is problematic, however. It has been claimed that once a decision was made to leave the USSR, and an application to leave had been lodged, there was no recindance on this decision. Attempting to leave the Soviet Union was an arduous process, regardless of official permission from the Soviet government.

---

6 Jewish allegiance to the Jewish state was a factor both after the formation of Israel, and before it, to the Zionist movement.
13 Schroeter, p. 354.
14 New Zealand Jewish Council, Soviet Jewry - A Question of Human Rights, Report no. 14, Wellington, 6 March 1984. Oral Interview, Participants B & C (Mr G. and Mrs B. Reyn), Wellington, 23/6/ 997. Mr & Mrs Reyn are a married couple who immigrated to New Zealand in December 1978 with their two children. They became Soviet citizens when the borders of Europe were redrawn at the end of World War II.
15 Oral Interview, Participant A (Mr Schiff), Wellington, 19/6/1997. Mr A. Schiff, as has been discussed in the text, was a key figure in the immigration to New Zealand of European Jews, including Soviet Jews. Mr Schiff received a Queen’s Service Medal for his contribution to the resettlement of refugees in New Zealand.
to leave. No valuables were allowed to leave the USSR. This policy was implemented even to the extent of cutting fur off emigrants' clothes as they were wearing them.

It has been claimed that Russia is the traditional home of anti-Semitism. The USSR did not have an official policy of anti-Semitism, but it existed on an unofficial level. It was active in both the political and cultural spheres of Soviet society. Because the Jewish ethnicity contained religious components, anti-Semitism was not founded on xenophobic grounds only. There were two main elements to Soviet religious anti-Semitism. Firstly, all religious groups were viewed as suspect because they provided Soviet citizens with a legal alternative ideology to that offered by the Communist Party. Secondly, Judaism was seen as a particularly threatening religious doctrine because it encouraged alliance to a state other than the USSR. Another reason why it was so threatening can be seen when examining some of Marx's earlier writing. Marx claimed that Judaism was the manifestation and embodiment of money and greed in society. In Marx's later theories the means of production and money became essential elements in the structure of society. He saw this negatively and thus saw Jews negatively. As Marxist theory was the ideology at the heart of the Soviet Union his anti-Semitic views became incorporated into the social and political systems. It was believed that Judaism was capable of being a threat to the USSR as an economic ideology and a religion. Despite it not being an official policy, Soviet Jews were aware of the anti-Semitic attitudes of politicians and the wider community. Religion was viewed as a dangerous and superstitious practice in many communist countries. Judaism was also different to other religions because of its political overtones. This made Jews a greater target for Soviet persecution than other religious minorities. It has been pointed out also that Soviet Jews, like all other religious minorities, suffer, not solely for their religious beliefs, but because all Soviet citizens suffer.

For many Jews anti-Semitism was one of the main factors for leaving the USSR. However, there were other reasons. Corruption in the USSR was prevalent, and was growing monthly. Some Soviet refugees, interviewed for this dissertation, found the corruption impossible to avoid, despite their best intentions and efforts. One woman, now in New

---
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Zealand, had been in a position of authority in her employment, and had found herself having to lie to her subordinates. In her position she had to profess the Communist Party line, but she could see failings in it. A high level official would state a matter had to be conducted in a certain way, and a number of people who were involved, on the lower levels, could see that the matter was being handled badly. No-one dared to say anything because challenging the party line could be dangerous. Due to this, many mistakes which could have been avoided were repeated, time and time again.29 There was also constant uncertainty over what would constitute the party line. One day an official might be highly respected, and the next day, executed as a traitor.30 An example of this was the arrest and execution of L.P. Beria (1899-1953).31

Although it was possible for Jews to leave the USSR it was an arduous process. The decision to leave the Soviet Union was a difficult one. Once an application to leave had been lodged and considered there was no possibility of review.32 Applications usually took a substantial period of time, often months or years, to be approved. Once it became known that a person had applied to leave the Soviet Union they were often dismissed from their employment. They were officially and publicly ostracised, and branded a traitor.33 It was popularly believed that emigrants took skills and expertise to the West to help to build capitalism. Some applicants were able to avoid some of these forms of persecution if they had courageous allies. In the case of one woman who came to New Zealand, her previous employer in the USSR told government officials that if he was trusted to employ staff, which was a part of his job, they would have to trust those people that he wanted to employ. He emphatically stated that he wanted this particular woman in his employ and because of this, she was able to retain her job. This was very important to her family as her husband and children had all been dismissed, and hers was the only income for the household.34

The policy of the Soviet government concerning emigration was different for various periods of the twentieth century. Usually emigration was an exclusive Jewish prerogative, and emigration policy was often affected by international events and situations, especially those concerning Israel. After the Six Day War in 1967, emigration was suspended for over a year, but in the build up to the Moscow Olympic Games in 1980, emigration restrictions were

29 Oral Interview B & C.
30 Oral Interview B & C.
33 Oral Interview B & C. Marrus, p. 364.
34 Oral Interview B & C.
considerably relaxed. In the period prior to the Olympic Games one of the largest outflows of people in the second half of this century occurred. In the 1972-1973 period more Jews left the Soviet Union than the combined number of legal, and illegal, emigrants from all Soviet ethnicities in the previous forty years, with the exception of the mass deportations during World War II. In 1979 Soviet Jewish emigration rose to over fifty thousand. The Olympic Games were the focus of a large amount of media attention, and Soviet emigration policy was relaxed to earn the USSR positive publicity. After the Games it once more became increasingly difficult to leave the Soviet Union, until the mid 1980s. During the late 1980s any Soviet Jew who obtained a permit from the Israeli Embassy in Moscow was allowed to leave the USSR. This was just one aspect of Soviet policy during glasnost’ and perestroika.

When Mikhail Gorbachev became President of the USSR he introduced a policy of glasnost’. This eased some of the repression of Soviet society, including the relaxation of the enforcement of censorship laws, and slackening restrictions for obtaining visas for overseas travel. In the late 1980s Gorbachev furthered reforms through a policy of perestroika which aimed at reshaping the USSR’s political structure. The easing of restrictions on travel and emigration resulted in large numbers of people wanting to leave the USSR. This final period of emigration proved a financial success for Hungarian Airlines, as it was the only airline to accept Russian currency. Three or four Hungarian Airlines 747 aeroplanes were flown out of the USSR each day, taking hundreds of thousands of people out of the country in the period from 1989 to 1991.

Prior to the easing of emigration restrictions, Jews had been the only Soviet ethnicity to be allowed to leave the USSR. This was only allowed with the proviso of emigration to Israel. As Jews were only allowed to leave the USSR to go to Israel the arrival of Soviet Jews in New Zealand is an interesting topic. For many Soviet Jews it was not that they wanted to go to Israel, but rather they wanted to leave the USSR. All migrants are effected by two types of considerations when moving. These are ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors. ‘Push’ factors are matters in a migrant’s home country which make them want to leave. These include persecution due to religious or political belief, racial or national identity, and social or cultural practices. In contrast, ‘pull’ factors are those issues which attract people to a particular

35 Schroeter, p. 350.
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37 Glasnost’ - The USSR policy or practice of more open consultative government and wider dissemination of information. Literally ‘publicity’ or ‘openness’.
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country. One of the most important 'pull' factors is family reunification. Others include financial, health, and educational opportunities. In the case of Soviet Jews in New Zealand the desire to leave the USSR was a 'push' factor. For most refugees 'push' factors are more important than 'pull' factors. Some people wanted to escape the repression of the Soviet Communist regime, while others wanted to live in a place where they were allowed to practise their religion. Once out of the Soviet Union Jewish refugees wanted to go to Israel or any Western country. This included New Zealand. Soviet Jews who left the USSR can be classified into three separate groups. The first group was made up of people who left the USSR and did not go to Israel. The second group was comprised of people who left the Soviet Union, went to Israel, and then decided to live somewhere else; these people were called returnees. The third group was made up of people who left the USSR and travelled directly to their country of resettlement. Due to the nature of the circumstances surrounding how these people left the USSR the first two groups can be considered refugees, but the last group is mainly composed of immigrants. This chapter is concerned with the first two groups.

In the early 1960s the New Zealand Jewish community approached Mr Alexander Schiff, a Jewish immigrant living in Wellington, with the intention of involving him in the resettlement process for immigrants in the New Zealand Jewish community. This settlement programme involved Jews from all over Europe. From this primary involvement Mr Schiff rose to become Secretary of the Jewish community. In this position he was able to become more involved with the community’s programme for European immigrants. He was then approached by the Hebrew Immigrants’ Aid Society, hereafter HIAS, to become the society’s New Zealand representative. Part of the society’s aim was to help Jews who did not want to go to Israel find a Jewish community elsewhere in the world where they could settle. From 1972 onwards Mr Schiff made regular trips to Europe to contact refugees and immigrants about the possibility of coming to New Zealand. In 1977 he began dealing with Israeli returnees, who had decided after going to Israel that they would rather live somewhere else. HIAS had made an agreement with the Israeli government that they would not give aid to any returnees. However, the New Zealand Jewish community decided that although it did not want to take people away from Israel, it was better that returnees were able to live in a Jewish community. If returnees wanted to come to New Zealand, the New Zealand community was prepared to accept them, and Mr Schiff acted as the community’s representative in Europe in this regard. New Zealand was not the only country which sent a HIAS representative to Rome, and delegations from the United States of America, Canada, and Australia went through similar
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Mr Schiff conducted briefings on New Zealand and what immigrants could expect. These briefings usually lasted approximately two hours and were translated as Mr Schiff spoke. Often these briefings were made to groups of one hundred families at a time. After the initial briefing, every family that was considering moving to New Zealand was required to have two personal interviews with Mr Schiff. Each set of interviews was translated by a different translator to ensure that the families had received a fair translation of the interview, and had actually understood the interview correctly. All files of prospective immigrants from the USSR, both returnees and those coming to Rome directly from the USSR, had to be cleared by the New Zealand Immigration Department and the New Zealand Secret Intelligence Service.51

Prospective immigrants to New Zealand were all given medical examinations when attempting to gain a place of resettlement. The results of the medical examinations took a long time to be cleared by the New Zealand Embassy. This was because the results were sent to London to be checked before immigration applications could be processed in Rome. The results could take months to be returned from London.52 In the 1970s Mr Schiff was given a quota of thirty families to bring into the country from Italy by the New Zealand government, on the understanding that the immigrants would not apply for the unemployment benefit on arrival. Often when the quota was full it was renegotiated, and the quota for that year would be enlarged.53 In 1989 Mr Schiff was able to bring immigrants to New Zealand straight from the USSR, many of whom could still be classified as refugees.54

The New Zealand Jewish community was initially keen to help aid immigrants who would arrive in the country with very few possessions. Clothing, furniture, kitchenware and other donated goods were stored together in a large warehouse. Immigrants were able to go into the warehouse and choose what they wanted when they arrived in the country. A flat was let for each family in Wellington, prior to its arrival, so that it would be able to have its own home. Each family was given a small cash donation from the New Zealand Jewish community to help it settle into New Zealand. This grant was initially $250, which later rose to $500 per family. Later, the amount was calculated on the basis of the number of people in a family.55 Mr Schiff told the immigrants before they arrived in New Zealand that they would have two responsibilities to the New Zealand Jewish community. Firstly, they were in some way to participate in the Jewish community's activities and running. Secondly, they were to repay the cost of their air travel to New Zealand. Many of the immigrants did not join the Jewish community in any significant way. Some families attended the synagogue or social functions
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occasionally, but very few of the immigrant families became involved in the day to day activities of the community. The repayment of travel loans also did not go smoothly. There were two ways of travel loan repayment. The first method was a $10 monthly repayment to HIAS. This was problematic as the rate of repayment was too slow, to the extent that even now some of the early immigrants are still repaying their travel loans. Due to the problematic nature of the first method a second one was devised. The second method allowed for a bank loan to be obtained by the immigrants which had to be repaid over a two year period. Interest and bank fees were to be paid by the New Zealand Jewish community, but if the loan was not repaid in two years the community handed all responsibility to the individual, who had to then pay the interest and late penalties on top of the principal. This second method was more practical than the first and, because of this, it was a success.

Many of the refugees who came to New Zealand could not speak English. Compulsory short courses had been conducted for the refugees in Rome but these only addressed the basics of the language. Those people who did not speak English had to find manual labour employment when they arrived in New Zealand, regardless of their training and qualifications, due to their lack of language skills. Part-time language courses were available at Wellington Polytechnic, but for some refugees attending these courses was not feasible when combined with full-time employment. The New Zealand government was approached with a scheme which would mean giving refugees the Unemployment Benefit for six months while they learnt English. This type of scheme had been run in the United States of America, but the New Zealand government rejected it. Families with young children were able to learn English more easily than couples or families with grown children due to the increased amount of interaction with English speaking families through kindergarten, play groups, and schools.

Whether or not the resettlement of Soviet Jews in New Zealand was a success or not is, like the case of the Old Believers, a matter of perspective. Of the Jews who were brought here from the Soviet Union and became naturalised, approximately one hundred and thirty families have moved overseas. Many of these families have moved to Australia, which appears to be a general New Zealand trend. Other families appear to have viewed New Zealand as a temporary stop before moving elsewhere, especially the United States of America and Canada. To some members of the New Zealand Jewish Community it may seem that their
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efforts to enlarge their community, through immigration, have failed due to the lack of immigrants' involvement in it. If the involvement of immigrants in the New Zealand Jewish Community was the only reason for the community's resettlement scheme, then the Soviet aspect of it might be considered a failure. However, the enlargement of the New Zealand Jewish Community does not seem to be the only consideration for the community to aid Jewish migrants. If it had been there may well have been attempts to attract Jews in Israel to come to New Zealand. For those people who did not want to go to Israel, but did want to leave the USSR, New Zealand was an option only possible through the efforts of the New Zealand Jewish Community. The departure of Soviet Jews to Australia, the United States of America, or Canada, after they were naturalised in New Zealand, is a sign of their integration into New Zealand society. Many New Zealanders and Australians cross the Tasman Sea to live each year. Therefore it is only reasonable that for immigrants, who feel integrated into New Zealand society, this would also be an option. Immigrants that leave New Zealand for North America must have some sense of increased security if they feel they can leave their country of asylum and not become homeless again. As integration and assimilation are a major part of New Zealand's immigration policy the government would see the Jewish resettlement scheme a success. Mr Schiff has been awarded a Queen's Service medal for his contribution to refugee resettlement. This is further evidence that the programme is seen as a success. Although most of the immigrants aided by the New Zealand Jewish Community were Jewish, not all of the immigrants were. The New Zealand Jewish Community aided other people to immigrate, including some Russian Orthodox members\textsuperscript{65} and this also contributed to the programme's success.

\textsuperscript{65} Oral Interview, Participant D, Wellington, 24/6/1997.
Conclusion

After examining Nansen Home, the Old Believers settlement, and Soviet Jews in New Zealand the questions remain to be answered as to whether or not New Zealand has fulfilled its obligation to resettle refugees, and how successful these resettlements have been. To answer the latter question, it is useful to compare the three groups of Russian refugees examined in this dissertation.

Nansen Home can be viewed as an important part of the implementation of humanitarian refugee policy. This is not to say that the New Zealand government's refugee policy was a success, as Nansen Home was established and run through the efforts of individuals, dedicated to humanitarian relief. Their determination of purpose was one of many factors which contributed to the home later becoming obsolete. Although to many people the closure of Nansen Home as a refugee home may be a symbol of its failure, it is actually a sign of its success. The Home became obsolete because there was no longer a need for such a home. Elderly refugees had either died, or been resettled. The policy of settling elderly refugees with their family, if possible, was another part of why the need for the home decreased, as was the raising of the age that refugees could apply to resettle. One of the very few failures of Nansen Home was the lack of government support. Individuals within government supported the home but the government did not sponsor the opening of any more homes, or other resettlement schemes itself. This was a major flaw in all three of the groups examined.

The success, or not, of the Old Believer settlement is a matter of perspective. There are many reasons why this resettlement should be viewed as a success. The National Council of Churches in New Zealand (NCC) was able to involve large numbers of people from the Southland community in the scheme and foster a sense of community spirit. These people believed that the resettlement was such a success that it should be repeated in other parts of the country. Assimilation was a stated aim of the NCC's for the resettlement. It was also an unstated aim for many New Zealanders. Some Old Believers did not want to assimilate. Rather, they chose to join other Old Believer settlements overseas and keep their identity. However, many of the Old Believer families did settle into the New Zealand way of life and its culture. Previously unknown material wealth was also experienced by most of the group. However, there is one significant aspect of the Old Believer resettlement which was negative and must not be overlooked. From the mid-seventeenth century until their resettlement in Southland, these Old Believers and their families before them had maintained a style of dress, manner, and culture which, although marking them as different, had given them a sense of identity and belonging. Assimilation, which was so highly cherished by the New Zealand government and population, was a double-edged sword. Old Believers could integrate and
assimilate into New Zealand society, or they could maintain one of the foundations of their identity as a group and their heritage. There was no midpoint between these two options. It is for this reason that the Southland Old Believer resettlement was a failure. However, the NCC personnel who undertook the resettlement did not intend it to be a failure, and the programme was undertaken with genuine humanitarian intent. The consequences of settling a cohesive group like the Old Believers in separate centres were foreseen. That is why the group was not settled in smaller groups all over the country. However, it was not foreseen that settling the families in centres throughout Southland would be detrimental to their identity and selves. It was thought that they were close enough to each other to maintain their identity and integrate into New Zealand society, but far enough apart so that they would not be a closed community.

The success of the resettlement of Soviet Jews in New Zealand is also a matter of perspective. Like the Old Believers, many Jews have subsequently left New Zealand. However, the reasons why members of the two groups left New Zealand are quite different. Many of the Old Believers left the country because they felt that they were unable to maintain their identity here. Soviet Jews left New Zealand because they had personal reasons for leaving the country. This was similar to many New Zealand born citizens who left for personal reasons also, such as employment. The Jewish migration out of New Zealand was not caused by a lack of, or threat to, their identity. It is a sign of how well the Jews integrated into New Zealand society. In this case, assimilation and integration are not necessarily a negative aspect of their resettlement. Being a Jew and being a New Zealander are not mutually exclusive. This is unlike the Old Believers, where maintaining their identity and culture, which is what defines them, is mutually exclusive with integration. Although many of the refugees brought to New Zealand by the New Zealand Jewish community did not actually involve themselves in the day to day activities of the community, the community's resettlement is not a failure. Involvement in the community was only one aspect of the scheme, and other aspects were largely humanitarian. This resettlement programme has been viewed in this dissertation as a success.

Several authors have examined the question of whether or not New Zealand has fulfilled its role as a country of second asylum for refugees, and have reached a range of conclusions. New Zealand has been praised for the advances it has made in refugee policy, especially its policy changes concerning the admittance of handicapped refugees. New Zealand's policy on handicapped refugees encouraged other countries to adopt this sort of policy also. This was significant as it showed that the idea the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) had been promoting for several years was actually feasible to implement. Raising the age for refugee resettlement was another major step forward. These advances

2 I.W. Fraser to A. Binzegger, 4/12/1978.
made New Zealand appear to be a very good asylum country to many in the international community. One assessment of the situation in New Zealand by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees was that "The settlement of refugees here was very good, and the balance between voluntary agencies and government assistance for refugees worked just perfectly."4 It was also claimed that the admission of refugees into New Zealand was an ongoing part of New Zealand humanitarian immigration policy.5 New Zealand's immigration policy has been viewed in an especially good light when its size and population has been taken into account.6 However, not all work on New Zealand's immigration and refugee policy has viewed it so glowingly. At least one writer has accepted its good points and limitations, and maintained that not enough had been done.7 It was pointed out that although humanitarian goals have played a part, economics has been the determining factor in any New Zealand immigration policy.8 While many writers have seen New Zealand's refugee effort as important, one major international organisation has condemned New Zealand's position. Amnesty International claimed that the New Zealand government has failed, over a number of terms in office, in its refugee policy on three accounts. Firstly, asylum seekers have been unable to obtain access to New Zealand due to the lack of efficient and fair administrative procedures. Secondly, any procedures which are in place have failed to meet the minimum standard required by the UNHCR. Thirdly, the government has delayed any changes to policy concerning the admittance of refugees to the point of culpability.9 It has also been claimed by another writer that New Zealand has, and is, avoiding its responsibility of resettling refugees.10

The above interpretations of New Zealand's immigration and refugee policy are very interesting. However, it is impossible to completely agree with any of them. New Zealand has made significant steps in refugee resettlement, but a very small percentage of refugees have benefited from these policies. New Zealand has been important for leading the way for other countries to adopt similar policies but has not been able to aid significant numbers of refugees itself. This is tied to the size of the country and population. New Zealand's refugee resettlement history is not all negative thanks to the work of voluntary organisations. The importance of voluntary efforts to resettlement shows the support given to refugees by individual members of the New Zealand public. New Zealand has taken steps so that refugees, who would most likely not have been able to leave their refugee camps, can enter the country.

7 Binzegger, p. 5.
8 Binzegger, p. 5.
However, there was a lot more that the New Zealand government could have done to improve its secondary asylum position, including becoming involved in resettlement itself rather than leaving it in the hands of voluntary organisations. This statement, however, could be said about nearly every country on Earth. There will always be something more that governments can do about refugees until there are no longer any more. The problem is finding the right balance between what should be done and what feasibly can be done. In the case of New Zealand's situation with Russian refugees, the quality of refugee resettlement was preferred to the quantity of refugees the country could accept.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{11} See Appendix E.
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Appendix A

United States officials seem particularly enthusiastic in finding an exact definition of 'refugee'. The *Refugee Relief Act of 1953* (Section 2 (A)) defines 'refugee' as such:

any person in a country or area which is neither Communist nor Communist dominated who because of persecution, fear of persecution, natural calamity or military operations is out of his usual place of abode and unable to return thereto, who has not been firmly resettled, and who is in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life or for transportation.¹

The *Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965* (Section 203 (a) (7)) defines a refugee as:

An individual who at the time of examination is in any non-communist-dominated country, (A) that (i) because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion may have fled (I) from any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area or (II) from any country within the general area of the Middle East and (ii) are unable or unwilling to return to such a country or area on account of race, religion or political opinion, and (iii) are not nationals of the countries or areas in which their application for conditional entry is made; or (B) that they are persons uprooted by catastrophic natural calamity as defined by the President who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. For the purpose of the foregoing term "the general area of the Middle East" means the area between and including (1) Libya on the West, (2) Turkey on the North, (3) Pakistan on the East and (4) Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia in the South...²

Various American Congressmen and Senators have also put forward definitions. Senator Edward Kennedy, a Democratic Party member from Massachusetts, suggested the following definition:

The term 'alien refugee' means (1) any alien (A) who has fled or shall flee from and is unwilling to return to any communist or Communist-dominated country or area, due to persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, or (B) who has fled or shall flee from and is unwilling to return to any country due to a well-founded fear of persecution or danger to his life or civil liberties, or (C) who has been uprooted by natural calamity or military operations and who is unable to return to his usual place of abode, and (2) the spouse and children of any such alien, if accompanying or following to join him.³

Congressman Emanuel Celler, a Democratic Party member from New York, submitted this definition:

The term 'refugee' means any alien (i) who has fled or shall flee from and is unwilling to return to a Communist, Communist dominated, or Communist-


occupied area, due to persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, or (ii) has fled or shall flee from and, in the opinion of the Attorney General, has well-founded reasons for being unwilling to return to any country due to persecution or danger to his life or liberties or (iii) who has been uprooted by natural calamity or military operations and who is unable to return to his usual place of abode.4

The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service defines 'refugee' as:

a person who -
(a) on account of persecution or fear of persecution, because of race, religion, nationality, or membership of a particular social group or political opinion or belief, or as a result of military operations or natural calamity, is outside of his usual place of abode; and
(b) cannot return thereto or will not return thereto because of such persecution or military operations or natural calamity;
(c) provided, however, that a national who is out of his usual place of abode and has found refuge in the country of which he was technically a national and cannot or will not return to his usual place of abode for fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion or belief, or as a result of military operations or natural calamity, shall not be precluded from consideration as a refugee.
(d) notwithstanding any other provisions of law.5

Professor J.G. Stoessinger, a respected academic in the field of international affairs cited Sir John Simpson's treatise on refugees and defined them as:

The essential quality of a refugee...is that he has sought refuge in a territory other than that in which he was formerly resident as a result of political events which render his continued residence in his former territory impossible or intolerable. He must have left his former 'Territory' either in the sense of having departed or be unwilling to return to it, as a direct consequence of the political conditions existing there.6

---

## Appendix B

Major religious professions by number at successive censuses 1956 to 1981 for total New Zealand population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican (Ch. of England)</td>
<td>780,999</td>
<td>835,434</td>
<td>901,701</td>
<td>895,839</td>
<td>915,202</td>
<td>814,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyt.</td>
<td>483,884</td>
<td>539,459</td>
<td>582,976</td>
<td>583,701</td>
<td>566,569</td>
<td>523,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>310,723</td>
<td>364,098</td>
<td>425,280</td>
<td>449,974</td>
<td>478,530</td>
<td>456,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>161,823</td>
<td>173,838</td>
<td>186,260</td>
<td>182,727</td>
<td>173,526</td>
<td>148,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>33,910</td>
<td>40,886</td>
<td>46,748</td>
<td>47,350</td>
<td>49,442</td>
<td>50,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brethren</td>
<td>22,444</td>
<td>25,764</td>
<td>23,139</td>
<td>25,768</td>
<td>24,414</td>
<td>24,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>14,122</td>
<td>15,454</td>
<td>17,737</td>
<td>19,371</td>
<td>22,019</td>
<td>20,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Chs of Christ</td>
<td>10,852</td>
<td>10,485</td>
<td>10,301</td>
<td>8,930</td>
<td>8,087</td>
<td>6,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregat</td>
<td>7,448</td>
<td>9,377</td>
<td>12,101</td>
<td>7,704</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>3,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Orthodox Hebrew</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>4,319</td>
<td>4,153</td>
<td>3,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>173,569</td>
<td>204,056</td>
<td>210,851</td>
<td>247,019</td>
<td>438,511</td>
<td>473,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specify</td>
<td>16,252</td>
<td>14,198</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>103,533</td>
<td>39,380</td>
<td>108,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,022,577</td>
<td>2,240,383</td>
<td>2,444,103</td>
<td>2,580,038</td>
<td>2,730,354</td>
<td>2,636,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>2,174,062</td>
<td>2,414,984</td>
<td>2,676,919</td>
<td>2,862,631</td>
<td>3,129,383</td>
<td>3,175,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix C

**The Old Believer Community in New Zealand in June 1972.**

#### Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Народ</th>
<th>July 1965</th>
<th>July 1965</th>
<th>August 1965</th>
<th>January 1967</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Children Born in NZ**: 25 Children
- **Other Arrivals from Australia**: 8 Adults, 6 Children
- **Total**: 43 Adults, 76 Children, 119 People
- **Deaths**: 2 Adults
- **Transfers to Australia & USA**: 3 Adults, 2 Children
- **Total**: 38 adults, 74 Children, 112 People

#### Age Groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Группировки возрастов</th>
<th>0 - 5 years</th>
<th>6 - 15 years</th>
<th>16 - 25 years</th>
<th>26 - 40 years</th>
<th>41 - 65 years</th>
<th>66 and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Places of Residence

- **Invercargill**: 20 Adults, 40 Children
- **Gore**: 2 Adults, 3 Children
- **Christchurch**: 16 Adults, 31 Children

#### Occupations

- **Men -**
  - Freezing Works: 7
  - Factories and Labouring: 6
  - Railways and Electricity: 3
  - Trades: 7
  - Shop: 1

---

85
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women - Clothing Factories</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D


Year ended 31 March 1975 = 25
Year ended 31 March 1976 = 62
Year ended 31 March 1977 = 15
Year ended 31 March 1978 = 37
Year ended 31 March 1979 = 70
Year ended 31 March 1980 = 32
Year ended 31 March 1981 = 17
Year ended 31 March 1982 = 0
Year ended 31 March 1983 = 0
Year ended 31 March 1984 = 29
Year ended 31 March 1985 = 0
Year ended 31 March 1986 = 48
Total = 335 individuals

Source: Acceptance of Refugees as Settlers in New Zealand, New Zealand Immigration Service, Department of Labour, Wellington, 1989, p. 3.
Appendix E

New Zealand Census Results, 1991.
The groups 'Russian' and 'Jewish' have been taken as totally separate categories. Where participants have indicated that they are both Russian and Jewish they have been counted in each group. Not all Russians are refugees and the majority of the Jews are not of Russian origin. These statistics do not give a precise account of the number of Russian refugees in New Zealand, but they do give an indication of the Russian and Jewish communities in New Zealand. Both of these groups include significant numbers of refugees.

Total Responses to Selected Ethnic Groups (Russian and Jewish). Sex by Age group for Population Resident in New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Russian Males</th>
<th>Russian Females</th>
<th>Jewish Males</th>
<th>Jewish Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Responses to Selected Ethnic Groups (Russian and Jewish). Sex by Birthplace for Population Resident in New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Russian Males</th>
<th>Russian Females</th>
<th>Jewish Males</th>
<th>Jewish Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK &amp; Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Total Response to Selected Ethnic Groups (Russian and Jewish). Sex by Marital Status and De Facto status for Population Resident in New Zealand, aged 15 years and over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Russian Males</th>
<th>Russian Females</th>
<th>Jewish Males</th>
<th>Jewish Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (1)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarried</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated (2)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) First Marriage  
(2) Includes persons who are still married but permanently separated.
(3) Persons in this category are also included in one of the preceding formal marital status categories


**Total Responses to Selected Ethnic Groups (Russian and Jewish). Sex by Religious Denomination for Population Resident in New Zealand.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Denomination</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Russian Females</th>
<th>Russian Males</th>
<th>Jewish Females</th>
<th>Jewish Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratana</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix H

Newspaper clippings in Rev Dr I.W. Fraser's Papers, Presbyterian Support Services, Central Office, Wellington.


‘Answer to Slab Mystery?’, No Reference, 3/4/1963


‘Rebuke for Mr Shand’, No Reference, c 31/5/1963.

‘Wonderful Achievement Generous Giving Furnishes Home’, The Evening Post, 10 June 1963, p.11.


‘Christmas Cheer for White Russians’, No Reference, 16/12/1964.


‘Refugees Still Big Problem’, No Reference, nd.

‘Untitled Article’, in NCW, NZHJ, Church and People, nd.


‘Appointment of Matron’, No Reference, nd.

‘Assembly Proposal - Refugee Homes’, No Reference, nd.

‘Bazaar next Saturday for Nansen Home’, No Reference, nd.

‘Dinner Marks Opening’, No Reference, nd.

‘Example of N.Z. With Refugees’, No Reference, nd.

‘Former Ballet Star Arrives’, No Reference, nd


‘Happiness at Last’, No Reference, nd.
'Happy in Refugees' Home’, No Reference, nd.

'Haven for Refugees’, No Reference, nd.

'Home for Elderly Refugees' (1), No Reference, nd.

'Home for Elderly Refugees' (2), No Reference, nd.

'Home for Elderly Refugees opened’, No Reference, nd.

'Home for White Russians’, No Reference, nd.

'Installed at Nansen Home - Christchurch Girls Give Refugees TV’, No Reference, nd.

'Linen Wanted for Nansen Home’, No Reference, nd.

'N.Z. Stands High in Refugee Assistance’, No Reference, nd.

'Opening of Home for Refugees’, No Reference, nd.

'Prized Samovar Given By White Russians’, No Reference, nd.

'Reception for distinguished visitors’, No Reference, nd.

'Refugee Home Matron’, No Reference, nd.

'Refugee Home to be extended this year’, No Reference, nd.

'Refugees Happy’, No Reference, nd.

'Refugees seek place in World’, No Reference, nd.

'Still keen on their Work’, No Reference, nd.

'The First Arrivals’, No Reference, nd.