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Nearly eighteen years ago when I first became interested in the history and sociology of Australian immigration, I was particularly attracted by the fact and opportunity to incorporate immigration settlement, experience and accomplishments in my history teaching in secondary school. In particular it was the area of the settlement of Australia that needed a fuller understanding in the teaching of Australian history. By that I mean it was needed to show that there were many other ethnic groups besides the Anglo-Saxon group which had participated in the development of Australia since 1788.

Since the end of World War II, the Australian population has doubled, the population structure and characteristics have changed and knowledge about the diverse groups forming the Australian nation is now sought. Some ethnic groups, mainly the numerically large, have been studied and numerous reports are available. But many of the smaller groups have attracted little interest among Australian scholars. This was one of the reasons that I decided to research the behaviour of one of the smaller groups - the Czechs - to find out about their immigration history to Australia; their immigration processes such as re-settlement and re-establishment; and their community life since World War II.

Because of the scarcity of written materials on Czechs in Australia, I had to rely on interviews, personal reminiscences, letters and documents translated from the Czech language. I should like to express my gratitude to all people and officials of Czech ethnic organisations and clubs in Australia, who agreed to be interviewed and who provided me with documentary material so important for my work. Respecting the wishes of my interviewees their anonymity had to be preserved.

(viii)
In the course of my research, I have received substantial help and the encouragement from the Editor of the now extinct Czech language paper Newspaper Hlas domova, Mr. F.V., whose co-operation is gratefully recognised. I am also grateful to Associate Professor William D. Rubinstein for his help and encouragement in all stages of my work.

The introductory part of the study is covered in Chapter One. The reasons for the need to increase Australia's population after World War II and an analysis of the development of settlement in Australia between 1947 and 1984 are discussed. The emigration of Czechs into Australia and their place in the post-war immigration scheme is introduced. To obtain an overview of how Czechs have emigrated around the world, the literature describing their settlement is compared. Also discussed in the literature on Czech settlement in Australia from an historical point of view.

The studies on the concept of ethnicity and settlement in Australia are used to document the theoretical issues for an understanding of Australian society. This chapter also contains aspects of sources and research, showing the processes of documentary research, interviews and related matters.

In Chapter Two the history of Czech emigration is discussed, covering the period from the seventeenth to the twentieth century. The first contacts with Australia are highlighted, continuing into the inter-war period and finally the re-settlement of Czechs after World War II. To understand why Czechs left their ancestral country after World War II, the political situation in Czechoslovakia is analysed.
The third chapter concentrates mainly in the 1948 wave of settlers, who left Czechoslovakia after the communist take-over in 1948. Their means of departure from their homeland, selection of Australia as a new homeland and their re-settlement and re-establishment are discussed. Their attitudes after their arrival and their later stages of their settlement are analysed. The formation of numerous Czech ethnic organisations which mushroomed between 1950 and 1954 led to an active community life which began to change about five years after their arrival. These changes led to disorganisation of Czech community's life. The causes of these changes which were influential for the failure of the 1948 group to establish a viable community in Australia are analysed.

In Chapter Four the wave of 1968 is viewed, their arrival and settling is covered. The study of their group attitudes and formation of group institutions is the main part of this section. A comparison of my data of the two waves, 1948 and 1968, reveals the information that these two groups did not develop the harmonious relationship expected of them as members of the one ethnic group.

Chapter Five discusses immigration typologies and concentrates on the differences between legal and illegal emigrants from the Czechoslovak point of view. The integration processes of Czechs and their incorporation into Australian society are discussed.

The sixth chapter sums up the findings of this dissertation and states the influences which were responsible for the divisions in Czech ethnic life in Australia in the 1980s.
CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

As the world of birds for convenience sake is divided into three sections - home birds, migrating birds, and emigrating birds, mankind may be classified into three analogous groups - home people, sailors, and emigrants.

Jens Lyng, 1907
1.1 INTRODUCTION

Australia is a nation of immigrants. From the arrival of the earliest Australians some 40,000 years ago, to the arrival of the English in 1788, the doubling of population in the 1850s and the recent addition of three and a half million people since 1945, Australia has become a new homeland to settlers from all over the world. Indeed it is essentially valid to claim that no other phenomenon has had as significant an impact, particularly since 1945, on Australian history and society as that of immigration.

Australian immigration history up to World War II was characterised by two main features. The first was that the main impact of immigration on Australian society had been predominantly a British one. Although till the 1840s the Aboriginal population on the fifth continent was larger than that of the European, it has often been stated that Australia's population was "98 percent British". However, since the early days of European settlement, the tone and texture of the Australian society - such as the language, institutions, traditions, government and ideologies - remained British. While substantial numbers of non-British settlers, such as Germans, Chinese and Scandinavians settled in Australia in the nineteenth century, followed by Italians during the 1920s and the Jewish refugee settlers in the late 1930s, immigration from Britain continued to be the priority of the Australian immigration process.

The irregularity and spasmodic nature of the intake of settlers remained a feature of the immigration process. Although the initial European settlers were convicts, the first free settlers began to arrive in large numbers in the penal colonies by the 1830s. This immigration also led to the establishment of new colonies in Western Australia, South Australia and Victoria. After this period immigration was very slow and finally reached its peak during the gold rush era in the 1850s and 1860s, when Australia's population nearly trebled, growing from 400,000 in 1851 to 1,000,000 in 1862.

1 These events have been labelled by a former Minister for Immigration "as the four great chapters" in the history of the Australian people. Al J. Grassby, Australia's Decade of Decision, Immigration Reference Paper, 1973.
Between the 1880s and the first decade of the twentieth century immigration nearly came to a standstill. Some revival took place in the period before and after World War I. But by 1930, because of the depression there was a lull which only came to an end after 1945.

During the period since the end of World War II the population of Australia has increased from seven to over fifteen million. A large-scale immigration program has contributed more than a half of the increase, so that now nearly over three million of the population consists of post-war settlers, while a quarter of those born in Australia have at least one parent born overseas.

Even if the main impact of immigration on Australian society had been a predominantly British one, substantial numbers of other ethnic groups were added to the Australian population. After World War II the Australian immigration program underwent a remarkable change. The main points of this change were the inclusion of refugees into the assisted immigration scheme and a constant flow of non-British settlers to Australia.

This was the result of two factors. The first was the near invasion of Australia by Japanese forces during the last war had revealed the vulnerability of a small population and their ability to defend themselves and their country. The political catchcry of the time, "Populate or perish" meant that population was actively sought.2

Another reason was the awareness of a long decline in the birth-rate, which had begun in 1870 and reached its nadir in 1930, when the Australian population was below the self-replacement level.3 Immigration, it was believed was needed to supplement population growth and to provide manpower for the growth of post-war development.


3 Arthur A. Calwell. Immigration (Canberra, Department of Immigration, 1949, p.12).
In the period from January 1947 to September 1952, the Australian population increased by approximately 1,182,000, of which net immigration gains contributed 555,000 or 47 percent.\(^4\)

This era was characterised by official immigration schemes such as British Immigration, American War Veterans, Irish Immigration, Child Immigration, European Allies, Displaced Persons, Dutch Farmers, and, by private schemes such as Big Brother Movement, Dr. Bernardo, and Jewish Immigration.\(^5\)

In addition to the above schemes a series of further immigration agreements with Ireland, the Netherlands, Germany and Italy, provided for assisted passages for suitable settlers from those countries. Restored economic conditions in northern Europe reduced immigration to Australia after 1960, and consequently Australia was forced to search elsewhere for immigrants. The settlement of Greeks rose considerably from 1960, and when the Yugoslav Government removed the emigration restrictions, it led to a sudden rise of immigration in the years 1969-71, making Yugoslavs second in numbers to the British in these years. The 1970s were characterised by the immigration of Turks, South Americans and Asians. In spite of this increase from other parts of the world, however, immigration from Britain has continued its traditional role as the backbone of the Australian immigration.

Besides this economic "push" from north-western and southern European countries which resulted in emigration to Australia, there has also been the political "push". The emigration of Central and Eastern Europeans would be examples. This emigration consisted of people from Hungary after the October 1956 revolution, after the fall of the Stalinist-type leadership in Poland in 1956 which followed by relaxing of conditions, making it possible for some people to leave the country, and after the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Treaty armies in 1968. Also included in this heading could be refugees from Chile and later from Indo-China.

---


The sustained intake in immigrants into Australia has been affected not only by economic and political interest from the home countries, but also by the economic situation within Australia itself. Each of the economic recessions of the early 1950s, early 1960s and 1970s is reflected in the reduction during these years of the annual immigration intakes into Australia, for very closely linked with depressed economic conditions has been the reduction in overall immigration targets set by Commonwealth Governments in Australia. A similar situation occurred in the 1980s.

By 1981 (the date of the Commonwealth Census) therefore, a remarkable change in comparison with the 1947 situation had occurred in the composition of the Australian population. At the 1947 Census, 74 percent of the 0.7 million non-Australian-born residents had been born in the United Kingdom and Ireland. By the 1981 Census, the number of non-Australian-born had reached 3.1 million but the proportion born in the United Kingdom and Ireland had declined to 46 percent, almost half of the proportion it had been in 1947. In 1981 the total population of Australia has reached 14.8 million people, as compared with 7.5 million in 1947. These figures show clearly the change which took place in the post-war developments of Australian immigration.

Table 1
Censuses 1947 and 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population of Australia</td>
<td>7,579,358</td>
<td>14,854,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas-born</td>
<td>774,187</td>
<td>3,102,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of overseas-born</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the ethnic groups represented in today's Australia are the Czechs, whose settlement during the last 50 years consists of several waves. In Australia this ethnic group consists of:

---

(i) Pre-World War II settlers
(ii) War-time refugees
(iii) Post-1948 refugees
(iv) Post-1968 refugees
(v) Immigrants arriving in the 1970s and 1980s.

Among the large influx of Displaced Persons into Australia after World War II, some 182,159 persons\(^7\), included also were Czechs who were resettled in this country under the International Refugee Organisation Displaced Persons Scheme. They were the largest group of Czechs to reach Australia. The next largest was the immigration wave which reached Australia twenty years later, in 1968. The 1948 and the 1968 groups are therefore the most numerous and are the major purpose of this thesis whose object is to analyse the settlement and integration processes among those two waves of settlers.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1948</th>
<th>Group 1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>4,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>5,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1,063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most studies of immigrants in Australia have been primarily concerned with questions of assimilation up to the 1970s. Working from within the traditional Anglo-conformist climate, educationalists have often emphasised deprivation, and researchers, degree of assimilation. By implication, therefore, they have painted a negative picture of ethnicity. The assumption has always been that progress along the road toward assimilation necessarily has meant a corresponding decrease in ethnicity; that is, assimilation and ethnicity have been generally assumed to be mutually exclusive. Only recently a breakaway from this traditional attitude is beginning to appear.

\(^7\) V. Vernant, op.cit., p.706.
\(^8\) Commonwealth Census 1947 and 1971
Where this latest research differs in this respect from earlier studies is the belief that ethnicity is something positive and indeed a valuable property, not just for those who belong to ethnic group, but for the host society as well. It is a force which is very important for settlers in their initial periods of re-settlement and re-establishment. An immigrant's ethnicity, which the newcomer brings into a new country, as visible and invisible "luggage", is an important stronghold upon his arrival and his beginnings in a new land. Another feature of this research is that although ethnic traits are common to all groups, some ethnic characteristics manifest themselves differently among political immigrants as compared with economic immigrants.9

Political immigrants are those who left their countries because of political reasons, such as were the Displaced Persons after World War II, consisting of Albanians, Bulgarians, Croats, Czechs, Hungarians, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Romanians, Russians, Serbians, Slovaks, Slovenes and Ukrainians. Further groups of political refugees reaching Australia were the Hungarians in 1956, Czechs and Slovaks in 1968, Chileans in 1971 and Indo-Chinese in 1979. Political refugees are sometimes also called 'forced immigrants'. This term also includes people who had to leave their countries because of religious persecution, ethnic persecution, slavery, colonisation, drought, famine, war, health and natural disasters.

The re-settlement of political immigrants is usually organised by some international organisation or by the immigrant seeking countries themselves. The post-war International Refugee Organisation would be the best example of a humanitarian body assisting the re-settlement of political refugees in Australia.

In contrast to political immigrants are economic immigrants who could be described as people who leave their ancestral country for personal betterment. Also called 'free immigrants' they arrived in Australia at their own volition and can return to their home countries freely if they wish. The return of political immigrants is practically impossible as the great majority would face an unfriendly reception, sanctions or even some punitive action by the country of their origin. Illegal departures (e.g. leaving the ancestral country like Czechoslovakia as an escapee) are regarded by the great majority of totalitarian countries as a major crime.

As refugees, both waves of immigrants of the 1948 and 1968 intakes displayed strong ethnic and nationalistic characteristics upon their arrival in Australia. They came from a country which has been historically affected by Germanic expansion from the West and Slavic pressures from the East, and have therefore developed a strong nationalistic outlook and these historical circumstances would have had a significant effect upon behaviour in a new land. Moreover, both groups lived under communism; the 1948 group for a short period of time, whilst the 1968 group for nearly two decades.

The advantage of studying a refugee group like the Czechs is that these settlers had been settled in Australia long enough to study the end product of the integration process of the first generation. In this study only the first generation of Czechs is therefore the target of research. The other advantages of studying such an established and stable ethnic community was that it was not being constantly restructured by vast numbers of recent arrivals, as would be in the case of the southern European communities. Thus integrational relationship between the two groups could be analysed without interferences from new arrivals.

The main thrust of this research is to ascertain why each wave of settlers behaved differently in their integration process during their re-settlement and re-establishment in Australia. To show this the research will examine both the 1948 and 1968 groups, analysing their reasons for becoming refugees, their immigration history, general characteristics of each group, the emerging difference between these two groups, and, finally the consequences of their attitudes on the Czech community life in Australia. It was through interest in the processes of settlement in Australia that
this research was initiated in the late 1970s and early 1980s by the writer, who himself was a Czech Displaced Person of the 1948 vintage.

Through interviews I tried to find out why Czech organisational life began to collapse after only a few short years in Australia. The enquiry was aimed at the causes of these changes and the variables which affected the organisational structures were analysed. The answer sought was - were these changes a part of immigrants' integration into the structures of the host society or were they influenced by some forces from outside, beyond the control of individuals?

Another question asked was why the nationalistic and anti-communist attitude suddenly disappeared from the ethnic scene as early as in the late 1950s? Were the leaders of the organisations responsible for the deterioration of ethnic communal life or was it the decision of the rank-and-file members? What role did the churches play in these activities?

The appearance of the 1968 arrivals, which was hailed as a new force which would revitalise the Czech organisational life, never materialised or fulfilled the wishes of the leaders. An important question asked was, why did the new arrivals have such a lack of enthusiasm to participation in ethnic life? What were the causes of misunderstanding between 1948 and 1968 group? Had the twenty years of life under the totalitarian communist system changed the 1968 settlers?

The only way to find out the answers to the above questions was to gather information by interviewing and to then collate the data to reach some reliable conclusions.

This research does not cover the entire refugee population from Czechoslovakia. This country consists of two main Slavic groups, the Czechs and Slovaks. The Czech-speaking people are found in Bohemia and Moravia, while Slovak-speaking live in Slovakia, in the extreme east of the country. Both the Czech and Slovak languages belong to the Slavic linguistic family; they are very similar and are mutually understood. Although often the term "Czech" is used generally for everyone who comes from Czechoslovakia, in this thesis only those who regard themselves ethnically as Czechs, irrespective
of their religious background, are considered. Note that the political and cultural histories of Czechoslovakia and the various national groups there, will be examined in more detail later.

1.2 PREVIOUS RESEARCH

In all immigrant-receiving countries there is a great volume of literature written from many different perspectives on various aspects of immigration. The difficulty for the reviewer of this literature is where to begin. Although not much has been written on the Czechs which is directly relevant to my thesis, the generally available literature was a helpful source of information regarding the historical situation of the Czech countries, reasons for emigration, countries of settlement, development of ethnic communal life and processes of integration. The information gained gave the author a good insight in the basic issues for his work.

For the purposes of this study and its objectives, it was decided to concentrate upon the literature in three main areas - studies on Czechs overseas, studies of Czech immigrants in Australia, and, studies on the concept of ethnicity and settlement in Australia.

(i) Studies on Czech overseas

Although the Czechs have a nearly 300 years old history of emigration, not much has been written in the countries of their settlement about the processes of their integration into the host societies. The largest number of the emigrants settled in the United States, totalling a figure of 1.5 million during the last 200 years.10

The classic work about Czech settlement in America is the study of Thomas Capek, *Czechs in America*, completed in 1920. This historical work is still regarded as the most important report on Czechs in the United States. Capek concentrates mainly on the stronghold of Czech settlement in Illinois and Ohio, and discusses the development and preservation of Czech heritage and ethnic life. Another American writer, Emily Balch, in her work devoted a chapter to Czech settlers in her book *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*.  

Interested in the family life of new settlers she concentrates on the cultural habits of settlers and the transportation of ancestral cultural values into the "New World". Joseph S. Roucek in a book written with Francis S. Brown, *One America*, has an historical chapter on Czech immigration to America, listing the sequential order of immigrant groups and their arrival. Other historical and sociological articles appear in numerous publications, but none of these reach the richness of information as offered in the works of Capek and Balch.

What is missing in the American immigration research is a lack of studies on the Czech refugees who settled in the U.S.A. after World War II. Although a great number of Czech intellectuals settled there and many hold academic positions, hardly any of them have shown any interest in ethnography. This situation corresponds with Milton M. Gordon's description of intellectuals as a sub-society and their alienation from their ethnic background. Similarly critical is Andrew M. Greeley who feels that intellectuals show a biased negativism towards ethnicity.

---


14 Andrew M. Greeley. *Why can't they be like us?* (New York, Dutton and Co., 1971), p. 120-134.
The situation in Canada is somewhat similar to Australia. Many articles were written in different publications about Czechs. But it was only in the late 1960s that the first book about this group appeared in Canada. Under the title *The Czechs and Slovaks in Canada*, written by Gellner and Smerek, it describes the settlement of immigrants from Czechoslovakia, beginning by the end of the nineteenth century. It is more of a demographic study with the main thrust on the post-war settlement.\(^\text{15}\)

Finally the South American experience is summarised in Herman's *The Czechs in Brazil*, written in Czech, which is the only work describing their settlement in the Latin lands. The main feature of her work is based on organisational activities as the main force of preservation of Czech culture and heritage among their Portuguese-speaking fellow-citizens.\(^\text{16}\)

Although the settlement in the above mentioned countries developed individually, shaped by the local conditions, their cultural heritage played an important part in the preservation of their ethnic life.

(ii) Studies on Czechs in Australia

It is interesting to note that while the first books on Czechs in other countries were published in the countries of their settlement, the first works concerning the Australian experience appeared in Bohemia, the main Czech-speaking county. It is mainly historical literature, represented by the work of Cenek Paclt, Jaromir John and Antonin Vaneczek.


\(^{16}\) Marie Herman, *Češi v Brazilii* (*The Czechs in Brazil*), (Sao Paulo, Bohemia, 1979).
The most informative are the Paclt memoirs Česty po světe (World Wide Travels), which provides an opportunity to see the gold-rushes in Australia through Czech eyes. A very observant writer, Paclt's work abounds with interesting facts about the early pluralistic composition among miners on the gold-fields. The Czechs he met and describes all display the characteristic restlessness of that period with gold-seekers migrating from one colony to the other.\textsuperscript{17}

Another early immigrant was Alois Topic, who settled in Queensland in the 1880s, and his rich experiences as a settler were written in Australska dobrodružství Aloise Topice (Australian adventures of Alois Topic).\textsuperscript{18} Describing his countrymen, he noted that children of Czech parents refused to use their ancestral language and preferred English.\textsuperscript{19} Although the Czech presence in Queensland was certainly small, Topic writes about the hardship of a few pioneers hacking out their livelihood in the Australian bush.

While Paclt concentrated on Victoria and New South Wales, and Topic on Queensland, Polak's reminiscences published under the title Zlato na Labutí řece (Gold on the Swan River) threw light on life in Western Australia.\textsuperscript{20} In his description of settlers he writes about several of his countrymen who, after gold rushes, found their place among the farming communities.

\textsuperscript{17} Čenek Paclt, Česty po světě (Mladá Boleslav, Vačlena, 1888).

\textsuperscript{18} Jaromír John, Australská dobrodružství Aloise Topiče (Prague, Melantrich, 1946).

\textsuperscript{19} The decline of the use their mother tongue by children was common among small groups of settlers in Queensland in the nineteenth century. The larger group of settlers, like Germans, because of German schools and church influence, the youngsters usually retained and used their mother tongue in their social contacts (Reference: Ian Harnstorf and Michael Cigler, The Germans in Australia. Melbourne, AE Press, 1985).

\textsuperscript{20} Antonin Vaněček, Zlato na Labutí řece (Prague, Mladá Fronta, 1964).
While these early writers on Australia and the Czechs who settled in Australia were people of working class backgrounds and limited formal education, the next generation of writers who began to frequent Australia in the earlier part of the twentieth century were mainly educated individuals. Like their predecessors, they also noted the existence of groups of Czechs in Australia. The most important of these works were Josef Korenský's work Proti nozou (The Antipodes)\textsuperscript{21} and Egon E. Kisch's Australian Landfall.\textsuperscript{22}

The literature mentioned so far could be described as being of an informative and descriptive character, without any detailed study of Czech settlers. It was only after World War II, when in the 1950s nearly over 10,000 Czechoslovak-born settled in Australia, that more systematic studies of this group began to appear. The most important is Jean I. Martin's study Community and Identity: Refugee Groups in Adelaide, where the author includes a study of the political behaviour of Czechs. It is a study which expertly analyses the political split among the Czechs in Australia, consisting of strict anti-communist followers and those who favoured co-existence with the emerging "liberalisation" of Czechoslovakia, which resulted later in Alexander Dubček's experiment.\textsuperscript{23}

After re-settlement in the 1940s and 1950s, community life began to emerge and led to the formation of many organisations and to the establishment of numerous periodicals within the Czech community. A study of this organisational growth and the influence of ethnic press was highlighted by Miriam Gilson and Jerzy Zrubzycki in their work The Foreign-language Press in Australia, 1848-1964.\textsuperscript{24} This publication carries a special section on Czech language publications which began to appear in Australia after 1950.

\textsuperscript{21} Josef Kořenský, Proti nozou (Prague, Wagner, 1907).

\textsuperscript{22} Egon E. Kisch, Australian Landfall (Sydney, McMillan, 1969).

\textsuperscript{23} Jean I. Martin, Community and Identity: Refugee Groups in Adelaide. Canberra, Australian National University, 1965.

The first work giving an overview of Czech immigration to Australia, written by the writer of this thesis, appeared in 1983 under the title *The Czechs in Australia*. It documents the Czech presence on the "fifth continent" since 1793, when the first Czech-born persons landed in Sydney. Further the writer produced programs on the settlement in Australia which were broadcast by the Special Broadcasting Service in 1983 under the title *The Czech Presence in Australia* on radio stations in Sydney and Melbourne. In ten programs each lasting fifteen minutes the history of immigration of the Czechs was outlined to the listeners.

From the literature available in Australia it appears that studies of refugees are not as frequently undertaken as research on free or economic immigrants, such as Italians and Greeks.\footnote{26}


\footnote{26} There could be several reasons for this such as the number of settlers of a particular ethnic group, availability of researchers and willingness to co-operate. It also appears that a good deal of research on the Italians and Greeks is completed by people who became interested in their ethnic roots during their studies, or, by interested researchers who feel that larger groups are more important and easier to research than refugees.
(iii) Studies on the concept of ethnicity and settlement in Australia

In this section I shall discuss studies on ethnicity and settlement in Australia.

Ethnicity is a concept that is extremely difficult to deal with because it has both objective and subjective elements. On the subjective, descriptive level, ethnicity refers to a commones of traits related to heredity and cultural influences. These traits may be physical or "racial" especially where the ethnic group has in-married for a long time. They may be behavioural, such as gestures or other forms of "body language"; they may be emotional, such as reaction to pain; or they may be cultural, related to values such as the importance of family and education. In all these cases, we need to add that ethnic background leads only to a tendency toward having any particular trait, a likelihood that is greater in one ethnic group than another, and not to a reliable prediction about any individual.

The most penetrating early analysis of ethnicity and of ethnic group can be found in Weber's *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (Economy and Society). To him the essence of ethnic affinities is based mainly on the development of communal sentiments and of patterns of interaction facilitating social intercourse and involves, usually, a community language, shared customs, cults or religion. Talcott Parsons defines ethnic group in terms of kinship relations and includes them, together with family, class and community, in the four basic structural components which characterise every individual and every society. The contribution of Milton M. Gordon lies mainly in distinguishing and defining processes of assimilation. He used "peoplehood" as an equivalent of "ethnicity" derived from the Greek word "ethnos" meaning "people" or "nation" and he defines an ethnic group as a group with shared feeling of peoplehood.


Richard A. Schermerhorn, in his ambitious work on comparative ethnic relations, attempted to formulate a framework for theory and research. He essentially sees ethnic groups as being either dominant or subordinate, but for the sake of practicability uses the term ethnic only for subordinate groups. The term subordinate seems too strong for Australian settlement conditions and would be non-applicable to do justice in a few sentences to the complex analyses and to the manifold categories, paradigms, typologies and classification scheme that Schermerhorn develops in his work.30

An interesting description of ethnicity is offered by A. Greeley who states that the functions of ethnicity as multiple: to keep cultural traditions alive, to help to organise the social structure and to enable men to identify themselves in the face of the threatening chaos of a large and impersonal society.31

Since World War II ethnicity has become a topical concern in Australia and is likely to remain so for some time. The definitions appearing in Australian research are more or less limited to the life of settlers in Australia; they do not possess the theoretical depth such as the European or American definitions. In Australia, studies on ethnic groups began to appear in the late 1950s.


31 Andrew Greeley, op.cit., pp. 51-52.
Discussing ethnicity, Charles Price described an ethnic group as an entity needed for companionship with people of their kind who understood their background, who can speak the same language or dialect. Jerzy Zubrzycki looked upon an ethnic group as a community in which immigrants can enjoy the protection of people of their own kind - an essential condition in maintaining normal settler's sense of security and happiness. Jean I. Martin wrote that stimuli to ethnic groups organisations may be the reaction from the dominant group, a wish to preserve a cultural tradition, or a positive concern to maintain group identity and individual identity.

Definitions of identity have a great deal in common, using the framework of symbolic interaction, ethnicity is defined generally as the cultural bond holding individuals together in historical groups and societies, assuring these groups their survival and development and, within groups, the unfolding of human potential-intellectual, expressive and moral. Further, ethnicity, as the research indicates, is a process of cultural formation, denoting the bonding of individuals in historical groups through an intricate socialisation process securing a degree of integration of the individual personality with the social and cultural patterns developed by these groups throughout their history and continuously being developed.

Ethnic groups are also defined as carriers of their distinct cultural bonds based on historical development, or, as in transplanted cultures, on continuation of historical patterns modified by the experience in the new environment. The main elements of these distinct patterns are: language, group definition related to historical development and origins, cultural content including folk patterns of marriage, of family life, or socialisation, institutional and associational structures and functions, and modes of group identification involving both group identities and relations to the larger society and to other groups.


34 Jean I. Martin, *op.cit.*, p.46.
Immigration and ethnicity are today two very topical subjects. The current debate about the former has naturally had considerable impact on the later. Over the last three decades, Australia has become a highly pluralistic society. There is a large body of literature that describes and explains Australian Settlement experiences, pitfalls, growth and acceptance.

To obtain a good overview for understanding fully the issues of the early post-war settlement in connection with the arrival of the 1948 group the assimilationist literature was researched. When the first Czechs arrived after the last war, Australia was a monistic society with assimilation of immigrants high on the priority list. A host of definitions of assimilation can be encountered in the literature on the subject. Assimilation is generally defined as a process of change during which the immigrant is expected to identify himself in various respects with members of the host group and becomes less distinguishable from them.

The literature on assimilation is immense and the bulk of it naturally comes from countries with a long tradition of immigration. It is not surprising therefore that most of the literature is of American origin and is represented by such writers as: Handlin35(1953), Hansen36(1948), Schermerhorn37(1949) and Warner and Srole38(1945). All these authors concentrate on the assimilation of free or economic immigrants. Davie39(1947), Kent40(1953) and Saenger41(1941) deal with the assimilation of forced immigrants or refugees.


Literature on the subject also emerged in Israel after World War II, where Eisenstadt\textsuperscript{42} (1954) has made an important contribution in the field.

Australian writers such as Borrie\textsuperscript{43} (1954), Hempel\textsuperscript{44} (1959), Price\textsuperscript{45} (1945) and Richardson\textsuperscript{46} (1960) have all studies assimilation of free immigrants. Forced immigrants became the subject matter of studies carried out by Craig\textsuperscript{47} (1954), Murphy\textsuperscript{48} (1952) and Taft\textsuperscript{49} (1953). The names mentioned so far are only a few of the authors who have researched the intricacies of the assimilation process.

The widening sources on immigrants in Australia, the growth of the voluntary immigrant element within the population, the appearance of the second and third generation in schools and workforce, has brought an increased pre-occupation with immigrants as settlers. The appearance of historical, psychological, demographic, sociological, health and educational studies show how enormous this area has become in Australia during the last forty years.


\textsuperscript{43} W.D. Borrie, \textit{Italians and Germans in Australia}. Melbourne, Cheshire, 1945.


\textsuperscript{46} Alan R. Richardson, \textit{British Immigrants in Western Australia, The study of immigrants in Australia}, ed. C.A.Price. Canberra, Australian National University, 1960.


\textsuperscript{49} Ronald Taft, \textit{A shared frame of reference concept applied to the assimilation immigrants}. Human relations. 1953,6,pp.45-55.
The following literature was helpful in obtaining a better understanding of Australian society in the last two decades and consisted of studies written by Appleyard\textsuperscript{50} (1985), Burnley, Enoel, McCall\textsuperscript{51} (1984), Harris\textsuperscript{52} (1979). Jupp\textsuperscript{53} (1966), Kovacs and Crootley\textsuperscript{54} (1975), Martin\textsuperscript{55} (1965), (1978), (1981), Price\textsuperscript{56} (1966), (1970), (1979), (1984), (1985), Witton and Bosworth\textsuperscript{57} (1984). Further, as a nominated member of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs in Melbourne, 1982-1984, I participated in the completion of several reports and I am well acquainted with the literature produced by this Institute since its inception.


1.3 SOURCES AND METHODS OF RESEARCH

The interest in ethnicity and immigration studies gave the social sciences a new impetus. It was mainly the areas of sociology and history which took a prominent part in these studies.

The debate about the relationship between sociology and history still continues. Arnold Toynbee believed that the two disciplines are contradictory while R. Bierstedt argues that they are complimentary.58 This research is an historico-sociological study based on belief that "history without sociology is blind and sociology without history is empty."59 To understand how certain ethnic groups behave, the deep knowledge of their historical background is very important. In Carr's words "the more sociological history becomes, and the more historical sociology becomes, the better for both."60 To obtain the information for a study on ethnic group a variety of different research techniques were required. The methods employed could be divided in the following way: documentary research and interviews.

(i) Documentary research

It would be generally expected that settlers from the same country of origin, speaking the same language, being proud of their ethnic heritage, leaving their homeland because of their dislike of communism and finally being classified as refugees and offered settlement in Australia, would display the same forms of community behaviour and similar ethnic characteristics.

This is how the outsider may view an ethnic group displaying above described similarities and originating in the same country. But not only outsiders but also the leaders of Czech communities in Australia who had arrived with the 1948 wave believed that with the arrival of new blood in 1968, harmonious relationship and full participation of all Czechs would characterise Czech ethnic life.

59 ibid, p.103.
Some time after the arrival of the 1968 group it became clear that the expected rejuvenation of the Czech community life had not proceeded as expected, and approximately 4,500 new settlers of the 1968 intake had hardly made any visible impact on the dormant community life created by the 1948 settlers. The original cordial relationships between the two groups was soon replaced by attitudes of mistrust and social negativity on both sides.

In this research I intend to find out further the motives and factors which led to this estrangement of both groups. Was it the nationalistic and paternalistic attitude of the older group, or was it the legacy of twenty years of living under the communism of the younger group? The roots of this estrangement have both historical connotations, covering their European and Australian experiences, and as such their ancestral history and their processes of re-settlement will be investigated.

The research consisted of several stages. The first stage consisted of gathering and studying publications in the Czech language published in Czechoslovakia describing the visits and emigration of Czechs to Australia. In the second stage a comparative study of publications discussing aspects of ethnicity in the United States, Canada and Australia was undertaken. Also considered were the publications about the settlement of Czechs in other countries. In the third stage a study of all Czech language publications which have appeared since World War II in Australia was conducted. It included newspapers, bulletins, circulars and occasional publications. Also researched were clubs' and associations' documents, their correspondence, personal papers of settlers and official reports. The writer's knowledge of the Czech language was very helpful in this research. Also important was the writer's personal experience and knowledge of Australian re-settlement. Himself a refugee of 1948, he worked for the International Refugee Organisation in the American Occupational Zone of Western Germany in 1949, and, upon arrival in Australia, he worked for the Commonwealth Department of Immigration in the Bonegilla Immigration Centre, Victoria, in 1950. Later, in 1964–68, the writer was the Director of the Saturday morning Czech language school in Melbourne, and a lecturer of the Czech language at Melbourne University, in 1973. He was also involved in the introduction of the Czech language at H.S.C. level in
Victoria. All these activities and experiences were helpful in researching for this study.

In the final stage the Australian historical and sociological studies which discuss post-war immigration were examined.

(ii) Interviews

Interviewing formed an important part of collecting necessary data and information in the initial stages of my research. To obtain necessary data for the research a decision was made to select a sample which includes both the 1948 and 1968 settlers. Originally, it was planned to have two of the same samples, one from Melbourne and the other from Sydney. Because of the geographical difficulties and time requirements, it was decided to concentrate on Melbourne only. Further, I was told by a community leader that I will have a better chance to obtain necessary information in Melbourne than in Sydney, where my name is not known.

The Czechoslovak-born population of Victoria totalled 4,819 out of 16,152 persons for the whole of Australia in 1981. According to Price 74 per cent of the total figure of Czechoslovak-born in Australia are Czechs; the reminder are Slovaks, along with some Germans, Hungarians and Jews born in Czechoslovakia.61 Applying the same percentage for Victoria the 74 per cent would represent 3,566 people. It was decided that five per cent of the total of Czech-born persons in Victoria would constitute a statistically valid sample, a total of 178 people. Anticipating that some would refuse to be interviewed I added another 72 people to my sample which brings the total to 250 persons.

The necessary details for my sample such as the names and addresses were obtained from the ex-editor of the extinct Czech-language newspaper Hlas domova which ceased its activities in 1982. The members of my sample were selected from the above register and altogether 250 persons known to be Czechs were contacted.

61 Charles A.Price, op cit, p.56.
Out of that number 197 reacted positively to my request and agreed to meet me. Out of this number 103 persons were settlers of 1948 and 94 were of the 1968 intake. A questionnaire was prepared containing specific questions for the survey's data.

When the questionnaire was completed I consulted several people and sought their advice about the content of my questionnaire. The reason for this was to find out how sensitive this instrument of enquiry would be, bearing in mind that some questions were concerned with the details of settlers' personal backgrounds. When I was informed that the proposed questions might have deterred some members of the Czech community participating in my survey, I decided to re-write my questionnaire in a more general way (Appendix A). The people selected for my sample were notified about the project and about a third preferred only to answer the questionnaire and return it by mail, while the rest of the enquiry was conducted by personal interviewing.

When the beginning of the interviewing began the details of the interview were discussed with people concerned and they were assured that this survey was for the purpose of research and that their responses to the questionnaire are strictly confidential. Being generally known to the Melbourne Czech community was an advantage in gaining their co-operation, and the personal interviewing was more rewarding for the purpose of my research. Generally, personal contact is regarded as one of the best approaches in completing survey data. G.W. Alport wrote that "If you want to know how people feel, what they experienced and what they remember, what their emotions and motives are like, and their reasons for acting as they do - why not to ask them".62

Interviewing is a technique used commonly in social research. It is flexible and gives not only the chance to rephrase the questions but also an opportunity to gauge the validity of responses. During my interviews I tried to revive memories of people involved in ethnic life relevant to events and conditions decades ago.

I felt that by personal interviewing, the conversation so created had advantage of great intimacy and gaining the interviewees confidence.

The general questions forming the interview were aimed to find out as much as possible about their personal background, reasons why they escaped, their political affiliation in their country of origin and in Australia, their opinions about the regime they escaped from, their opinions about the organisation of their re-settlement, the reason for selecting Australia as their place of settlement and how they feel about their new home now. Further the direction of the interviewing was channelled into the area of ethnic life of Czechs in Australia. The interviewing contained questions like how the 1948 group felt about the 1968 settlers and vice versa, what satisfaction, if any, they found in their social contacts with their fellow countrymen, and if they had ceased all their contacts with their fellow Czechs, what were their reasons for this move. All these and other questions I sought to use in putting together some solid argument which would show why the sudden differences appeared within the structures of Czech communities in Australia and why these sudden differences led to the near-complete breakdown of Czech ethnic life in Australia. Were the forces which brought the malaise into Czech ethnic life internal depending on the settlers and their organisation only, or was some external influence from the host society, overseas or even their homeland responsible, or are they general to all immigrant groups?

However, some difficulties were encountered during the interviews. To conduct research on political refugees is far more complicated than to conduct similar work among free or economic immigrants. To explain the latter, the free or economic immigrants are the people who leave their homeland for personal betterment: such persons are free to leave their country and they can return any time they wish to. Refugees, in particular the refugees from communist governed countries, have always been regarded as illegal emigrants from their ancestral homes by regimes controlling their lands. This illegality of departure, according to the laws of these countries, is a criminal and unpatriotic act against the state: a warrant is automatically issued on every escapee. The property of refugees is usually confiscated by the state and their settlement in the country of their choice is often monitored. Since the end of World War II it
has become known that the totalitarian regimes planted informers among the settlers, whose task is to report on the settlers. This was officially disclosed during the Royal Commission on Espionage, investigating activities of a Soviet Embassy official in Canberra, Vladimir Petrov, in 1954; this matter will be discussed later in this thesis.

The awareness of the above situation led to a state among immigrants which could be described as a feeling of fear, mistrust, and a "be careful" attitude about anyone who tries to find out about their background. Because of this situation some chosen interviewees have refused to be interviewed. They felt that the details of their interview may be made public or may leak out and be used against them in the future by the Czechoslovak authorities. As far as cooperation with the interviewer was concerned, settlers with a longer period of stay in Australia were more understanding of the purposes of the survey. Their co-operation was more positive and they were willing to contribute as much as possible.
CHAPTER TWO

CZECH EMIGRATION HISTORY AND

SETTLEMENT IN AUSTRALIA PRIOR TO 1948

If you leave your homeland you will perish.

Czech proverb, 19th century.
2.1 SHORT HISTORY OF BOHEMIA AND MORAVIA

Among the many hundreds of thousands of people who have settled in Australia since World War II, about 18,000 were born in Czechoslovakia. These settlers have come from Czechoslovakia, which is a central European country consisting of two ethnic Slavic groups, the Czechs and the Slovaks. The Czech-speaking people are found in Bohemia and Moravia, while the Slovak-speaking people live in Slovakia.

Czechoslovakia shares borders with Western and Eastern Germany, Poland, the U.S.S.R., Hungary and Austria. It occupies an area of 78,960 kilometres and in 1982 had a population of 15,468,000.¹

In the early history of Europe, the Czech regions were occupied by a succession of different civilisations, among them Celts, Romans and various Germanic tribes. The Slavic tribes moved to Bohemia in the fourth century A.D. and later established their settlement in Moravia. From the seventh century for a period of three hundred years, the Slavic empire flourished. The first important state recorded in these provinces was the Kingdom of Great Moravia, first mentioned in 869 and destroyed by the invading tribe of Magyars in 904-905. The Czechs, who were minimally affected by this invasion, founded the Kingdom of Bohemia.²

During the fourteenth century, Prague was the centre of the Holy Roman Empire, a confederation of European states. Its far-sighted monarch, Charles IV, founded in 1348 the University of Prague, which was named after him. In the fifteenth century Prague became the centre of a new reforming movement, led by Jan Hus, which questioned the religious doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.

1 Czechoslovak Life (Prague, 1983), p.5.
An area of cultural enrichment followed: some 2,500 castles in Romanesque, Gothic, Renaissance and Baroque architectural styles trace in stone the history and culture of the Bohemia of these centuries.³

In the seventeenth century the Czechs were defeated by the armies of the German Hapsburgs who were defending the Catholic cause. In 1620, with the defeat of the rebellion against the emperor, the national schism was complete. On one side stood the victorious Roman Catholics, on the other, the defeated Protestants. The result of this was that the Protestant Czechs were expelled from their homeland and spread throughout the world, taking their literary, scholastic and religious doctrine with them. They became known as Moravian Brethren.

Under the Hapsburgs, and especially in the days of the Counter Reformation, Czech national life and language were almost eliminated. For the next 300 years the Czech provinces of Bohemia and Moravia remained a part of the Hapsburg Empire. In the first hundred years of Hapsburg rule, these counties lost most of their wealth, many of their nobles, and almost all their independence. In the second hundred years, national leaders brought about a rebirth of national feeling in the peoples of these lands. It was in the third hundred years when nationalism began to play an important role in the nation's issues and Czech identity began to re-emerge. The nation became united in opposition to their German-speaking rulers of Austria.

During the turbulent year of 1848, the people of Bohemia revolted along with Magyars of Hungary against the Austrians. These revolts were put down ruthlessly. In 1867, the Magyars won equality with Austria and the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary was created.⁴ But the Czechs were still deprived of national status. While deprived of political freedom a wave of nationalism emerged and led to the growth and popularization of the Czech language, literature, history, art and music.

⁴ Harriet Wanklyn, op.cit., p.12.
Around the middle of the nineteenth century many literary works of distinction made their appearance and Czech poetry achieved a high level. The theatre was a most important influence in shaping the new Czech culture. In the nineteenth century Czech music made striking progress. Attention was concentrated on creating a national opera. The most celebrated names in this field were Bedrich Smetana and Antonin Dvorak. Because the Czechs could not participate on the political stage in the Austro-Hungarian empire, they put their energies and interest in cultural and industrial spheres. These cultural aspects and industrial achievements were their nationalistic expression.

The political climate of this era also led to the state of affairs that Czech resistance against German bureaucracy was characterised by a profusion of historical works describing glorious past of the Czechs and by satirising the status quo, as depicted in Hasek's work The Good Soldier Svejk. With the breakdown and destruction of Austria-Hungary in the World War I the independence of Czechoslovakia was proclaimed on October 28, 1918. Besides Czechs and Slovaks, the new republic incorporated within its boundaries smaller numbers of Germans, Hungarians, Ruthenians and Poles. In spite of the imperfections common to most democracies, it was, until the Munich catastrophe in 1938, a country governed by restrained and responsible groups with understanding and appreciation of parliamentary government, and was frequently mentioned as a model European democracy.

Up to the rise of Nazism in Germany in 1933, the minorities participated with the Czechoslovak Government in a positive way. From 1936, Germany began to encourage the minorities to ask for more rights and autonomies. In such a way the minorities' nationalism was used to weaken the position of the Czechoslovak state and prepared the situation for the fateful year of 1938.

In September 1938, the British and French ministers concluded the Munich Pact with Hitler. Czechoslovakia was to surrender to Germany its frontier territories as well as making border adjustments in favour of Hungary and Poland. Notwithstanding these concessions, Nazi Germany occupied the Czech lands of Bohemia and Moravia in 1939. The Nazis proceeded to help Slovaks to set up
their own state, in the shadow of the German Reich. After the outbreak of war in September 1939, thousands of Czechs went into exile, many of them joining French and British armed forces. The German occupation, the losses of enlisted men in the French, British and Russian armies, and the losses in the Slovak National Eising against the Germans in 1944 cost Czechoslovakia 375,000 dead.

After World War II the Czechoslovak Republic was re-established, though not precisely within its former boundaries. The territory of Ruthenia had been annexed within its former boundaries by the Soviet Union. After three years of democratic rule the Communist Party had a successful bid for absolute takeover in 1948. Following this, some 80,000 Czechs and Slovaks left their homeland and over 12,000 of them settled in Australia in 1949-50. After nearly twenty years of Communist rule in Czechoslovakia a most unexpected change occurred in 1968, when the Czechoslovak Communist Party proclaimed its new program of "socialism with a human face". Past mistakes were published and criticised. But the prospect of a "better tomorrow and a more human socialism", as promised by the Communist leader Alexander Dubček in his speeches was squashed by the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the armies of the Warsaw Pact. As in 1968, approximately 60,000 people left Czechoslovakia and re-settled elsewhere. Over 6,500 emigrated to Australia and made their permanent homes in this country.


6 Ibid, p.42.
2.2 EMIGRATION FROM EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES

It is important to realise that the tragic history of the Czechs resulted in complicated social consequences. An outcome of these was that Czechs have a long history of emigration.

The foregoing is important to understand the behaviour of settlers who emigrated to Australia in the post World War II era.

The Battle of White Mountain near Prague in 1620 is regarded as the most momentous event in the history of Bohemia and Moravia. The forces of Czech Protestantism were defeated, the nation lost its independence, and Protestantism was suppressed in Bohemia and Moravia. A number of rebel chiefs fled from the country, others were apprehended and tried for treason, some executed and many were punished by the confiscation of their property or by prison sentences. It has been estimated that 36,000 Protestant families, including 185 houses of the nobility, went into exile.

Historians recognise three stages in the exodus of Czech Protestants:

(i) The first emigration began in 1621 when the victors ordered the banishment of teachers and ministers of the gospel. About a thousand members of these two professions were forced to leave the country.

(ii) Next, the victors turned against the laymen, whose property was to be confiscated. By the end of 1623, more than 600 of the largest estates had been seized. This brought about the second emigration.

(iii) The Imperial Patent, which was a part of re-catholization of Bohemia and Moravia in 1627, provided that non-Catholics should not henceforth be permitted to live in the country. The third emigration, the most far reaching exodus of all, followed on this degree.7

7 Thomas Capek, op cit., p.3.
The exiles at first sought refuge in the neighbouring states of Saxony and Silesia, and as their hopes of an early return to their native country waned, they emigrated to more distant lands such as Sweden, Denmark, Holland, England, Switzerland and Russia. Among them was the Bishop of the Moravian Brethren Church, Jan Amos Komensky, who established himself in Holland where, under the name of Comenius, he became known to philosophers for his work and writing in the field of education.

This immigration continued in the eighteenth century at a slower pace. While the seventeenth century emigrants had been absorbed by the English or Dutch, or wherever they happened to settle, the eighteenth century emigrants developed special settlements of their own. The best known settlements were Herrnhut in Saxony and Bethlehem in Pennsylvania.8

In spite of "stray" emigrants from the mid-seventeenth century there was nothing that could be called a mass movement of emigrants in the modern sense from Bohemia till the revolutionary years 1848-9. At this time there was social ferment in Bohemia, fanned by a desire for political independence, a resurrection of national self-consciousness and a spirit of religious questioning due to reaction against the corrupt and benighted influence of Austrian clericalism.9

The revolutionary years 1848-49 produced the first political refugees. The Czech literati started to organise ethnic life in countries of their re-settlement, leading to establishment of the first Czech society in New York in 1850, and the first Czech newspaper in Racine, Wisconsin, in 1855.10

Emigration at this time may have been quickened by two other influences besides those of the revolutionary activities of the period. The first of those was the abolition of serfdom and labour dues in 1848, which for the first time gave the peasants their personal freedom. The second possible influence was the discovery of gold in California in 1849, which is said to have brought Czech gold seekers and to have stimulated the activity of shipping agents.

8 Ibid, p.5.
9 Thomas Capek, op cit, p.161.
10 Ibid, p.163.
Notwithstanding strict police regulations, advertisements, though veiled, appeared telling of the great opportunities in America, giving instructions how to travel and other advice.\textsuperscript{11}

It is interesting, however, to note that the Prague Czech language newspaper, the Pražské Noviny, September 16, 1847, admonished readers not to emigrate. If the Czechs, the writer argued, who contemplate going to America, work as hard at home as Americans are known to toil, they will find America at their own threshold. Similarly, the Politické wesnické noviny z Čech of September 11, 1849, pleaded with the readers that love of fatherland, if nothing else, should deter Czechs from emigrating.\textsuperscript{12} The proverb used at the opening of this chapter originated in this era.

\textsuperscript{11} Emily G. Balch, \textit{op cit,} p.69.

\textsuperscript{12} Thomas Capek, \textit{op cit,} p.165.
2.3 THE FIRST CZECH CONTACTS WITH AUSTRALIA

The first Czech to set foot on the Australian mainland arrived in the eighteenth century with the Spanish Navy. His name was Tadeas Haenke; he landed in Sydney in 1693. The Austrian Emperor Joseph II had arranged for Haenke to be attached to the Spanish Navy to collect botanical specimens during ship's calls in different parts of the world.\(^13\)

The first known Czech-born person who stayed permanently in Australia was Mark Blucher, Jewish by religion. As a young man he left Prague for Germany and later reached England. In 1829 he stole some lace and was sentenced in Nottingham to seven years imprisonment. Soon after, his sentence was changed to transportation to the Colony of New South Wales. He arrived in Sydney in the convict ship Durwegan in 1830.\(^14\)

One of the best known Czechs who lived in Australia in the nineteenth century was Jan Ihotsky. A scientist and medical doctor, he arrived in Sydney in 1832. He became known as a writer, scientist and explorer. In 1834 Ihotsky organised an expedition to the Australian Alps, which yielded a vast amount of valuable scientific information.\(^15\)

During the Gold Rush the gold fever brought Bohemian diggers and brass bands to the gold fields.\(^16\) The best known Czech diggers were Cenek Pacit and Josef Polak, both mentioned previously.

---


As mentioned previously, music was part of an awakening of Czech national consciousness. While the educated strata of Czech society concentrated on serious and theatrical music, in the Czech countryside, the peasants, developed skill in brass band music. It was worth mentioning that during the Austro-Hungarian Empire nearly all military bands had Czech bandleaders and musicians. The Czech musicians also dominated among the European circus bands.
The religious orders like the Moravian Brethren and the Jesuits were involved in missionary work among the Aborigines. In both groups there were missionaries of Czech origin.17

After the gold rush period economic growth marked a new phase in Australian economic development. People were needed, and assisted immigration became an important supply of new settlers. The need for certain skills dictated that experts be sought, not only in Britain but also on the European continent. This led to the immigration of some specialists who were accepted as assisted immigrants. This era also witnessed the foundation of the first Czech ethnic organisation in Sydney in 1884. The backbone of this organisation were the gold diggers who after making some money on the goldfields decided to establish themselves as businessmen in Sydney. A leading personality was Vaclav Jira, who established a business in precious stones.18

It is rather impossible to give an exact number of Czechs living in the Australian colonies in the nineteenth century. Bohemia was a part of Austria-Hungary and the official colonial censuses included Czechs under the section of Austro-Hungarians. The figures for people born in Austria-Hungary residing at the dates of the colonial censuses were as follows: 610 persons in 1871, 1086 in 1881, 1661 in 1891, 1921 in 1901 and 2797 in 1911. Danes mentions that the Czech-born in Sydney amounted to over 100 in the 1880s.

17 Michael Cigler, op cit, p.15.
2.4 THE PERIOD BETWEEN WORLD WAR I AND WORLD WAR II

The period between the two World Wars was an era of less immigration than at any time in this century. While the British immigrants were the most numerous, there were some other Europeans settling in Australia although not in large numbers. The increase of non-Britishers was noticeable mainly after 1921, which was caused by the imposition of immigration to the United States of America. Queensland was affected more by this increase than any other Australian state; the reasons being that Queensland was the only state which at that period of time introduced assisted immigration of non-Britishers, such as Scandinavians, Germans and Austrians.

The Federal Immigration Act of 1929 which was introduced after the recommendation of the Royal Commission also provided a framework for the effective prevention of the entry of any group or individual for whatever grounds, be they racial, economic and social, considered to be undesirable or unassimilable.\(^\text{19}\)

Based on the Royal Commission investigating the settlement of Southern Europeans in Queensland in 1925 it defined the desirable types of settlers as those who are thrifty, industrious, honest and willing to pioneer the land. Italian and Maltese were seen to be desirable in that sense. The Greek immigrants were found to be a "menace" to the country as they resided in towns and managed cafes and fish shops. The Queensland Government was only interested in immigrants with agricultural interests who would open up undeveloped areas.\(^\text{20}\)

Due to this Immigration Act the Australian Government decided to introduce official quotas for immigrants from countries other than Britain. The quota for immigrants from Czechoslovakia was set at 300 persons per year; the quotas for other European countries were slightly higher or lower.


The control of European immigrants (other than British) was consolidated in two ways:

(i) by requiring each immigrant to have a guarantor resident in Australia or Forty Pounds of his own;

(ii) by asking British Consuls in the countries of origin to issue visas to Australia only for limited number each year.21

There was considerable flexibility in this latter system. Some Consuls did not take the request very seriously whilst others, together with Australian officials, would sometimes allow a surplus in one year to be set against a deficit in an earlier year. In practice very few countries ever reached their quota, most of them being well below it. This happened partly because Australia was not very attractive to many Europeans in the mid-twenties and partly because the requirements of a sponsor or the Forty Pounds landing money reduced the number of those applying for visas.

The year 1921 was an important milestone for emigration from Europe. The United States introduced special immigration quotas for individual nations, allowing only 14,262 immigrants from Czechoslovakia per year, this being reduced to 3,073 in 1924.22 This restrictionist policy of the United States led prospective emigrants to seek new destinations and Australia attracted increased interest. According to the Commonwealth Census of 1921 the total population of Czechoslovak-born was 264.

Besides ordinary immigrants, this era witnessed visits of sportsmen, teams and individuals and their reports, or reports about them appearing in the Czech newspapers or other publications, helped to promote the image of Australia. The most significant was the visit of Czech journalist Egon Kisch who came to Australia in 1934 as a delegate of the World Committee of Movement Against War and

21 Jan Sveštenů, op cit., p.327.
Fascism. He was declared to be a prohibited immigrant and his affair made many Australians aware of the Dictation Test initiated by the Immigration Restriction Act of 1901, which was finally abolished 24 years later in 1958.23

Events which led to the outbreak of World War II brought to Australia a new type of immigrant, the refugees fleeing Nazi persecution. Most significant were the several thousand Jewish refugees fleeing from the increasing Nazi domination in Europe. At the Evian Conference in Switzerland Australia had agreed to accept 15,000 of these people over a three-year period. The outbreak of war intervened and by late 1939 only just under 8,000 of the refugees arrived.24 Among these were over 200 Jewish refugees from Czechoslovakia. Approximately over eighty settled in Melbourne. In the initial stages after their arrival these refugees were closely connected with the activities of the Czech community. They participated in all affairs, such as social life, cultural nights, and activities helping to support the Allied War effort in Melbourne.

According to my interviewee, who held a position of the President of the Czechoslovak Club in Melbourne, the Jewish refugees regarded themselves exclusively as Czechs, not as Jews in a national sense. Some could speak German only and Czechoslovak citizenship gave them a guarantee of Allied subjects in Australia. They regarded themselves as German speaking anti-Nazi Czechoslovak citizens.

The Czechoslovak community in Melbourne amounted to over 400 people during World War II, and approximately 200 participated in the activities of the Czechoslovak Club. Similarly active was the Czechoslovak Club in Sydney with participation of nearly 300 people.25

24 Janis Wilton and Richard Bosworth, op cit, p.49.
25 Disclosed during the interview with the President of the Czechoslovak Club in Melbourne of that time, F. Prochazka. All the other facts appearing on this page came from the same source.
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The declaration of World War II on September 3, 1939, meant that some visitors from overseas who were about to leave Australia were forced to stay in Australia. One of them was a Czech, Eduard Borovansky, who reached Australia in 1938 as a ballet dancer with the Colonel de Basil Troupe. Borovansky with his wife, who was also a ballet dancer, established the Borovansky Ballet Company, Australia's first professional company, which was responsible for the spread of ballet throughout Australia.

The Czechoslovak clubs mentioned before were forerunners of the great organisational activity which followed after the arrival of the first post-war settlers. The activities of both clubs in Melbourne and Sydney were closely associated with the Czechoslovak consulates in both cities. Both clubs ceased their activities in 1950 after the arrival of the 1948 refugees, who created their own organisational ethnic network.

Among the war-time refugees were about twenty people who returned after World War II to Czechoslovakia. According to my informant all of them subsequently re-emigrated to Australia. Some, the single ones, married in Czechoslovakia and brought their new wives with them.

When World War II began in 1939 the Australian Government established the Aliens Classification and Advisory Committee which divided all aliens residing in Australia in special groups. The Czechs were included in the group of Allied nationals. When the Czechoslovak Government in Exile declared war on Germany in 1939, some of the Australian Czechs volunteered for the newly formed Czechoslovak Army in the United Kingdom, some joined the Australian Armed Forces.


28 Information received from F. Prochazka (The ex-President of the Czechoslovak Club in Melbourne).
In the first chapter, I stressed the importance of history in the study of societal issues. I would even go further and argue that without the understanding of history and culture of a group of people, researchers do not get the full understanding of the group they study. It could be said that as an important part of social sciences, history summarises the experiences of nation’s past, from which we can learn a great deal of understanding of present societies, groups of people and be able to judge their behaviour and national aspirations.

The unsettled history of Czechs described in this chapter has greatly influenced their behaviour not only in their ancestral country but also in other countries where they settled. The notion of national survival, the tendency to be and stay together as a whole, is the only way how to survive as a group and preserve the national existence. This tradition incalculated on the minds of Czechs by the various foreign occupations became the motto of the writers, poets, teachers and national societies.

Refugees are often misunderstood as far their processes of settlement are concerned. Because of their past experiences they usually behave and act differently when compared with the economic immigrants. Refugees are people who generally would often not intend to emigrate under normal circumstances. Nearly 95 per cent of my sample (the structure of my sample will be discussed in detail later) stated that if the conditions of Czechoslovakia were normal, as in the pre-war times, they would never have become emigrants. The sudden departure from their homeland is a stressful factor and deepens their nostalgic memoirs and their links with their past. In the countries of their settlement it emerges in a new form, in an ethno-nationalistic tendency which influences and characterises their behaviour during the periods of their re-settlement and re-establishment. This was common for both groups, the 1948 and 1968 settlers, and in the next chapters where these two groups will be analysed, nationalism played an important part.
World War II was among the most important turning point in the growth and development of Australia. It also marked a change in governmental and political thinking, resulting in large scale immigration after the war. During the last war, Australia was for the first time threatened by an enemy invasion and this resulted in a radical change in Australian political thinking.

The Minister for Immigration, Harold Holt, stated in 1953:

The danger of invasion by a determined enemy did more than all the political oratory and journalism of the preceding fifty years to convince the great mass of Australians that they must either populate and develop their vast continent or accept the probability of having it taken from them.\textsuperscript{29}

The military argument was very important and was accepted by a large proportion of Australian policy makers.

Another variable, a demographic one, was the statistical evidence which had shown that Australian mothers had not borne enough children in the ten years before the war to replace the population in the next generation, let alone increase Australia's numbers.

This argument was raised in 1947 and the Minister for Immigration at that time, Arthur Calwell, stated:

The sad truth is that Australia as we know it is only 160 years old, but we are slowly bleeding to death. If the net rate of reproduction does not improve, we will be finished as a nation at the end of another fifty years.\textsuperscript{30}

The immigration policy was still very pro-British. The Minister for Immigration Calwell, hoped that "for every foreign immigrant there will be ten people from the United Kingdom".\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{29} Harold E. Holt et al, \textit{op cit.}, p.1.

\textsuperscript{30} Arthur A. Calwell, \textit{op cit.}, p.12.

\textsuperscript{31} James Jupp, \textit{Arrivals and departures.} (Melbourne, Cheshire, 1966), p.4.
Although the Britons were preferred, the schemes for European Allies, American War Veterans, Irish, farmers from Holland and finally refugees, known as Displaced Persons, signalled the approaching change. The first groups of European immigrants began to arrive in 1947 and 1948, and the first appearance of Czechs as post-war settlers in larger groups had begun by 1949.32

In connection with the above schemes the emigration program for European Allies should be elaborated upon here, as there were several Czechs who arrived under this scheme in Australia in 1946. This scheme was designed for the Allied nationals who served during World War II under the High Allied Command either in Europe or Asia. It was meant only for those of European racial background. During World War II Czechoslovak Army and Air Force were incorporated under the British Command and those who have chosen Australia as the land of the settlement were ex-soldiers whose passages were paid for by the Australian Government.

---

32 Michael J. Cigler, op cit., p.159.
2.6 CZECHOSLOVAKIA IN 1948

Shortly after World War II, when the immigration to Australia was renewed and began to develop, the political circumstances in central and eastern Europe had gradually taken a new and unexpected turn which forecast uncertain political periods in several countries. Czechoslovakia was one of them.

World War II ended in Czechoslovakia on May 9, 1945. After the German surrender, about 90 per cent of Czechoslovak territory was occupied by the Russians and 10 per cent by the Americans. Prior to the war's end the Czechoslovak Government in Exile, which had established its headquarters in London, returned to the already liberated part of Czechoslovakia through the Soviet Union. On April 4, 1945, in the Soviet-occupied town of Kosice (eastern Slovakia), President Edward Benes appointed a Provisional Government with Z.Fierlinger, a former diplomat and a left-wing socialist, as Prime Minister.

His Cabinet consisted of seven Communists of whom three were Slovaks, two Czech Social Democrats, three National Socialists, three Czech Populists and three Slovak Democrats, together with Jan Masaryk as Foreign Minister and General L. Svoboda as Minister of Defence. While Masaryk was not associated with any political party, the General had Communist sympathies. More important was the nomination of the Communist V. Nosek as Minister of Interior with the control of the police. The new Government worked out a general program and declared its policy, known as the "Kosice Program", based broadly on a socialist economy.33

In October the nationalisation of the banks, insurance companies, mines and heavy industry was carried out in accordance with the proposal embodied in the "Kosice Program".

In this was more than 50 per cent of industry passed into the hands of the state, while more than 1,700,000 hectares of land were distributed among 170,000 small and medium farmers and agricultural workers. A Provisional Assembly was elected by local National Committees which had been formed as the country was liberated; it met on October 28, 1945, and functioned until a Constituent Assembly was elected on May 26, 1946.

In the election the five chief political parties polled as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communists</td>
<td>2,695,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Socialists</td>
<td>1,298,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populists</td>
<td>1,110,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Democrats</td>
<td>998,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democrats</td>
<td>905,654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new Government was appointed with the Communist leader Gottwald as Prime Minister. Otherwise there were only a few important changes among ministers. The first big measure put to the new Constituent Assembly was a two-year economic plan, essentially a recovery program.

By the summer of 1947 the main post-war trend in European politics was beginning to overshadow every aspect of Czechoslovak life - the determination of the Soviets to hold as much as possible of Central Europe. The growth of Soviet influence in Czechoslovakia was reflected in the increasing truculence of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and the so-called Iron Curtain became a reality in 1947. This became clear when Czechoslovakia was considering membership in the European Recovery program.

Economic recovery was proceeding slowly, and a severe drought in 1947 further affected the economy. The offer of aid under the European Recovery Program (known also as the Marshall Plan) in June 1947 was therefore of great importance to the Prague Government.

35 Josef Josten, op cit., p.65.
But in obedience to Russian demands, the Czechoslovak Government had to reverse its decision to attend the discussions about economic recovery in Europe. Moscow informed Prague that for the Czechs to go to Paris to discuss the U.S. project would be incompatible with their alliance with the U.S.S.R. The Soviets referred to the Czechoslovak-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Co-operation, signed by President E. Benes in Moscow, in 1943.37

Although the elections of May 1946 had shown the Communists to be the strongest party among the Czech voters, there was much indignation over the Soviet interference; the public grew increasingly suspicious of Communist motives and the situation grew tense. The popularity of the Communist Party gradually began to decrease. It became obvious that in the general elections which were to be held in May 1948, the Communist Party would not be the largest party as they had been in the 1946 elections.

The situation became worse at the beginning of 1948. The Communists demanded further nationalisation and land reforms. Within the Cabinet a conflict developed over the action of Minister Nosek in substituting Communists for non-Communists in the police force.38

At the Cabinet meeting on 17 February 1948, the non-Communist ministers walked out, demanding that the question of personnel in the National Security Corps be evaluated on professional merit and not on political party membership. Prime Minister Gottwald stated that this was a matter for the Ministry of the Government. Following the walk-out about this issue, twelve non-Communist ministers resigned in protest on February 20, 1948.39

37 Harriet Wanklyn, op cit., p.188.


As a result of the above action, the Communist Party called a mass rally on February 21, 1948, in the Old Town Square in Prague at which Prime Minister Gottwald reported the Communist version of the resignation of the twelve ministers. The next day Gottwald spoke at the Congress of Works' Councils, where a resolution was proposed demanding further nationalisation of all wholesale trade, foreign trade, department stores, drug production, building enterprises, publishing houses, hospitals and sanatoria. The Congress expressed its solidarity with the peasants' demands for further land reforms; in support of these demands, a one-hour token strike was called in all enterprises and offices for February 24, 1948.40

The Communists brought in police reserves from outside Prague and ordered the immediate formation of so-called "Action Committees", which were replicas of the "soviet" formed during the 1917 revolution in Russia. The Communists issued arms to factory workers and formed them into a Works Militia, which was ordered to occupy important buildings, ministries, broadcasting stations, communication centres, railways, bridges and newspaper buildings. At the same time it was reported that the Soviet military units were on the move in Eastern Germany and the Soviet Zone of Austria and finally Hungary, concentrating near Czechoslovak frontiers.41

Prime Minister Gottwald formed a new Government, replacing the resigned members, and by February 25, 1948, the Communist had taken over power in Czechoslovakia. The non-Communist ministers and members demanded action by President Benes who was by that time a sick man. It was too late for democratic forces to act decisively. For the second time within a decade totalitarian rule was enforced in Czechoslovakia.42


41 Miroslav Brouček, op cit., p.353.

42 František Ravka, op cit., p.140.
Further Action Committees were formed in all places of employment, factories, shops, offices, army units, universities and villages. Anti-Communists who were politically involved, were dismissed from their employment, staff and students were expelled from the universities, military and police officers were pensioned off, factory managers were removed, non-Communist writers and journalists barred from entering their places of employment, newspapers hostile to the Communist Party were suppressed and student demonstrations were crushed and many people were arrested.

Some people who before the Communist take-over had not belonged to the Communist Party, in effort to keep their jobs, their income and even houses and flats, hurriedly joined the Communist Party. Political purges affected practically every working person. For many, mainly professionals and intellectuals, the temporary solution was to take employment as a manual worker and wait for the situation to stabilise.\textsuperscript{42}

But many thousands did not wait for this to happen. From February 25, 1948, defection from Czechoslovakia, by illegally crossing the borders into Germany and Austria, at that time still under American, British and French occupation, became an alternative solution.

In the centuries-long emigration history of Czechs these defectors have become known as "February refugees".

\textsuperscript{42} Miroslav Brouček, \emph{op cit}, p. 358.
CHAPTER THREE

THE 1948 WAVE

From the nomadic wanderings of early tribes to the organised migrations of the current Displaced Persons the world has witnessed an almost constant shifting of peoples, leading us to believe that migration is probably as old as human society.

Donald P. Kent, 1953.
3.1 ARRIVAL AND SETTLING IN

When the Czechs became refugees in 1948, the western world was already aware of the magnitude and seriousness of the refugee problem, and the International Refugee Organisation, backed by the United Nations, was already well established in the American, British and French occupational zones of Western Germany and Austria.

Besides these refugees who made the hazardous crossing of Czechoslovak frontiers to Western Germany and Austria, there were many Czechs who at the beginning of 1948 were travelling, working or studying abroad when the Communists took over. A large proportion of these people like diplomats, sportsmen, tourists and students did not return to Czechoslovakia from abroad. They also became refugees.

It is estimated that the number of refugees who escaped into Western Germany and Austria and those who refused to return to Czechoslovakia, reached over 50,000 by 1950. Also by 1950 the number of people who had been caught crossing the frontier was estimated at more than 10,0001.

Soon after February 1948, several camps were made available by the International Refugee Organisation, which began to co-ordinate the activities of Czech refugees. Each refugee underwent military and political screening and after receiving a clearance as being a genuine refugee, he was given International Refugee Organisation eligibility, which meant he received free accommodation, sustenance, personal maintenance, medical care, re-training, and free transport to a country which would accept him or her as an immigrant.

When the first notices appeared in the Displaced Persons' camps by the end of 1948, inviting Czechs to settle in Australia, Australia had already had a very positive experience with settlers from Europe. When Australia became a signatory to the Constitution

---

1 Josef Josten, Oh, my country! (London, Latimer House, 1949), p.70
of the International Refugee Organisation on 13 May 1947, there was no hint given to the Australia public that any Displaced Persons would be admitted to Australia. Refugees were not very popular in Australia at that time. The thought of central European refugees settling in Australia was an unpleasant thought, even for a spokesman of the Returned Servicemen's League.²

The Minister of Immigration, Arthur Calwell, was impressed by what he saw in the Displaced Persons' camps of Europe. He decided to test the climate at home by sending a trial shipment of people from the camps to Australia. This decision made, he got his selection officers quite deliberately to find good types of immigrants who were blue-eyed and blonde-types, mainly from the Baltic states, and therefore less likely to offend Australians. Also this initial trial shipment came to Australian shores at a time when Australia was desperately short of labour.³

When they finally arrived in Melbourne in 1947, Calwell met them at the port and found that

"...many spoke some English. There was also a number of platinum blonds of both sexes, many were red-headed and blue-eyed. The men were handsome and the women were beautiful. It was not hard to sell immigration to the Australian people once the press published photographs of that group".⁴

The arrival of the Baltic immigrants - Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians was the turning point in Australian post-war immigration. These people paved the way for many other Displaced Persons and other non-British settlers, including the Czechs.

² Janis Wilton and Richard Bosworth, op cit., p.11.
⁴ Arthur A. Calwell, Be just and fear not. (Adelaide, Rigby, 1981)
By the end of 1948 and throughout 1949, notices appeared in every Displaced Persons camp announcing that prospects existed for emigration to Australia. The notices were very short, stating that Australia was looking for single and married settlers up to the age of forty, or in the case of married people with dependants up to forty-five years of age. Also mentioned was the fact that upon arrival in Australia, immigrants have to complete a two year working contract.5

To cope with the new immigration scheme the Australian Immigration Mission was established in Augsburg Re-settlement Centre in Western Germany, where all applicants were medically examined before having a personal interview with the Australian consul, a security check was made and the International Refugee Organisation, and the American agencies were consulted. Once accepted, the immigrants were notified within a few weeks about their departure.

All selected emigrants were transported to Italy where they waited in the Embarkation Centre in Bagnoli, near Naples, for final placement aboard an immigrant ship bound for Australia. Later, some left for Australia from the German port of Hamburg.

Even after boarding the ship the immigrants did not know the disembarkation point or place of settlement in Australia. The immigrants therefore had no choice. Not even the captains of the ship knew where they were going to disembark their passengers. This decision depended on the availability of accommodation in the immigrant receiving centres in Australia and the demands of the labour market in the individual states. The captains of the vessels were usually notified somewhere in the Indian Ocean where they were going to make port.

On disembarkation new settlers were transported to reception centres. Depending on the port of disembarkation, all went through main centres known as the Commonwealth Immigration Centres, such as Bonegilla in Victoria, Bathurst and Greta in New South Wales, and Graylands in Western Australia.

5 Michael Cigler, op cit., p.48.
At these centres immigrants were again medically examined and interviewed individually, to assess their employment potential and were sent, travel free, to pre-arranged jobs to fulfil their two-year work contracts. The Commonwealth Employment Office would allocate immigrants to any job in any part of Australia.

Every man and woman was equipped with essential clothing, a hat and heavy working boots. A special certificate was issued to the newly arrived settlers over 16 years old, which enabled the authorities to have supervisory control over immigrants' movement. Known as the Certificate of Registration it was similar to an internal passport, as it contained all relevant data about the immigrant, his photograph and space for his address. It also carried a stamped statement indicating that

The bearer of this Certificate has been admitted to the Commonwealth under exemption subject to that person remaining in an approved occupation and locality for a period of two years from the date of his arrival.
Sample copy of the internal pages of the Certificate of Registration issued to every immigrant upon his arrival in Australia.
Prospective emigrants were not told during the signing of their two year working contract before leaving Europe, that men will be classified as labourers and women as domestics. Although they were aware that they would have to work wherever the employment sends them, they anticipated that their work allocation would have some relationship with their previous occupational and professional training.

This document became a source of irritation as men objected to being called 'labourers' and women 'domestics'. Highly skilled and qualified people had to swallow their pride and accept the consequences of their decision to leave the refugee camps in Europe for Australia. And so, experienced engineers cleared bush, physicians worked in factories, technicians dug ditches, farmers worked in steelworks and professional women as kitchen hands.  

One of my interviewees stated:

I found it ridiculous that as an experienced electrician I had to clear the scrub in the bush, while the country was short of tradesmen with my occupational background. They could easily have put me in some electrical factory or to be employed as a hand to an electrical contractor.

The term 'domestic', used to describe the occupational status of all adult females, did not mean that all women worked as domestics. It was just an occupational term labelling them as unqualified workers destined to be used in manual employment.

This occupational downgrading during the contract period had long term ramifications both for immigrants and for Australian society at large. Many Australians began to think of the Displaced Persons as an unskilled workforce, undertaking much of the donkey work in Australian post-war developmental plans which fully employed native Australians were only too willing to avoid.


7 James Jupp, op cit., p.9.
Whatever skills the Czech and other Displaced Persons may have had before their entry into Australia, they were used for a period of two years in the manner considered most important to Australia's post-war development. On completion of this period the settlers were free to select their own job. This era caused a great deal of bitterness and for many it was the beginning of disillusionment with Australia. Jupp writes that 'many skilled and highly qualified people were pitchforked into manual labour, dumped in outback construction camps and regarded as foreigners and cheap labour.'

Even after completion of the bond most found it difficult to get anything other than factory work. An interesting epoch for nearly every immigrant was that after their contract they took up temporary employment, a stage in which they began to assess possibilities of permanent employment and having a job usually little more conducive than that during the contract. This was common for professionals, tradesmen and even workers.

People in such a situation were looking for a temporary job which was financially rewarding. One of many interviewee, an ex-lawyer, indicated:

From the beginning I realised that I would never practice in Australia as a lawyer as I was too old to bother to study again. So I decided to go into business. For such a venture I needed more money than I had saved so far so I decided to be an insurance agent and assist an estate agent to sell houses to European settlers. My aim was to have enough finance to start a business of my own.

This interviewee worked for three years as an insurance agent and assistant to an estate agent. Later he purchased a house with an electrical appliances shop, which he ran with his son for nearly twenty-five years.

The below table of the Kew Mental Hospital employees in Melbourne indicates the different employment periods these Czechs underwent till they finally established themselves in their permanent employment in Australia. Included in the section of temporary employment.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czecho-</th>
<th>First Work</th>
<th>Final Work</th>
<th>Temporary Employment</th>
<th>Final Employment in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lovakia</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Science student</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Medical assistant in New Guinea</td>
<td>Photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Architecture student</td>
<td>Orderly in hospital</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Window dresser</td>
<td>Newsagent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Teacher</td>
<td>Orderly in hospital</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Bus driver</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Politics student</td>
<td>Orderly in hospital</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Radio mechanic</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Politics student</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Truck driver</td>
<td>Estate agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Physician</td>
<td>Orderly in hospital</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>First Aid man</td>
<td>Medical doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Psychology student</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Assistant to osteopath</td>
<td>Postal officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Commerce student</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Office clerk</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>Photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Businessman</td>
<td>Railway worker</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Taxi Truck operator</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lawyer</td>
<td>Orderly in hospital</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Insurance agent</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Surgeon</td>
<td>Kitchen man</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Medical officer in New Guinea</td>
<td>Medical doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Dentist</td>
<td>Orderly in hospital</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Dental mechanic</td>
<td>Dentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Farmer</td>
<td>Railway worker</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Storeman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Michael Cigler, op cit., p.55.
Temporary employment in the above table followed immediately after the completion of the contract work. The duration of the temporary employment varied and depended on the individuals themselves. Factors like monetary reward, advantages of this type of employment, personal aims coupled with ambitions were often decisive about the duration of these temporary employments.

In the case of tradesmen and workers the transfer was easier, as these people generally found work according to their skills immediately after the completion of their contract. If they happened to have a period of temporary employment, it was just changing the place of employment within the same type of work.

More difficult was the employment of professional people. For the majority it was just a change from the environment of contract work to another type of unskilled work. For many of them, to reach the professional status they had held in their home country, meant a struggle of several years, even up to a decade. To demonstrate this I shall use three cases from the Table No.9.

Case No.3  A teacher

His temporary employment was a bus driver. His Czech B.A. qualification from the Prague Charles University was not recognised by the Victorian Education Department; he decided to study in Melbourne again. He was given two subjects as a credit, so instead of completing ten subjects he needed to study eight subjects for his Australian B.A. He began to study part-time while driving the bus. In 1959, when he had completed four subjects, he obtained employment as a temporary teacher under the condition that after completing his Melbourne B.A. he will also study a Diploma of Education irrespective that he had also a Diploma of Education from Czechoslovakia. After he had completed his B.A. and established a good teaching record, he applied to the Victorian Department of Education for recognition of his Czechoslovak teaching qualifications. This finally eventuated in 1964, and he was offered a permanent appointment. After this he
decided to obtain an Australian Diploma of Education in Melbourne.

It took him 14 years from the date of his arrival to work in the same type of employment that he had been trained for in Czechoslovakia.

Case No.6  
A physician

After completion of his contract he began to work as a first aid man on a dam project about 120 kilometres from Melbourne. For five years he tried to obtain registration in all Australian states, but was unsuccessful. He therefore began to study in Melbourne, and was allowed to enrol into the third year of the medical study course. After he passed the third year he joined the Australian Army Medical Corps to obtain an Army's scholarship for his medical studies. He completed his studies supported by the scholarship and after obtaining his medical degree from Melbourne University he served for several years in the Australian Army Medical Corps, reaching the rank of Major after five years of service in the Army.

It had taken him 12 years from the date of his arrival to work in the medical profession he had been trained for in Czechoslovakia.

Case No.7  
A dentist

A fully qualified medical doctor and dentist, who applied for registration as a dentist in Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia.10 Being unsuccessful, he stayed for another two years in the mental hospital, working as a ward attendant. He left the hospital and moved to Sydney, where he worked as a dental mechanic for three years.

10 To be a dentist in Czechoslovakia, a person had to complete a medical degree first, and complete a post-graduate course in dentistry, lasting two years.
Because of the great shortage of dentists in New South Wales in the 1950s, he was helped by his Sydney employer to obtain registration; he succeeded and opened a practice as a dental surgeon.

It had taken him nine years from the date of arrival to return to work as a dentist again.

These three cases show how difficult it was for professional people to regain their original professional status in the country of their settlement.

The following table shows how long it took for the rest of the sample of the Kew Mental Hospital employees to establish themselves in their final employment.

Table 4

Duration of time between the arrival and final employment  
(Based on the Table No. )  
N=14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in the sample</th>
<th>Time in years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of years of this sample is nine.

The above table indicates the turbulent years which were part of the re-establishment process of Czech-born immigrants in the 1950s and 1960s.
As indicated previously the process of settling in and the process of change among the Czech settlers consisted of three main stages:

1. Re-settlement
2. Re-establishment
3. Integration

In this section only the first and second stages are elaborated. Graphically depicted the following tables clearly indicate the processes involved in the particular stages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Process of Change in the 1948 Czech Group in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Re-settlement</td>
<td>2. Re-establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial employment</td>
<td>Contract employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of contract work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational needs - Formation of organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Europe</td>
<td>Newly formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift to residential suburbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of home, flat/farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs are selected according</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More to qualifications/interest satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom in selection and Completion of unfinished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Employment training and Retraining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More satisfactory social life: Formation of other organisations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with Australians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables affecting group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance of immigrants in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural organisational life of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ural host society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penetration Intermarriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in ethnic organisational activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last-integration stage - will be discussed in the latter part of this chapter.

The re-settlement period is regarded as the most stressful part of any settler's life beginning a life in a new country. The experiences and impressions made upon immigrants in this stage are regarded as an important factor in their integration process. Accommodation is considered as being a variable which may act positively or negatively on settler's affiliation and integration stage. The profound importance of congenial housing conditions of immigrants has been demonstrated by Handlin.\textsuperscript{11} He believes that the possibilities of integration are remote for those settlers who live in inferior dwellings. The first impressions and experiences are the most important as they influence and set pattern for further steps in integration.

Although this may be the case of some people, the results of my research, which will be discussed in the next section of this chapter, show that although the impact of primitive camp accommodation made an impression on them, it did not leave a permanent effect upon their outlook for the future of their life in Australia in those days. Closely connected with the early accommodation were other problems which played an important part.

The cruellest part of any Australian immigration schemes took place during the immigration of the Displaced Persons in the 1950s, when during the two year contract period families were forcibly separated. It happened when the breadwinner was sent to fulfil his bond obligations elsewhere, whilst his family were accommodated in a family camp.

The early re-establishment period was a great financial burden for married settlers with families. The cost of maintaining their families in so called family camps, paying for their accommodation and maintenance, was a drain on their income, considering that they had to pay for their own accommodation and keep in their places of employment.

The prospective emigrants were never told about this accommodation arrangement before leaving European refugee camps. They were also never told about the great shortage of family accommodation in those days in Australia. The reality of forced separation was revealed to them only after their arrival in immigration camps in Australia. To show the difficulties of such a situation the case of a Czech refugee M.V. indicates the difficulties encountered by married settlers in their initial stay in their places of employment and in family camps.

At Bonegilla Immigration Centre in Victoria, the employment officer sent me to Mildura with six other DP's to complete my contract as farm labourer on one of the out-lying farms. When I objected that I am an electrical engineer and that I had never worked on a farm, the employment officer indicated that I may even get a worse job, like clearing the scrub in the Tasmanian bush. I therefore accepted their offer and moved to a farm near Mildura, in western Victoria. I was given a pair of heavy boots, moleskin trousers, a coat, two shirts, singlets, underpants and socks. The most useful was a large hat which was popular amongst farmers in the 1940s.

When I learned that my wife and two children were to be sent to the Benalla camp in eastern Victoria, I felt distressed. I did not want to break up our family. I wanted them to be with me. The matter became worse when I found out the distance between Mildura and Benalla. In geographical terms the distance was like from one end of Czechoslovakia to the other. I began to worry how I was going to keep in touch with them.

Upon reaching my new employment I decided to visit my family every third week. But the first trip was a shock to me. It took me a whole night and nearly half a day to reach Benalla by train. It hurt me also financially as the return fare equalled a third of my weekly wage.

The Benalla camp where my wife and children lived consisted of Nissen huts and old wooden army barracks, and hanging blankets divided the bedroom from the sitting room: the mess, toilets, showers and laundry were communal. My accommo-
dation on the farm was similar - an old shearing shed with a dozen beds in a common dormitory. I never imagined that our first accommodation in Australia outside the Bonegilla camp will be so primitive. The visits used to upset me and I grew sick of the distance I had to travel just to spend several hours with my family.

I also began to worry about the life in the camps where my family was accommodated. As my wife could speak Czech only, and there were no other Czech families in 1949 in this camp, she could not talk to anyone but her children. Another point were the growing and fast circulating stories about the infidelity of spouses in these camps. These and other points made up my mind.

I mentioned my problems to my boss on the farm who flatly refused any possibility of giving me permission to leave. He answered that if I go, the others would like to go too. When I said that I am the only married man amongst the six employees, he left me standing and departed. I went to the local employment office in Mildura asking for a transfer either to Wangaratta or Melbourne. This was again flatly refused and I was told that should I decide to leave my job illegally, I would be in real trouble, even being sent back to Europe by the next ship. This did really upset me and I went for the first time to an Australian pub where I had a few glasses of beer to cheer me up. Next day, after receiving my pay, I packed my belongings and left the farm pretending I am going to see my family.

The farm I worked on was owned by an absentee farmer who visited the property once a month. The old overseer also did not live on the farm and the six workers were other DP's, mainly of Polish and Lithuanian nationality, all of them single. I therefore had no special feeling for my place of employment.

When I reached Benalla, I went to see the employment office asking for a transfer from Mildura to any place and any job near the camp where my family was. I was threatened with the same story like in Mildura and the dreaded word - deportation - was mentioned again. In the meantime the employment office rang
to the camp commandant and upon my arrival to my wife's barrack I was met by a camp policeman, who told me to leave within ten minutes, as I was not a visitor but a trespasser. This incident upset all my family and my approach to the camp commandant was also useless. He was a military man, like many of the people in charge of similar camps at that time. I left the camp for town and told my wife that I would be back by night time. I asked her to pack up all our belongings and told her we would be leaving the camp.

Under the cover of darkness we crossed 'illegally' the back fence of the camp's boundary and left in the middle of the night by taxi for an unknown destination in Melbourne.12

Upon reaching Melbourne M.V. took employment with an engineering firm and after several days he explained to the employer the circumstances which had led to his decision to settle in Melbourne. The firm arranged the transfer from Mildura and M.V. completed his contract with them.

The above story of a Czech immigrant is similar to stories of many other settlers, and these experiences are today only personal memoirs of many ex-Displaced Persons who had to make Australia their home.

The families, as indicated by the above case study, stayed in the 'family camps' till the breadwinners completed their contracts. These camps, twenty in number were strategically placed all over Australia:

- New South Wales: Cowra, Greta II, Kapooka, Parkes, Scheyville, Uranquinty
- Victoria: Benalla, Mildura, Rushworth, Somers, West Sale
- Queensland: Cairns, Enoggera, Stuart, Wacol
- South Australia: Mallala, Woodside
- Western Australia: Gundergin, Holden, Northam.13

12 Beryl and Michael Cigler, op cit., p.168.
13 This information was furnished by the research section of the Commonwealth Department of Immigration.
While the majority of Czech settlers passed positively through the re-settlement stage, there were some for whom Australia never became the promised land at that period of settlers life. These were mainly the professional people who even after their contracts were forced to perform manual and unskilled work.

Restrictions introduced in many immigrant seeking countries did not allow a person with certain professional qualifications, obtained outside of the country of settlement, to practise his profession. The only way for those individuals was either to study or to look for new opportunities elsewhere. In the case of further studies, financial and linguistic difficulties and advanced age rendered such a task impossible for some, who were pushed out of the professionally trained class of people.

As a result of their loss of status and the resulting loss of self-respect many settlers developed not only personal problems but also antagonistic feelings against the new country. Such persons, in their process of re-establishment, became embittered and this consequently led to a slow process of their integration into the host society. Some returned to Europe, some looked for other settlement opportunities elsewhere and ultimately the United States became the object of their last hope. In the letter to the editor of the Czech language paper in Melbourne, readers leaving Australia often stated their reasons for their departures. A letter from a physician stated:

To speak frankly my reason for leaving for the United States is rather simple. As a Czech doctor I have not the slightest chance here. I do not intend to die as a general hand in the factory, believe me. Many of my colleagues will follow my example I think, because such a problem does not exists in the United States.14

14 Hlas domova, 31 March 1951.
Similar departures lasted till 1955 and it was common to find a group of Czechs on any ship crossing via Pacific Ocean for the United States. On the passenger ship Orcades which left Australia in November 1954, there were 70 Czechs, mainly single men, who were leaving for San Francisco.15

It could be said that those who left for the United States were people who had found Australian life unacceptable and had decided to leave Australia and try the United States as a new place of settlement. Americans were more altruistic towards newcomers as so far professional qualifications were concerned; their qualifications were valued and often recognised. Similar statements in letters from America only encouraged the dissatisfied individuals leaving and looking for better opportunities across the Pacific Ocean.

The United States had imposed immigration quotas for every country as so far entry of immigrants is concerned since the early 1920s and the quota for Czechoslovakia was utilised, resulting in waiting period of up to three or four years from the time of application. This is why the majority of Czechs who intended to leave Australia departed in 1955.

Some who could not obtain a sponsor for immigration in the United States, often returned to Europe, mainly to Western Germany whose prosperity in the 1950s was beginning to improve.

Another important characteristic of the re-establishment period was the tendency to improve professional and other qualifications. There was a considerable number of university students among the 1948 intake, amounting to 406 people.16 These students had not finished their studies in Czechoslovakia and a great majority of them were expelled from the universities after the Communist take-over in 1948.

15 ibid., 20 January 1955.
16 The number of 406 people was revealed in the circular published by the Association of Ex-University Students which had centres in Melbourne and Sydney. They register all known students in Australia in 1953. All university students were registered in the European refugee camps after their arrival from Czechoslovakia. When they emigrated their names were sent to the students representative in a particular country of their settlement. The writer was a member of this association.
Some of the students began to study in Australia again, while still doing their contract work. Others began to study after finishing their contracts. By June 1955, seventeen Czech-born students were enrolled at the Melbourne University and six had already completed their studies. The others completed their studies after the completion of their contracts.

Other settlers with professional backgrounds, who were unable to study again, seemed to adjust their aspirations to a realistic level. When the Department of Health of Victoria introduced psychiatric nursing courses, some lawyers, ex-clerical employees, ex-professionals, ex-professional soldiers and even farmers used this opportunity for retraining while working in the hospital. So, nursing became their Australian profession.

Finally, the re-establishment period of the 1948 intake was characterised by a search for accommodation and a shift from inner suburbs or country towns to metropolitan residential suburbs. The long stay in family camps has been criticised as an influential factor which negatively affected their integration. The communal life supposedly deprived the individuals of the intimacy of the family circle and loosened their feeling and security stated the enquiry on immigrant children.17

The meaning of a home for immigrants has been given prominence by many authors during their research. Vernant clarified this point by saying "In the eyes of the immigrant a home is a symbol of permanent settlement. It is a root struck in the soil, the end of a makeshift life. It gives him psychological as well as physical stability, which is of the utmost importance to him, more than his employment".18


18 J. Vernant, op cit., p.464.
The question of employment was after the accommodation the second priority. The studies on refugees in the United States, like the work of Davie\textsuperscript{19} and Kent\textsuperscript{20} indicate that when those who were placed in occupations similar to those they pursued in the country of their origin, their personal satisfaction accelerated their integration markedly.

The length of the re-settlement and re-establishment periods varied from person to person. In each of these two periods needs for ethnic socialisation began to emerge and the longing to re-create a social life, similar to those in the ancestral country, began to emerge. It played an important part in Czech immigrants' life and will be discussed in the next section.


3.2 GROUP ATTITUDES

As indicated in the first chapter, a sample of interviewees was selected to ascertain how members of the community feel about certain aspects of their experiences as refugees, settlers in Australia, members of ethnic communities and their relationship with their countrymen. In this section therefore the 1948 intake sample will be analysed and their attitudes will be compared with the 1968 group in later chapters.

One basic thing which both groups had in common was that they regarded themselves as refugees who left their home country because of political upheavals. Both groups had their own reasons for departure. Some reasons for leaving Czechoslovakia in 1948 were as follows:

Table 6
Respondents' responses to: What was the main reason for your departure from Czechoslovakia?

N=103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal persecution</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Opposition to the regime</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Escaping military service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other reason</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the Table 6 indicates, the majority left for reasons of personal persecution, followed by those who opposed the regime and those who tried to avoid the military service.

After reaching the refugee camps they were not aware of any organisational help; this was stated by 90 (87%) out of 103. Also they did not know about emigration possibilities as indicated by 94 (91%) interviewees.
Among the Displaced Persons were members of certain nations which had sided with Germany during World War II, such as the Bulgarians, Croats, Hungarians and Slovenes. The first three countries declared war on the Allies and fought with Germany till 1945. Slovenia (which was a part of Yugoslavia) was divided into two sections; the southern section was annexed by Italy and the northern was incorporated by Germany under certain autonomous rule till the defeat of the Axis in 1945.

Some members of the Baltic nations, such as Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, served in special SS military units; similarly involved were some Ukrainians. Some Baltic and Ukrainian units were used as guards in concentration camps and Prisoner-of-War camps.21

21 This term (Displaced Person) was also an object of irritation even after their settlement in Australia and became a heated issue in Czech ethnic affairs in Brisbane, where the local Czechoslovak Association publicly announced in the papers their opposition in describing the Czechoslovak-born as Displaced Persons. When the representatives of the Immigration Department indicated that the Czechoslovak settlers should be pleased at getting free transport to Australia paid by the Australian taxpayers, the representatives of the Brisbane Association stated that:

1. The cost of transport of Displaced Persons was paid by the International Refugee Organisation.
2. Czechoslovaks were the only Displaced Persons who had paid for their passage to Australia indirectly in the form of their taxes in Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovak Government had contributed yearly from 1945 until 1949 to the upkeep of the International Refugee Organisation.
In the next question the reasons for selecting Australia as a place of settlement were asked for.

Table 7
Interviewees responses to: Which of these options made you decide to emigrate to Australia?

N = 103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Australia is a democratic country</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. English language is used in Australia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Australia has sunny weather</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Australia is far away from Europe</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Australia offered the shortest waiting time from emigration from Europe</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most popular was the option No.5, which was chosen by the overwhelming majority of the interviewees, followed by option No.4. This result coincides with a report published in 1950 which showed that out of the immigrant seeking and receiving countries, Australia had by 1950 taken more Czech refugees than any other country in the world.

Table 8

Czechoslovak Refugees re-settled by 1950

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentine</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4259</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Morocco</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>12281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pre-knowledge of Australia was another question considered as the following table indicates.

**Table 9**

**Interviewees' responses to: What was your knowledge about Australia before you arrived?**

\[ N = 103 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quite a lot</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. None</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those with a limited knowledge of Australia usually learnt about their selected country through 'hearsay' and were 'tortured' by thoughts of snakes, crocodiles, mosquitoes and sharks. Many ill-informed descriptions about immigrant receiving countries shortly after World War II were common. The interest to leave Europe was so great that immigration authorities of the countries concerned did not bother to circulate general information about the countries' conditions, flora, fauna and other aspects.

Australia invited similar exaggerated and ill-informed descriptions. The eccentric, but prolific, Czech-born writer, V.L. Borin, recalled in his autobiographical novel The Uprooted Survive, that the news that Australia would accept displaced persons 'electrified the minds of all the refugees in the camp'. But excitement dwindled into wonder as people asked: 'Where is it anyhow?' One character 'was almost sure that in Australia there must be some European buildings, because there are so many savage people...but also a few white people who went there from Europe to grow coconuts and dig for gold'. Another refugee, a Ukrainian, later confessed his alarm when, on board ship, he was shown typical
photographs of Australia - they were of Aborigines eating roast snake.

Knowledge of the English language was also considered. The interviewees were asked the following:

Table 10
Interviewees' responses to: When did you start to study the English Language?

N = 103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where exposed to the English language?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. After being accepted for immigration to Australia</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On the ship</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In Australia</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The educational level among the political emigres is usually higher than among economic immigrants. The educational level of the 1948 intake indicates the following standard:

Table 11
Interviewees' response to: Show the highest educational level you have completed

N = 103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tertiary qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Secondary qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basic qualifications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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An analysis of the data presented reveals that the majority had better than basic educational qualifications. In the Table 63 (61%) interviewees had better than basic educational qualifications and the Table shows that 63 (61.3%) persons began to study English after their acceptance for emigration to Australia.

The nationalistic feelings of the 1948 intake led to formation of numerous organisations and clubs reaching associations. When the interviewees were asked about the organisational belonging the following response was received.

Table 12

Interviewees' responses to: Czechoslovak organisational life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Did you belong to any Czechoslovak organisation between 1950-54? N=103
2. If yes - which of the organisations were useful to you? N=78
   Political
   National
   Sporting
   Gymnastic
   Cultural
   Religious
3. Did you belong to any organisation in 1960? N=103

The 78 people who patronised the Czechoslovak organisational life indicated that the most popular were national organisations frequented by 61 interviewees, cultural by 8, sporting by 7 and gymnastic by 2. Political and religious bodies have not
been indicated at all. By 1960 the associations' membership was greatly reduced and only 9 persons still had some organisational interest. The main answers for this display of lack of interest were indicated in the following table.

Table 13

Interviewees' responses to: Why did you not participate in the support of Czech organisations by 1960. Indicate only one answer out of the four, according to your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Not interested generally</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I live in Australia and the political issues do not interest me anymore</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have limited or no contact with my countrymen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To find their political affiliation the interviewees were asked to indicate their political party support pattern in the 1950s and the 1980s.
Table 14

Interviewees' responses to: Which political party did you vote for in your first Australian federal election?

N=103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Parties</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Australian Labour Party</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Liberal Party</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Democratic Labour Party</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows that the main political support was given to the Democratic Labour Party, followed by the Liberal Party, and finally by the Australian Labour Party. Some of the interviewees indicated that in spite of their support of the Democratic Labour Party on the federal level, they occasionally supported Liberals in state elections. The next table shows their support to the Australian political parties.
Table 15

Interviewees’ responses to: If the federal election were to be held in 1984 which political party would you support?

N=103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political parties</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Australian Democrats</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Australian Labour Party</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liberal Party</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Independent candidates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows changes in voting patterns which have occurred during the last thirty-five years. The Liberal Party was the most popular and supported party, followed by the Australian Democrats, while the Australian Labour Party was placed last. The last 2.9 per cent indicated that they would prefer independent candidates.

When the members of the sample were asked about their satisfaction as so far as their life in Australia is concerned, the question was divided to indicate positive and negative answers.

Table 16

Interviewees’ responses to: How satisfied were you in 1952 and how satisfied are you in the 1980s in Australia?

N=103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Were you satisfied with the choice of the country of your emigration during the contract period?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you satisfied now?</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Those who were not satisfied now felt that their reason for not being fully satisfied was because of the employment in Australia. Four in this category were ex-university students who now work in semi-skilled employment.

Table 16 was designed to find out how they feel about their status in Australia in the 1980s.

**Table 17**

*Interviewees' responses to: Would you return to live in Czechoslovakia?*

N=103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Never</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Temporarily</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Permanently</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 17 shows the majority of those interviewed, 84 out of 103 felt that they are Australians now and that they would never go back to live permanently in Czechoslovakia. The remaining 19 persons indicated that they would consider returning to Czechoslovakia as visitors, or live there temporarily. One of the interviewees stated:

It would be like being in another foreign country. The only link would be the tradition and language. Their way of life would be foreign to me.
An interesting aspect was revealed during interviewing when more than half of the respondents felt that after several weeks in Australia their culture was superior to that of Australians, as the following table indicates:

Table 18

Interviewees' responses to: Would you say that your national culture was superior to that of Australia's at the time of your arrival? If so, which aspects of the Australian way of life would you use to support your statement?

N=103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following aspects were mentioned in the second part of the above question:

1. Food and eating habits (24 respondees)
   - poor quality of bread
   - predominance of mutton
   - apples and tomatoes too hard
   - drinking of tea only
   - meal generally too simple and tasteless

2. Dress (11 respondees)
   - men wearing black shoes only
   - wearing of braces
   - striped suits for men only
   - men's shirts with hard collars
   - uniformity and simplicity of women's and men's dresses

3. Houses (12 respondees)
   - old fashioned
   - ineffective heating system
   - coin gas and shower systems
   - losing of heat through wall vents
   - timber houses in general
4. Institutional (9 respondees)
   . complicated currency
   . complicated measuring system
   . closing of hotels at 6 p.m.
   . sales restrictions in the evenings

5. Miscellaneous (5 respondees)
   . poor workmanship and working habits
   . poorly fitted dentures
   . lack of public toilets
   . lack of night life

The replies indicate that the area of food showed the highest frequency of replies. This may be due to the fact, that the food experience was really the first contact immigrants had with societal characteristics of Australia, and the differences between their ancestral type of food and Australia were therefore at that particular moment most noticeable.

The second choice is also interesting. Conventionally dress is characteristic of most people and immigrants coming to a new country normally endeavour to reduce to a minimum any differences in appearance and the dress would be the easiest method to achieve this result. Like in the case of food the dress was closely related to their first experiences in a new country.

The other choice appear in reduced frequencies and were less comprehensible than the food and dress. Also, a longer period of stay in the country of settlement was needed to understand these points.

The follow-up to Table 18 was the question "When did you change your opinion about the superiority of your culture?" All 61 interviewees disclosed that their attitude about the above had changed after a few years in Australia.

To find out how people live was another part of the interviewing as is indicated in the following table.
Table 19

Interviewees' responses to: In what type of accommodation did you live in 1960?

N=103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation possibilities</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Houses</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Flats</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rented accommodation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The year 1960 was used as by that year the majority had decided on the type of accommodation they were interested in. About a third of my interviewees already owned houses.

The table shows that 79 persons live in houses they own. A further breakdown indicates that 21 owned flats, while 3 lived in rented accommodation.

One of the questions asked further was how the 1948 group felt about their countrymen of the 1968 intake. The answers gave an insight into the relationship of these two groups from the viewpoint of the 1948 settlers.

Table 20

Interviewees' responses to: Do you think that the 1968 intake is different to your group of 1948? If yes, why?

N=103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do not know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following categories summarise the answers given by the 89 interviewees who felt that the 1968 Czechs are different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>MESSAGE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not trust them; many were active members of the Czechoslovak Communist Party</td>
<td>Communists</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They distance themselves from the democratic traditions of the pre-war Czechoslovak Republic</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the professionals are 'snobs'. They think that they are better educated than our group is</td>
<td>Snobbery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They received all possible help upon their arrival. If I knew how they will turn out I would not have helped them at all</td>
<td>Ingratitude</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their way of thinking is different from ours</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They talk about things I cannot understand. Often they use language which is hard to comprehend</td>
<td>Communicative distance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, attached to the above question was an enquiry about how many helped the refugees of the 1968 intake and how many would consider help again if a similar situation arose.
Table 21

Interviewees' responses to: Helping the 1968 and other possible refugees

N=103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
<td>Number Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Were you involved in helping the 1968 group members after their arrival in Australia?</td>
<td>81 78.6</td>
<td>22 21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If another situation would arise as in 1968, would you help the new-comers again?</td>
<td>69 66.9</td>
<td>34 33.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 shows that 12 respondents would not be involved in any further crises.
3.3 GROUP INSTITUTIONS

A very important part of the re-settlement and particularly of the re-establishment period, was the formation of organisational structures, among Czechs settlers in Australia.

In importance of organisational life in the immigrant receiving countries has been considered by many students of immigration settlement not only in recent times but even in the assimilationist era of the 1920s. Robert E. Park and Herbert A. Miller, who had a profound influence on generations of students of immigration clearly indicated their feelings and support about the importance of ethnic organisational life. They wrote:

If we wish to help the immigrant to get a grip on American life, to understand its conditions, and find his own role in it, we must seize on everything in his own life which will serve either to interpret the new or to hold him steady while he is getting adjusted. The language through which his compatriots can give him their garnered experience, the "societies" which make him feel "at home", the symbols of his own land, remind him of the moral standards under which he grew up. Common courtesy and kindness exact tolerance for these things, and common sense indicates that they are the foundation of the re-adjustment we seek.23

A grouping of people of the same ethnic origin in the lands of their settlement is as old as migration itself. Histories of different ethnic groups in immigrant organisational structures acted as force in maintenance of cultural heritage of each ethnic group. This was a common feature among the settlers in Australia during the last 200 years.

Immigrants who found many aspects of their life during the period of re-settlement and re-establishment, such as their employment and accommodation, far from satisfactory, compensated for their frustrations by searching for fulfilment in other areas.

Their limited knowledge of English, their desire to meet and mix with people of their own background, to exchange experiences and to learn about the new country from their own countrymen, created a need to bond together and to recreate in miniature a familiar society. When the 1948 intake became established in Melbourne and Sydney, the new settlers soon learned about the existence of Czechoslovak Clubs in both cities, which had been established in 1940.

The Melbourne based Czech paper Hlas domova24 reported in its first issue that several new arrivals tried to contact pre-war settlers, and, the article stated, that several of them attended a meeting of the Melbourne Czechoslovak Club in January 1950. The paper reported further that during the meeting an official mentioned that a report from the United States indicated that among immigrants from Displaced Persons categories, were many criminals. The Club's official continued saying the Australian authorities are aware of it and that any criminal activities among these newcomers would be dealt with.

This article caused an upheaval among the newly arrived settlers who felt that the statement about crime and new immigrants in America was directed at them. Further, the political orientation of this club indicated a close affinity with the Czechoslovak Communist Party's political philosophy. Some of the settlers who attended further meetings were given the cold shoulder and ceased all contacts with the Melbourne Club. Similarly the newly arrived settlers in Sydney also ceased their support for this club.

It was found later that the officials of the Melbourne Club had close contacts with the Czechoslovak Consulate in Melbourne and this may explain why all proposals by the newly arrived refugees were rejected. The anti-refugee attitude was deliberately encouraged by some Australian organisations, particularly by the Communist Party. They had political reasons for objecting to Displaced Persons. In their eyes anyone who had come out of a German refugee camp and preferred Australia to Russia or Poland (or any Communist country), must be a traitor or collaborator with Germans.25

25 James Jupp, op cit, p.18.
Because the first Displaced Persons who arrived in Australia were Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians, the epithet "Balt" came to be used for Displaced Persons. It was known that some Ukrainians, Hungarians, Croats and members of Baltic nations served with Germans during the World War II, the belief that all East Europeans, or all Displaced Persons were all fascist was easy to spread.

The Jewish community through its papers and organisations expressed concern about some of the former Nazis who were believed to be coming to Australia. The term 'criminals' mentioned during the meeting of the Czechoslovak Club in Melbourne may have been used due to the above allegations.26

Because of the cessation of all contacts with both Czechoslovak Clubs in Melbourne and Sydney, the need to develop new organisations was advocated in the Czech language paper Hlas domova, published fortnightly in Melbourne by a refugee from Czechoslovakia.27 As a result of this the first Czechoslovak organisations were formed in individual Australian states in 1950 and 1951.

Table 22
The first Czechoslovak associations formed in Australia in 1950 and 1951 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>Czechoslovak Club in South Australia (1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>Czechoslovak National Association (1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>Czechoslovak National Club (1951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Czechoslovak National Association (1951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Czechoslovak National Association (1951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Czechoslovak National Association (1951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>Czechoslovak Club (1951)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 James Jupp, op cit, p.19.
27 Hlas domova, 16 June 1950
28 The term Czechoslovak was and is still used for some organisations. The Slovak population in Australia was divided in two groups: one which was for co-operation with the Czechs in one state, the other advocating separatism and refusing co-operation with the Czechs (this group had a majority). Therefore, some organisations, predominantly Czech in membership numbers were also frequented by Slovaks.
Another feature of this organisational stage, a unique experience among the post-war ethnic groups, was the foundation of Czechoslovak political parties in Australia. Although other, already well established ethnic groups like the Chinese and Jews had their ancestral political parties in Australia, other newly arrived groups, mainly refugees, followed this pattern.

The uniqueness of the Czech organisational life was that they established some political parties which had ceased their existence in Czechoslovakia in 1939 and which were not renewed after World War II in 1945. These parties, founded on conservative political doctrines, were banned after the war by the pressure of the left wing oriented government which was installed by the Soviets when their armies gradually occupied the east provinces of Czechoslovakia. The other parties were organisations which had existed in Czechoslovakia since 1945 till 1948.

The tendency to create political parties in Australia was transplanted from the refugee camps in Europe through the ex-functionaries of the various political parties who had emigrated to the U.S.A. The purpose of these parties was to keep people with the same political ideas together, as in the early 1950s there was a strong belief that all refugees would soon return home, to a free Czechoslovakia. The political leaders regarded the stay of refugees in Australia as a temporary stage. Most believed the Korean War was the beginning of the defeat of Communism.

When the mass emigration of Czech refugees from Europe began in 1949 and 1950, all Czechoslovak parties had a well developed organisational network, and as soon as a group of members settled in a new country, contact was made with the European headquarters in exile. These contacts were quickly established by those Czechs who had emigrated to Australia, following the initial contacts made in refugee camps in Western Germany and Austria. When newcomers entered the Commonwealth Immigration Centres in Australia, they were informed by their fellow-countrymen about political contacts in all Australian cities.

The National Socialist Party was the first political organisation which established branches in all capital cities as
early as in 1950. The National Socialist Party was the second largest political party (after the Communist Party) in Czechoslovakia, followed by the Populist Party and finally by the Social Democrats. The Populist Party established no branches in Australia and the Social Democrats established themselves later in 1953. The Populist Party was formed only after World War II and its members were mainly people belonging to the pre-war conservative parties.

The other political groups which were formed in Australia represented political parties which had existed in Czechoslovakia before the war but which were not permitted to renew their activities after 1945, according to the Kosice Program of 1945, and began to flourish again in exile. They were mainly right-wing parties such as the Republican Party, the National Democratic Party and the Businessmen's Party.

The table below shows all political parties which were established in Australia by the 1948 Czech refugees.

29 The name of the National Socialist Party may need explanation. This party had no connections with the notorious 'Nazional Sozialistische Arbeiter Partei' of Hitler's Germany in the 1930s and 1940s. The Czech political party was formed at the beginning of this century. It was a democratic party encouraging free enterprise but advancing a social program which was based on the rights of working people.
Table 23
Czech political parties established in
Australia between 1950-1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PARTY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Socialist Party</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Socialist Party</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Socialist Party</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Socialist Party</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Socialist Party</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>1951-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Socialist Party</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Socialist Party</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Democratic Party</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Democratic Party</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Democratic Party</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen's Party</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen's Party</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen's Party</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen's Party</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Separatist Party</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1950-1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Separatist Party</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1950-1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Separatist Party</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1950-1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1953-1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1953-1954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These organisations were supported mainly by Czechs. The Slovaks had a choice of joining the organisations established by Czechs and Slovaks who believed in the unity of two nations in the independent Czechoslovak state, or the organisations which had been associated with the political philosophy of the Tiso regime (this regime had been backed by Germans during World War II and followed the policy of separatism from the Czechs). The Slovak Populist Party (a pre-war party) was the representative body of Slovak separatism.

The political organisations formed by Czechs in Australia had all gone out of existence by 1954.

Although political parties were accepted enthusiastically by the newcomers, the national organisations proved to be more practical and useful for the Czech communal life. By national organisation is meant the body which included people of all political beliefs. As the table indicates, they also had longer than the political parties.
National Organisations

The political organisations, the first to be established in Australia, were soon found to be of limited value to the majority of settlers. They needed organisational bodies which could represent the Czech communities in contact with official bodies of the host society such as the Immigration Department and Good Neighbour Council, a very influential organisation in the 1950s, and so to keep the national and ethnic life alive. While the political parties were divisive and fractional units, the need for common body was called for.

Due to this the years 1950-51 witnessed the formation of national organisations in every state. The founders of these organisations were usually people who had been involved in political activities before coming to Australia. They functions as delegates of their political parties and were appointed to act on behalf of these groups in the formation of national organisations. Therefore the main function of the national organisations was to be the central body of all ethnic activities, representing the ethnic sections for "outside" contacts with such bodies like before mentioned, the Department of Immigration and others. Economic immigrants were often backed by their diplomatic missions when needs arose; in cases of refugees, no Communist consulate would care about representations of their "ex-nationals". The table below indicates the distribution of national organisations in Australia.

Table 24
Czechoslovak National Organisations established in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of People of Good Will</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>1953-1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak Club in South Australia</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1951-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Czechoslovaks in S.A.</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1964-1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak National Association</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1950-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of Democratic Czechoslovaks</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1952-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak National Organisation</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>1950-1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak National Club</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>1951-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak National Association</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1951-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak National Association</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>1951-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak Club</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>1951-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These organisations are still in existence in 1985.
Experience had shown that while the national organisations may bring Czechs together for some special occasions, they still were too formal to cater for relaxed gatherings and social life. The need for such structures led to the establishment of further associations each as social, gymnastic, sporting and religious.

Social Organisations

Some groups were formed around special interests. These were, for example, professional groups, hobby groups, youth organisations and student bodies. Other grew out of shared experiences, such as the "Association of ex-political prisoners" founded in Melbourne and Sydney in 1954-55 after the West German Government decided to compensate persons who had been imprisoned during the German occupation of Czechoslovakia. Some were formed as the result of changes in the Australian attitude towards immigrants, as for instance the attitude towards the Allied Ex-Servicemen who served under British Command during World War II. The decisions to give these ex-soldiers some repatriation rights and the invitation to join the Australian Returned Soldiers League led to the formation of the "Association of Czechoslovak Ex-Servicemen" as late as 1966.
## Table 25
Czech Social Organisations Established in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak Club</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1940–1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Fund of the Alliance of Czechoslovak Democratic Organisations in Australia and New Zealand</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1953–1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Ex-Political Prisoners</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1954–1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Ex-Political Prisoners</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1954–1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee for the Erection of Czechoslovak House</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1960–1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Czechoslovak Ex-Servicemen</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1966–*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Graduates in Commerce</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1950–1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of University Students in Exile</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1951–1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak Scouts</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1953–1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak Circle</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1962–1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Czechoslovak Ex-Servicemen</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1966–*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak Settlers' Association</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1953–1954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Still in existence in 1986.

The complete list of these organisations is a result of detailed research of all Czech language publications, which regularly carried announcements of the establishment of individual organisations. The leaders of the ethnic groups were consulted and a contact with some active members was established to obtain deeper insight into the organisational life of these bodies. In some cases the association's minutes were consulted.

### Gymnastic Associations

The representative body of this Czech national tradition is the Sokol Gymnastic Association. The origin of Sokol goes back to the first half of the nineteenth century when Tyrs and Fugner, university teachers in Prague, argued that survival of the nation was only possible if it was physically, morally and spiritually fit. Both concluded that this could be achieved by physical and spiritual
education, and in 1862 they founded a physical culture society called Sokol, which means "falcon" in English. In a short time Sokol was a nation-wide movement of Czechs in the nineteenth century. The first group abroad was founded in St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A. in 1865. Sokol spread to other countries in Europe but all efforts to establish a central Sokol organisation were negated by the Hapsburg government which at that time ruled the Czech lands.\(^{30}\)

When World War I started, the Czechs were part of the Austrian Empire and therefore incorporated into the Austrian Army. Sokol undertook the task of organising a fighting army among Czech and Slovak conscripts who had deserted from the Austrian army and were in the Allied Prisoner-Of-War camps. Special legions were formed which from 1915 joined the Allied Forces in France, Russia and Italy.\(^{31}\)

Following the end of World War I, the Communists threatened Europe with strikes and demonstrations. In the newly formed democratic Czechoslovak state the Communists called a general strike in 1919; the Sokols restored and maintained order. When the Hungarian Communist Bela Kun invaded Czechoslovakia with his troops in 1919, Sokol formed "Sokol Freedom Guards" and drove the Bolsheviks out of the country. Between the two World Wars Sokol membership was about one million. After the German occupation in Czechoslovakia in 1939, the Nazis disbanded Sokol, but the groups existing outside of occupied Czechoslovakia survived. The loses in the ranks of Sokol during the World War II were enormous in occupied Czechoslovakia. After the war membership rose to over one million. When the Communists took power in Czechoslovakia in 1948, they disbanded Sokol in the same manner as the Nazis had done, and great numbers of Sokol members left Czechoslovakia and settled in practically every corner of the free world. Today, Sokol is organised as "Czechoslovak Sokol Abroad" in five regions - Australian Sokol, Sokol Gymnastic Association of Canada, South American Sokol, Vienna (Austria) Sokol and Western Europe Sokol.\(^{32}\)

\(^{30}\) 

\(^{31}\) 
Miroslav Brouček, op cit, p.78.

\(^{32}\) 
Sokolský Věstník, June 1970.
Sokol, originally a middle class gymnastic association during the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, became a national movement shortly before World War I and during the period between the World Wars. The independence of Czechs and Slovaks and the notion of democracy were the main aspects of this most popular Czechoslovak organisation.

The American Sokol is still an independent organisation enjoying fraternal relations with the Czechoslovak Sokol abroad. In Australia, Sokol is represented by only three groups: in Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne. The Sydney Sokol is the most successful Czech ethnic organisation in the 1980s, attracting people of all ages, offering a great range of activities for young people, Australian-born included, concentrating on gymnastic activities, swimming and boating in summer, and mountaineering and skiing in winter. The Melbourne Sokol, although not as successful as the Sydney association, owns a 'Sokol House' in North Melbourne, and besides gymnastic activities, the group is supportive in encouraging social festivities and the care of ageing Czech population. The Brisbane branch functions mainly as a social club.

Another gymnastic association, Orel, which had followers among the members of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia, began in Sydney, but never reached the popularity of Sokol, which was and is a non-denominational organisation.

Table 26
Czech Gymnastic Associations established in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sokol Gymnastic Association</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>1951-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokol Gymnastic Association</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1950-1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokol Gymnastic Association</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1953-1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokol Gymnastic Association</td>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>1950-1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokol Gymnastic Association</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1951- *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokol Gymnastic Association</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>1950-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokol Gymnastic Association</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1950- *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orel Gymnastic Association</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1953-1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokol Gymnastic Association</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>1965-1980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Still in existence in 1986.
Sporting Associations

Another feature of the re-settlement period was the emergence of groups of young people who began to form sporting clubs. These associations fulfilled different needs from those served by the political parties, which were mainly frequented by older people. The formation of sporting associations, usually soccer clubs, reached a peak in 1950. Among the Czech settlers were many people who felt the need to share recreational outlets with their fellow-countrymen. This movement was spontaneous all over Australia and led to the foundation of several sporting bodies.

None of these clubs exist today and the table illustrates that all are an important phase in the history of Czech settlement in Australia.

Table 27

Sporting associations and clubs established in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Club Bohemians</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1950-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Club Slavia Post Melbourne</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1950-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Club Bohemians</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>1950-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Club Prague</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1950-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey Club Slavonic Bombers</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1951-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Club Bohemia</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1955-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Sokol</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1966-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak Volleyball Club</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1951-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak Riding Society</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1954-55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cultural Associations

The limited memberships were recorded in the cultural bodies. Some of these enjoyed only a brief life, others lasted for more than twenty years. They represented five types of interest - music, theatre, literature, marionettes and Czech language schools.
Organisations representing highly specialised interests did not last long, soon disappearing because of lack of support and membership. Such was the case with the puppet theatre in Melbourne and the literary club in Sydney. Some theatres using the Czech language met a similar fate. Here an interesting situation arose. There were some professional actors among the 1948 refugees; two of them had been members of the dramatic section of the National Theatre of Prague. Working with a group of amateurs, these two professionals started a theatrical company to stage productions of established plays such as those of Karel Capek, one of the most famous Czech playwrights. Their enthusiasm was not matched by the Czech-speaking public. Their repertoire appealed only to a limited audience with special tastes. The patrons of these theatrical activities were people who liked a more sophisticated type of entertainment, but because of their educational background they were soon speaking English well enough to find this in the Australian cultural scene.

The other theatrical associations which are still in existence after nearly thirty years are made up of amateurs. The plays are nostalgic in character, scenes from the old country, village and Czech history. For some years the associations in Adelaide and Melbourne were well patronised by supporters who could not enjoy English language entertainment and elderly people whose command of English was limited. There used to be two or three performances per year in Melbourne, but gradually enthusiasm has weakened and, in spite of the increase in numbers of Czech-born immigrants in Melbourne, only one performance is now given per year. The attendance figures have decreased gradually from year to year. Several Czech language schools were established in Australia, mainly in Perth and Melbourne; these will be discussed in detail in the next section.
The table below shows the locations of cultural organisations.

Table 28
Czech cultural organisation in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Association</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech language school</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>1953-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech language school</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1952-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Theatre</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1953-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club K.H.Borovsky</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1954-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech language school</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1952-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Theatre</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1954-*33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Marionettes</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1956-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club of Friends of Czech Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Theatre</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1953-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous Scene Theatre</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious Organisations

Religious activity is more pronounced and important among Slovaks than Czechs. Both groups are predominantly Catholic, but in spite of this, there is a noticeable difference in their religious attitudes in both their home countries and the land of adoption. For instance, the 'leakage' among the members of the Catholic Church following emigration is greater among Czechs than Slovaks. This happened also among Czech settlers in America in the nineteenth century. The principal cause of this alienation lay deep in Bohemia's history, and although Protestantism had been practically stamped out during two centuries of Austrian oppression, it burst forth again as part of the reviving national consciousness of the Czech-American.34

33 * This organisation was still in existence in 1985 when this research was conducted.

Among the refugees of the 1948 exodus were a number of Catholic priests, and the ethnic communities in Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide, have had since the early 1950s priests to co-ordinate religious life. The Czech Protestants were worse off than the Catholics. As there were hardly any Protestant ministers among the refugees, the initiative was taken by a Protestant lay preacher from Melbourne; he was a refugee of the 1948 intake. He formed the Hus Congregation, which incorporated the members of the Evangelical Church, Czech Brethren Church, and Czech Lutheran Church. This congregation lasted only a short time and many of its members joined local Australian churches of similar faith. The members of the Czechoslovak Church (Československá Cirkev) were incorporated into the Church of England, Czech Brethren (Českobratrská Cirkev Evangelická) became a part of the Presbyterian Church, Czech Methodists (Jednota Bratřská) associated themselves with the Methodist Church, and the Czech Baptists joined the Baptist Church of Victoria. Approximately 20 per cent of Czechoslovak immigrants described themselves as Protestants. The move in Melbourne influenced members of the Protestant faith in other states who used the Melbourne "model" for their religious incorporation into the mainstream of Australian Protestant churches.

Christian Academy and the League of St. Cyril and Methodus, were connected with the central headquarters of the Christian Academy in Rome, and their main purpose was to propagate Catholic faith among the members of the Roman Catholic Church. The two Czech Catholic organisations never attracted a large membership; they were only products of the local efforts of a few dedicated and interested workers.

The table below shows the distribution of religious organisations in Australia.

Table 29

Czech religious associations in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Association</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>League of St.Cyril and Methodus</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1951-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of St.Cyril and Methodus</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1951-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Academy</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1951-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Hus Congregation</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1951-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of St.Cyril and Methodus</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>1951-54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only surviving signs of religious activity among the Czechs in Australia in the 1980s are two Catholic congregations, one in Melbourne and the other in Sydney. Both, are patronised by a small group of people who prefer to attend the services conducted in the Czech language rather in English.

Global Organisational Connections

All mentioned organisations played an important part in Czech ethnic life in Australia. Their existence often depended on the experience and enthusiasm of the leadership. Since 1952, when the Council of Free Czechoslovakia was established in Washington, D.C., U.S.A., this body represented the Czech exile: it was some kind of 'Government in Exile'. By 1954 a decision was made to include all exile organisations under the leadership of this organisation. For better organisational control and expediency, central committees in all countries where exiles lived were formed, and these bodies acted as a structure between the numerous organisations in a particular country and the Council in Washington.

This decision was responsible for the formation of the Central Committee of Czechoslovak Associations in Australia and New Zealand in Melbourne in 1954. This body played an important part in the organisational life of Czechs and will be discussed in the next section.
The Council of Free Czechoslovakia was the second 'Government in Exile' in a span of the 15 years, the first was instituted in London, U.K., in 1939.

When the Germans occupied the regions of Bohemia and Moravia in 1939, and created the independent state of Slovakia, many Czechs and Slovaks left their countries after 1939, escaping to neighbouring countries like Poland and Rumania, and from there were transported to France and England. The Government was formed in 1939 and the first act this body instituted was to create the Czechoslovak Army in Britain.

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia, which was formed in 1952 was created in expectation, that should some political misunderstanding lead to a conflict (as it was expected during 'cold war' years) between the West and East, Czechs will have a body which could speak on their behalf.
3.4 THE FAILURE OF THE 1948 WAVE TO ESTABLISH A VIABLE COMMUNITY TO AUSTRALIA

In the previous section the formation and purpose of Czech organisations in Australia were discussed. While the social, gymnastic, sporting and religious organisation kept politics out of their activities, one thing which all Czech organisations had in common at least in the 1950 and early 1960s was opposition to Communism. To fight the infiltration to communist ideology in Australia therefore became a very important part of Czech political life. In this anti-communist attitude the Czechs were not alone. Other immigrant groups, such as the Albanians, Bulgarians, Estonians, Hungarians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Romanians, Russians, Ukrainians and Yugoslava also had reasons for hating the regime which had forced them to become refugees.

Czechs came from Central Europe where political issues were always important. In Czech history the victory or defeat of political movements has meant occupation, death or exile for thousands. This interest in politics was one of the main reasons why there were so many Czech political parties formed in Australia after their arrival in 1949 and 1950.

The Czech political parties which were formed in Australia were mainly concerned with activities centred around ethnic life and demonstrations of their anti-communist stand. Although all these political parties were concerned with the ethnic affairs, only one party, the Social Democrats made an approach to an Australian political party. This happened when the Australian Labour Party introduced so-called New Australian Committees in 1952. These committees were initiated to contain non-British immigrants who showed an interest in joining the Australian Labour Party. Two members of the Czech Social Democratic Party decided to join a suburban branch of the Australian Labour Party. After attending the first branch meeting they were told by the secretary that they should join the New-Australian Committee, which would be more an appropriate section of this political party for them.

When this incident was reported to the committee of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party, the committee decided to lodge
a protest to the Australian Labour Party, indicating its disapproval with the formation of the New Australian Committee. In the letter the President of the Czechoslovak Democratic Party in Australia stated that this attitude was common in the southern states of the United States, where there existed special political branches for Negroes, to keep blacks separated from whites. Further, this separatist attitude of the Australian Labour Party was regarded as being racist, opposing the ideals of the Socialist Internationale. The Czechs asked to be accepted and regarded as equal members in any branch of the Australian Labour Party.\textsuperscript{36} When no official answer was received they withdrew all official contacts with the Australian Labour Party, disregarding the fact that the so-called New-Australian Committee of the Australian Labour Party had Italian, Greek, Yugoslav, Latvian, German, Polish, Ukrainian, Dutch and Portuguese members.\textsuperscript{37}

Further, in 1954 when the split in the Australian Labour Party began to appear and led to the formation of a break-away political party, the Democratic Labour Party, Czech social democrats in Melbourne sent a written statement to each Australian Labour Party federal and state parliamentarian indicating and documenting that the socialist left wing in the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party in Czechoslovakia had played a destructive role in collaborating with the Communists, so preparing the proper political climate for the Communist take-over in 1948. They warned the Australian parliamentarians that a similar climate seemed to be emerging within the Australian Labour Party and the only way to survive as a democratic socialist party was to form a new political party, free of the leftish element. This therefore was the political argument which the Czech contributed to the split of the Australian Labour Party in 1954.

\textsuperscript{36} This information was given to the writer by Mr. J.Z. who was the President of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party in Australia.

\textsuperscript{37} James Jupp, \textit{op cit}, p.83.
The new Democratic Labour Party had followers among the Czechs, possibly more than any political party. Altogether, 55.1 percent of my sample indicated that they voted Democratic Labour Party in federal and state elections. By 1954-55 when the post-war immigrants had obtained Australian citizenship and were able to vote in federal and state elections the Minister for Immigration, Harold Holt, realising the new emerging power, stated in June 1954 that

In the three years' time New Australians, with their hostility to Communism and distaste for socialism, based on their own experiences, will have a much more significant influence on the result of elections. 38

The Democratic Labour Party, realising its popularity among central and eastern European, was the only political party which advertised regularly to the Czech language paper Hlas domova. The Czechs' support of this party was because of its anti-communist policy; Catholicism had nothing to do with their support. The Democratic Labour Party had many followers among the Latvians and Estonians, whose religious faith was Lutheran. The Victorian Democratic Labour Party had a Latvian President and Latvian and Estonian representatives on the executive committee. The representatives of the Democratic Labour Party were the only political exponents of any party who frequently visited Czech communities meetings and also had Czechs on two state committees in Victoria and Queensland. But the main thrust of the Czech political and to a larger extent of the national organisations was in the area of combating communism, when suitable and promising occasions appeared.

An interesting fact which emerged is that there was some coincidence between the happenings in Czechoslovakia and the anti-Communist activities in Australia. The first opportunity occurred in 1951, when Czechoslovakia introduced forced labour for anti-Communist sympathisers, harsh sentences on anti-Communists and trying to gain hard western currency. At the same time the Korean War began.

38 Harold Holt, op cit, p.
The year 1951 is regarded as the cruellest year of communist rule in Czechoslovakia. Attitudes towards non-communists were worse than many refugees living previously in Czechoslovakia could remember. Long sentences and executions of non-communist activities of the pre-1948 Czechoslovakia hardened the anti-communist attitude against the Government in Czechoslovakia.

When the Korean War began, Australia did not have compulsory military service and the Australian Army called for volunteers, to fulfil the promised quota of men in this conflict. Among the volunteers were over forty Czechs; some were rejected on medical grounds and the others after interviews and screening. Those who passed the medical examination and were refused by the selection committees, lodged complaints with the appropriate public authorities. Protests were expressed at public meetings and through newspapers.

The group in Brisbane became the centre for this protest. The Brisbane Telegraph published an article which stated that

A security measure which stops any person who has been behind the Iron Curtain from joining the armed services has been applied.\(^\text{39}\)

Several unsuccessful recruits petitioned the Minister of the Army for reconsideration of their cases. The Minister replied that

The rejection of their application is no reflection on their status and character and that his department is dealing with a large number of people from a variety of countries to whom his department has insufficient information and no satisfactory means of providing information.\(^\text{40}\)

\(^{39}\) Brisbane Telegraph, 22 December 1951.

\(^{40}\) Hlas domova, 4 July 1951.
Several letters were exchanged between a spokesman of the Catholic Migration Centre, J. Murphy, who fully supported the immigrant group, and the Minister for the Army, Joseph Francis. Copies of these letters were given to the President of the Czechoslovak Association in Brisbane and parts of these letters were published in Hlas domova.41

These letters were used by the communist newspaper The Guardian which published a leading article under a heading 'War on Czechoslovakia'. Some time after publication of this article an editorial in Hlas domova stated that The Guardian had used the opportunity to launch an attack on Minister Joseph Francis in order to make him out to be a fierce warmonger.42 The Hlas domova article argued that in fact Minister Francis had flatly refused the offer of the Czech settlers to join the Australian Army, but that The Guardian had still accused Minister Francis of being a warmonger.43

Like many other issues the situation which arose about the Armed Forces enlistments caused a great deal of discussion. Articles were published in the ethnic press, and newspapers received letters indicating how readers felt about the whole issue. Finally, only one Czech-born was accepted for the service in Korea. He was an ex-soldier who during World War II had served in the Czechoslovak Army in Britain.44 The increase in persecution of non-Communists in Czechoslovakia in 1952 led also to an increase of anti-Communist activities against the representatives of the Czechoslovak regime in Australia.

41 The letters were: From Joseph Murphy to Joseph Francis (August 1951); from Joseph Francis to Joseph Murphy (October 1951); from Joseph Murphy to Joseph Francis (November 1951).

42 The Guardian, 17 April 1952.

43 Hlas domova, 12 May 1951.

44 The matter was also reported in other emigre papers (Polish, Latvian) and Hlas domova had received many letters in which the readers were voicing their feelings about The Guardian.
After the last war, Czechoslovakia was represented in
Australia by two consular officers, one in Melbourne and the other in
Sydney. The Melbourne Consulate was represented by the Honorary
Consul for Czechoslovakia, E. Peacock, while the Sydney Office was
occupied by an official from Prague, K. Franz, who was Consul-
General.

The newly arrived Czechs had little contact with either of
these representatives, and the only contact the consular offices had
with Czechs were people who had settled in Australia before the war,
or the Jewish anti-Fascists, including Communists, who arrived during
the war. The Melbourne Consul tried to make contacts with the newly
arrived immigrants who completely ignored the Consul and his office.
When the Melbourne newspaper The Herald\(^{45}\) published a statement by E.
Peacock that immigrants from Czechoslovakia would attend a reception
organised by the Consulate, Hlas domova\(^{46}\) answered, stating:

Mr. Peacock has no right to speak for
those Czechs in Australia who have
escaped abroad from the very government
Mr. Peacock still represents. If
political changes in Czechoslovakia make
no difference to Mr. Peacock, they do to
all of us. Mr. Peacock should know that
we are represented by the Department of
Immigration, not him.

The argument about the Melbourne Consul continued and
letters from all over Australia were sent to Czech papers in
Melbourne and to the local Australian newspapers. The Herald became
especially interested in the argument between the Czechoslovak
Consulate in Melbourne and the local Czech community. In the last
article The Herald\(^{47}\) reported that:

\(^{45}\) The Herald, 31 January 1953.
\(^{46}\) Hlas domova, 8 February 1951.
\(^{47}\) The Herald, 16 February 1953.
Mr. Peacock, Honorary Consul for Czechoslovakia, said today that he had never seen the Melbourne based Czech language newspaper which refuted his right to speak here for Czech immigrants. The paper is Hlas domova (the Voice of Home) which had said that Czechs here are represented by the Immigration Department, not by him. Mr. Peacock has been Consul for Czechoslovakia since 1972 and says he has carried out his duties to Czechoslovak citizens, regardless of their politics or changes of Government in Prague - the personal attack on me in Hlas domova seems to have been inspired by people with a grudge. My office is non-political and co-operates with the Immigration Department.

After a further spate of letters, Hlas domova answered on behalf of Melbourne's Czechoslovak organisations accusing E. Peacock of being a tool of the Communist government. This was the last article which appeared about this affair in Melbourne newspapers. The evidence which was revealed after 1968, when the Sydney-based Czechoslovak Consul, J. Franz, asked for asylum in Australia, the Czechoslovak government lost faith in their Honorary Consul, E. Peacock. The government was just waiting for an occasion to find a reason to close the Melbourne Consulate. The closure took place early in 1954. The ex-Consul Franz stated that the Czechoslovak Consulate-General in Sydney decided to close the Consulate because of the setbacks received in Melbourne.

The year 1954 was the most momentous in the Czech fight against Communist ideology in Australia. In Prague the Communist government had introduced spy trials, sentencing so-called "capitalist traitors" to death and to long jail sentences. The Czech language press in Australia was presenting the latest developments of the trials when suddenly the world learnt about the defection of Vladimir Petrov, the temporary M.V.D. (now K.G.B.) officer in Canberra.

48 Hlas domova, 23 February 1953.

49 This was stated by the Consul during the interview given by the Consul to Sydney journalists in September 1968, after he asked for political asylum in Australia.
The reaction of the emigre press in Australia was jubilant. They knew that a man in Petrov's position was not only responsible for espionage but also for the running of the whole embassy. Petrov gave the Australian Commonwealth Investigation Service a great deal of material including the names of persons involved in Soviet activities in Australia.

When it became known that the wife of the defector Petrov was being forced to return to the U.S.S.R. and that she would be leaving from Mascot Airport in Sydney, the Czechoslovak National Association, with the help of other refugee groups, organised a demonstration at Mascot Airport on April 19, 1954. The participants in this demonstration not only showed sympathy for Mrs. Petrov but used the demonstration to expose the strong anti-Communist feelings of most Czech immigrants in Australia. It became an occasion where they could air their feelings in the name of the national case. They carried placards which read 'We want free elections in Czechoslovakia' and 'We want the release of all political prisoners in Czechoslovakia'.

Mrs. Petrov was forcibly put aboard the aircraft accompanied by the Soviet security men. By the time the aircraft reached Darwin she was freed by the help of the Northern Territory Police and the Australian Security and returned to an unknown destination in Victoria to her husband.

The outcome of Petrov's defection was the Royal Commission on Espionage which opened its hearings on 27 May 1954 in Canberra. The purpose of this Commission was not to pass judgment on the ideology of Communism, but to investigate any threats to Australia's security. During the proceedings of the Royal Commission it was alleged that Soviet agents had infiltrated immigrant communities and organisations. Petrov told the Royal Commission that one of his duties was to keep in touch and direct the activities of immigrant spies. It was stated that meetings of the subversives had taken place from time to time and that some groups of immigrants were involved more than others.

50 Hlas domova, 7 May 1954.
51 Ibid, 12 July 1954. (The Royal Commission's Report does not name the individual immigrant groups).
The affair became a great issue in both the Australian and ethnic newspapers. When Mr. Windeyer, Q.C., the Counsel assisting the Royal Commission investigating the Soviet espionage, announced that many people would be scrutinised during the Commission’s hearing\(^{52}\), none of the Czech communities expected that one of their countrymen would be involved in this affair.

It was known among the immigrants that Czechoslovak Communist intelligence agents were operating in Australia in the 1950s. When the Czechoslovak Government introduced general amnesty in 1951 and 1955 for all emigres who were willing to return to Czechoslovakia, certain Czechs in all Australian capital cities began to urge their countrymen to return to Czechoslovakia. These Czech also directed them to Czechoslovak Consulates in Melbourne and Sydney for further information.\(^{53}\)

One of the witnesses who appeared before the Royal Commission was a Czech immigrant, Vincent Divisek, whose story, according to the President of the Commission, was 'very surprising and romantically interesting'.\(^{54}\)

The Czech immigrant revealed to the Commission how he was recruited in Czechoslovakia for intelligence work in Australia. Upon his arrival in Sydney, Divisek contacted the Australian intelligence officers and revealed his mission; finally, he was permitted to settle in Australia. His role was considered by the Commission and he was given a clean bill in regards to his political reliability and credibility.

The hearing of the Royal Commission lasted for several months and the Commission found enough evidence to recommend course proceedings against many of the witnesses appearing before the Commission.

The aspect of both amnesties will be discussed in the next chapter.

---

52 Argus, 1 July 1954.
53 Hlas domova, 1 November 1954 (Hlas domova was represented during all sessions of the hearing by a special reporter).
The Petrov affair had hardly died down when a new wave of resistance appeared in Czech communities in Australia. The readers of Czech newspapers to Australia learned about the persecution of Catholic religious orders. At the same time it was announced that a well known Protestant theologian, Josef Hromadka would visit Australia.

The Australian branch of the World Council of Churches had invited the Professor of Theology at Prague's Charles University, Josef Hromadka, to visit Australia in 1954. The purpose of his visit was to lecture on issues of religion in contemporary society. Prior to 1948 Hromadka had been a well known theologian who after the communist take-over began to change his political outlook and during religious congresses and meetings, where he represented Czechoslovakia, his constant partner was the 'Red Dean' of Canterbury, Hewlett Johnson, who was a great admirer of the soviet type of communism and fully supported the political status quo in central and eastern Europe.55

Hromadka's arrival was well publicised in the Czech newspaper. Many settlers became very hostile when they learned that Professor Hromadka planned to visit Australia and to lecture to the Australian public on how the religious life prospered under the Soviet rule of Central and Eastern Europe. The readers of Czech papers in Australia were well informed about this philosophy and the content of his lectures, as his visits to the U.S.A., the U.N. and Canada had been reported in the Czech ethnic press.

Czechs challenged Hromadka wherever he went in Melbourne, Perth, Adelaide, Brisbane and Sydney. In Perth, according to a local newspaper, anti-Communist Czechs prepared an unpleasant meeting for Hromadka. His opponents discussed and argued with him, and known Communists threatened them with clenched fists, Czechs asked question after question.56

55 Hlas domova, 20 September, 1954.
56 West Australian, 23 September 1954.
In Adelaide, Hromadka had to stand for some time before the noise of the crowd quietened down. Questions were asked, one after another.57 His worst meeting was in Brisbane, where the Czech Catholic priest, F. Hrdina, was physically assaulted by local Communists. The meeting was controlled by 75 extra policemen. Men who were distributing the anti-Hromadka leaflets were prevented in doing so by Hromadka's sympathisers, consisting of members of the Australian Communist Party. This led to scuffles and physical assaults and police arrested both parties. Similar scenes occurred at the meeting at Sydney University.58

Finally, when Hromadka arrived in Melbourne he had his quietest meeting because a number of bouncers who were strategically placed inside and at the doors of the stadium.59 However, this issue became a general Australian issue as it exploded in all cities where Czechs lived and which Hromadka visited. He was regarded as an agent of the Czechoslovak regime who under the cloak of religion and christianity was ordered to spread Communist ideology.

The above occasion showed how deep was the hate of the communist doctrine among the 1948 settlers who used any opportunity to demonstrate their feelings. The incidents had shown that national organisation can be influential and can manipulate the behaviour of communities. The organisational activities were helped by the Hlas domova, which was subscribed to by nearly 38 per cent of all Czechs in Australia in 1954, and whose editorial board closely co-operate with community's organisations. Hlas domova therefore had the power to deliver the anti-Communist message and the organisational structure acted accordingly.

While the communities were conducting their own vendetta against the Communist ideology in Australia since their arrival, the Czechoslovak Government authorities did not remain silent and inactive. They launched their campaign in the early 1950s, and mounted attacks against the Czech refugees. These attacks worsened.

58 Hlas domova, 20 September 1954.
59 Hlas domova, 20 September 1954, reported that these bouncers were members of the Painters and Dockers Union, which was under the strong influence of the Australian Communist Party.
after the unsuccessful attempt to persuade emigres to return to
Czechoslovakia during the amnesties in 1951 and 1955. The main
targets of their attacks were Czechs refugee settlers living in the
United States and Britain, where the groups were politically much
more active than in Australia.

The communist regimes always regarded the presence of
refugees in the western world as a threat to the spread of Communist
doctrine. With the foregoing in mind the Communist states of Eastern
Europe decided on a period of amnesty; Czechoslovakia was one of the
first countries which attempted to persuade refugees to return.

The full text of this amnesty was reported in all Czech
ethnic papers in 1955:

To commemorate the tenth anniversary of
the end of World War II, the Czechoslovak
Government has announced a general
amnesty, which will include all persons
sentences for any crime, except those
sentenced for murder and robbery. The
death sentence will be commuted to 25
years of imprisonment and all other
sentences will be reduced. The amnesty
also covers refugees, who should return
to Czechoslovakia within six months after
the announcement of the amnesty, provided
they have not committed an act of
treason.60

The amnesty was discussed and analysed by the emigres and
the general feeling among the settlers in Australia was that the move
was just another political ploy introduced by the Prague Communist
regime for propaganda purposes.61 News filtered out from
Czechoslovakia that some people who had returned to Czechoslovakia
before the amnesty were put into forced labour camps or uranium
mines, where they had to spend a certain amount of time before they
were able to resume employment commensurate with their
qualifications, reported Hlas domova.62

60 Hlas domova, 16 May 1955.

61 Some settlers received letters from home which carried newspaper
cuttings from Czechoslovak papers indicating the scope of the
amnesty. Some even received letters from the Czechoslovak
Consulate in Sydney inviting them to apply for repatriation.

62 Hlas domova, 1 June 1955.
It was also known to every refugee, as well as to the Czechoslovak officials, that after escaping from Czechoslovakia all refugees had been screened by American, British or French intelligence authorities, depending on which occupation zone of Western Germany or Austria the refugee had applied to for protection. Refugees realised that the very act of being screened could be regarded as an act of treason by the Communist Government. For instance, anyone who served in the Czechoslovak Army, whether as a professional soldier or a national serviceman, had to answer questions regarding the military service and general questions about the military forces. According to Czechoslovak Military Law, to have done so was an act of treason. As Czechoslovakia had compulsory national service, nearly every male escapee was affected by this threat.

Later the Prague press began to attack those anti-Communist papers published abroad which were writing against the amnesty. The Prague press stated that the exile papers were trying to frighten the ordinary, not politically active refugee.63

Emigre papers warned their readers of what would happen if they returned to their homeland. A Czech language paper based in Munich, Western Germany, published the following article:

Those who will disappear behind the Iron Curtain this year will not be the first ones who wanted to return home. A man whose name was Kreczek, who was twenty years old, was told at the Czechoslovak Military Mission in Western Germany, that nothing would happen to him after his return. He was sentenced to twelve years hard labour when he returned to Czechoslovakia. Similar was the case of J.Krahulik who was sent to a forced labour camp in the uranium mines. He was sentenced to twenty years.64

63 Práce (Prague), 27 June 1955.

64 Československý přehled (Munich), 11 July 1955.
At the same time the Czechoslovak Government began to publish a monthly newspaper written for Czechs and Slovaks living abroad. The name of this periodical was Hlas domova, the same name as the Czech language paper published in Melbourne. The Prague Hlas domova was sent to emigres whose add addressed were known to the Czechoslovak authorities. The Melbourne Hlas domova made an offer to M. Klinger who was the President of the Committee for people returning to Czechoslovakia during amnesty. This proposal was printed on the front page in the form of an open letter. It stated:

We realise that your Hlas domova will not reach all readers in Australia. We therefore offer you that in every number of our Hlas domova you can use one whole page (even more if you want), where you can write about everything you want to tell Czech emigrants in Australia. We guarantee that nothing will be changed and that our paper will reach the largest possible number of readers. We are even prepared to pay you and your fellow workers for your articles in our paper (normally all our articles are written by volunteers). We have one condition. We request that you could in return give us once a fortnight one page of your paper Svobodne Slovo in Prague, where we shall write why we think we should not return to Czechoslovakia, or are unable to return.65

Understandably, the Melbourne Hlas domova received no reaction to its proposal, even though one copy of the paper was sent personally to M. Klinger by registered mail.66

The Czechoslovak Government expected much from their amnesty. To cope with the number of people who they expected to want to leave Australia, the Czechoslovak authorities increased the number of consular officials four-fold.

65 Hlas domova, 11 July 1955.
66 Ibid, 4 August 1955.
One of my interviewees stated that in Russell Street in Melbourne an Australian working for the Czechoslovak Consulate carried a sandwich board up and down this busy street, announcing that an amnesty in Czechoslovakia had been proclaimed. Soon people began to receive a roneoed letter printed in Czech produced for circulation by an organisation known as HEPND. Several hundreds of the above letters were received in Australia, all having been posted in the United States. In some cases, the recipients did not know anyone in America.

To launch the amnesty move, the Czechoslovak Consulate in Melbourne organised a big party, showed films and served refreshments. Out of four thousand Czechoslovak-born persons in Victoria, only nine persons attended. One of the men who attended the party reported to Hlas domova that the Consul explained to him that the great advances made in Czechoslovakia under the communist rule. The Consul also asked him to fill in his curriculum vitae and he was told that in his statement he must answer the following questions:

The reasons for his escape.

Why is the applicant living abroad at the present time.

Names and addresses of relatives in Czechoslovakia.

In which Czechoslovak ethnic organisation the applicant participated and, if so, in what function?

Detailed curriculum vitae, showing his addresses and employment before World War II, during the war and after the war. Also every detail of his family should be disclosed as well.67

Failure of the Czechoslovak amnesty policy

In spite of the publicity given to the amnesty policy only a limited number of people showed any interest in the proposal. The Czechoslovak Consul in Sydney disclosed during a press conference in Sydney on 4 June 1955 that about 30 had applied so far for amnesty and repatriation.

67 Hlas domova, 30 August 1985.
By contract, the Czechoslovak press reported that 131 persons had returned to Czechoslovakia from Australia.68

The Commonwealth Department of Immigration notified the Editor of Hlas domova in Melbourne that 43 Czechoslovak-born had returned with their families to Czechoslovakia during the amnesty period. The letters which appeared in emigre papers gave some indication of the intensity of the pressure on immigrants in Australia. One letter stated:

During my visit to Melbourne I was surprised by how many people were actively engaged in encouraging our return to Czechoslovakia. In the street I met an Australian selling some Communist newspapers on the footpath. I was interested in the magazine Czechoslovak Life, published in English in Prague. He asked me if I was from Czechoslovakia and offered me a bundle of Czech newspapers. He proceeded to point out the amnesty in Czechoslovakia and also offered me an address where I could obtain all necessary information.69

Another interesting letter appeared in this newspaper:

If you want to know how the local Communists are involved in the action to lure refugees to return behind the Iron Curtain, it is enough to engage any of the street vendors of the Communist publications in discussion and to mention that the reason for buying their newspaper is that you want to know what is the latest news at home. It is just enough to buy one paper and you are asked "Why don't you return to your homeland?" You will learn from this street vendor all about the happy life you will enjoy in your native country. Very politely he will give you the address of the Czechoslovak Consulate which he knows by heart, and even sometimes you will be given the name of the official you should see. One of them wanted to give me a lift in his car when he had finished selling his newspapers. Other Communist agitators visit immigrants' clubs and some of them visit Czech restaurants where they try out their propaganda. Profit on any sales of newspapers from Communist countries is kept by the local Communist Party.70

68 Hlas domova, 19 September, 1955.
70 Hlas domova, 3 August, 1956.
Among those who applied for repatriation were some Australian-born wives. One of them was the wife of Karel Zoubek, an excellent concert violinist and teacher who had been in Australia since 1942. After being in Czechoslovakia for several months, Mrs. Zoubek asked the British Embassy in Prague to be repatriated to Australia as a 'distressed person' at the expense of the Australian Government. The reason she gave for her change of mind was the impossible living and social conditions under which the Czechoslovak citizens lived. Her husband was still alive at the time of her application to return to Australia. He died soon after and this strengthened her determination to seek repatriation to Australia in 1956.71

Change in ethnic attitudes

The purpose of the historical evidence and behavioural experience of the Czechs presented in this chapter is to document that that group used every possible opportunity to voice their stand to communist ideology. The evidence presented shows that ethnic organisations played an important part in keeping the anti-communist spirit alive and used every occasion to maintain this attitude.

In the initial stages of their stay the immigrants needed the organisational life which acted not just as a symbol of familiarity, but also as an emotional outlet, as told by two interviewees. One of them stated:

Yes, I participated in several demonstrations. These happenings were a good outlet for me as I had the chance to spell out many things which I could not discuss with my fellow workers.

The organisational activities were fully supported by Hlas domova which arranged free publication and advertisement space for any group of the Czech community. Such a service was of great importance not just to individuals, but to the Czech community as a whole.72

71 This information was given to the writer by a friend of Mrs. Zoubek.
72 This was mentioned during writer's discussion with the person, now completely out of all ethnic activities.
As I was told during the interviewing

The paper Hlas domova kept us well informed about the affairs of Czech communities.

After nearly three or four years in Australia, settlers became aware that no political changes in Europe would take place and that they would probably stay permanently in Australia. The communities' leaders anticipated, as the President of the Czechoslovak National Association of that time disclosed in Melbourne, that "the organisations will be the leaders of the ethnic life for one or two generations at least."

However, many leaders never expected that cracks may occur and changes will arise in the organisational life. It was not in "one or two generations" but as early as in 1954-5.

For many Czechs, Australian settlement meant more than just an ethnic organisational activity and concentration. The new environment began soon to produce a new challenge and experiences, especially for those with specific skills. These skills, part of their invisible luggage that helped them to penetrate into the structures of the host society on different levels than those usually associated with occupational qualifications. These skills could be termed as social integrative skills.

Such was the case of Czech skiers who in the early 1950s played a dominant role in the expansion of skiing in Victoria and New South Wales.

Another area of similar penetration into the societal structures was through music. Although this penetration could be termed also occupational, opportunities in symphonic orchestras, teaching music at conservatoria of music and even a conducting appointment with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation orchestras were offered to Czech musicians.

Both, the skiers and the musicians, happened to be in Australia when there was a great interest for such social skills and a shortage of experts in both categories.
A similar situation took place also among other ethnic groups; more probably among refugees than among economic immigrants. For instance when Czechs were resettling in Australia, the settlement of Dutch farmers was also in process. Comparing the two groups—refugees and economic settlers, there would be a greater possibility of occupational diversity among the refugees than among a mono-occupational group such as were the Dutch farmers.

Another important variable was masculinity. The Census of 1954, which was the first one taken after the arrival of the "February refugees", revealed a ratio of 204.44 males to 100 females of Czech origin. Many of them were single and this resulted in numerous marriages in the years after their arrival. Between the years 1945 and 1980 a total of 9067 Czechoslovak-born persons were married in Australia, of whom 6161 were men and 2906 women. More than a half of these marriages were out—in case of men, marriages to women of the host society.

As well as masculinity, the variable of age played an important role, as among the Czechs there was a large proportion of young people. The great majority, nearly 80 per cent, were between 20 and 30 years old upon their arrival in Australia. The detailed comparative figures will be discussed later. The occupational background, inter-marriages and age had undoubtedly an important influence on their integration.

They soon began to enter the institutions of the host society and this social entrance depended mainly on individual members and their personal and social skills. Of all the host society's institutions, the area of sport lent itself most easily to penetration by the young people who brought their sporting skills as 'invisible luggage' with them to Australia. Sport therefore became one of the first vehicles of penetration into the structures of Australian society.73

Some sporting activity had began earlier by the formation of individual Czech sporting teams, like the soccer clubs in Adela-
ide, Melbourne, Canberra and Sydney. These teams began to socialise as a group, interacting with other groups, either immigrant or
native-born. But far more outgoing and admirable was the penetration by individuals into society's sporting bodies. Winter sports like
skiing and ice-hockey were the first examples of this integrative action.

Between the years 1953-60 Czech skiers played an important pioneering role in the development of skiing in Australia; the evidence shows that they were well placed in various skiing competitions, acting as instructors, and became members of Australian Winter Olympic teams between 1957-64. The pioneering spirit of skiers led to the foundation of the winter sport centre Thredbo in New South Wales, which was founded by the well known Czech skier Anthony Sponar. Czech ice hockey players were also found in many Sydney and Melbourne teams.74

Other sporting activities were also popular once the settlers had discovered that advantages might accrue to immigrants whose talents were valued by the host groups. Special sporting activities like boxing, wrestling, kayak boating, swimming, rugby, Australian rules football, basketball, air acrobatics, car and motobike racing became objects of interest of many young Czechs.

Similarly affected were the areas of culture. When the ethnic community could not satisfy the cultural and personal needs of individuals the only way left for these people was to leave the group and seek satisfaction in the structures of the host society. An example of this was the case of acting. In the early 1950s there were several Czech language theatres formed but some ceased to function after a short period of time. A few of these actors approached Australian theatrical companies.

74 Some of them represented Australia during the Olympic Games in 1956, like the wrestler V.Mucha (1956) or played in the Australian rules football league like the Vinar brothers of Geelong (1954-1960), or represented their states like J. Culka in rugby (Victoria 1956), or J. Marek in basketball (Western Australia, 1958)
If may seem strange that immigrants from non-English speaking countries would be involved as professional actors using English as a tongue in Australian companies.

But three of them established themselves as professional actors in Melbourne.75

In other cases the theatrical activity was substituted by writing scripts for television, film making and advertising. In creative art painters, sculptors, church decorators and gallery owners began to make a mark in the Australian cultural sphere.76

Music was another interesting example. Among the settlers were some Czech musicians who like other immigrants had to undergo the two year working contract and physical work. Of course it could be argued, that music would be an easier integrational medium than theatre; in musical appreciation no knowledge of English is needed. Adding to it its internationalism and general popularity, some settlers established themselves soon as top performers.77

75 This was accomplished by Czech immigrants George Pravda and his wife Hanna, and Miss Zdena Fanti. Before the Pravdas left Czechoslovakia in 1948, both were professional actors. Soon after completing their working contract they began to seek contracts with the Australian theatrical companies. By 1956 George Pravda acted in more than 30 plays, working for Melbourne Theatre Company. Hanna, his wife also acted, but her main interest was in the stage directing. Miss Zdena Fanti, ex-employee of the Czechoslovak diplomatic service became a professional actress in Melbourne and Adelaide. By the end of the 1950s Pravdas and Fanti left for the United Kingdom where they continued in their acting profession.

76 The art gallery of Rudy Komon in Paddington, Sydney, became one of the best known in Australia between 1958-1960, exhibiting works of Sir William Dobell, Sir Sydney Nolan, Fred Williams, Russell Drysdale, Arthur Boyd, Roger Kemp, Clifton Pugh, Ron Robertson-Swann and Brett Whiteley.

77 One of the best known was Jiri Tancibudek, an oboist of world class, now lecturing at Adelaide University, violinist Eugene Prokop and the conductor Rudolf Pekarek. Pekarek worked in a Sydney glass factory where his job consisted of collecting broke glass and depositing it in special rubbish bins. When the well-known Czech conductor Rafael Kubelik visited Australia as a guest-conductor sponsored by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation he learnt about Pekarek. Kubelik's influence made it possible for Pekarek to be released from his contract obligation and he was offered a position as a resident conductor of the A.B.C. Orchestra in Perth, W.A.
Also the religious life became similarly affected. The majority of Czechs were Roman Catholics and among the refugees were several priests who looked after the spiritual needs of the settlers. In the 1950s cities like Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney had well developed Roman Catholic parishes and well attended weekly services. By 1954 the attendance of services and general participation began to decline. The distance of travel in Melbourne was one of the reasons that some of the settlers began to patronise their local Roman Catholic churches.\(^{78}\) Also some began to question the behavioural attitude of the priest and became critical of his sermons.

Czech Protestants were worse off than Catholics. As there were hardly any Protestant ministers among the refugees, the initiative was taken by a Protestant preacher from Melbourne.\(^{79}\) He formed the 'Hus Congregation', which incorporated members of the Evangelical Church, Czech Brethren Church, and the Czech Lutheran Church. This congregation lasted only for a short time and many of its members joined the local Australian churches of similar persuasion. Thus we may say that religious integration was the first institutional integrationalist case in the history of Czech immigration, as these bodies were invited to become a part of the host society's structures. The similarities of religious dogmas were the decisive points in this process.

The members of the Czechoslovak Church (Československa Cirkev) were incorporated into the Anglican Church; Czech Brethren (Českobratrska Cirkev Evangelicka) became members of the Presbyterian Church; Czech Methodists (Jednota Bratrská) associated themselves with the Methodist Church; the Czech Baptists joined the Baptist Church, and the Czech Lutherans joined the Lutheran Church of Australia.

\(^{78}\) In my sample there were four interviewees who felt that the attendance of local churches was more suitable because of the distances they had to travel.

\(^{79}\) The founder of the 'Hus Congregation', Mr. M. Hajek, gave me the information concerning the Protestant church activities in Melbourne.
Members of the Jewish faith selected their places of worship according to the closeness of the synagogue. They perceived themselves primarily as Jews and a majority of them broke off from the mainstream of Czech ethnic groups in Australia.

The search for permanent employment during the period of re-establishment led to a geographical dispersion of individuals and weakened the group contacts. Typical would be the case of the Czech employees of the Kew Mental Hospital in Melbourne. One of the informants stated that:

While working in the hospital, we attended ethnic meetings, manifestations, soccer and parties together. One day we left the hospital this cohesiveness was broken, and we haven't seen them again.

It therefore appears that there were several important variables which were behind this gradual defection from the organised ethnic life.

Table 31
Religion of Czechoslovak-born in Australia
(As given by the people) Census 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christians</th>
<th>Non-Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brethren</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>Total non-Christsians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>4645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Orthodox</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Day Adventist</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (unidentified)</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Christians</td>
<td>8885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Christians | 8885 |
| Non-Christians | 1294 |
| Indefinite      | 115  |
| No religion     | 122  |
| No reply        | 2264 |

TOTAL 12680
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Re-orientation

By the end of the 1950s most of the Czech-born in Australia had proceeded through the stages of re-settlement and re-establishment. By that time many of the immigrants were integrated economically in the host society. The most frequent were the patterns of marriages, better and permanent employment, housing dispersion and a search for more satisfactory social life.

The table below indicated the marriage trend among the Czechoslovak-born in Australia.

| Table 32 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Marriage Patterns of Czechoslovak-born in Australia (1945-1980) | |
| Czechoslovak-born men | Czechoslovak-born women |
| Married brides born in: | Married bridegrooms born in: |
| Australia | 2750 | Australia | 549 |
| Czechoslovakia | 1128 | Czechoslovakia | 1128 |
| Europe (other than Czechoslovakia) | 1909 | Europe (other than Czechoslovakia) | 1909 |
| Asia | 134 | Asia | 53 |
| Africa | 27 | Africa | 17 |
| America | 34 | America | 10 |
| Pacific | 79 | Pacific | 20 |
| Total | 6161 | Total | 2906 |

Source: Australian Censuses 1945-1981.

The above table shows the high proportion of out-marriages. This tendency to marry into Australian-born and other ethnic groups has been an influential factor which has helped lessen their interest in ethnic life. The marriage patterns show that Australian-born girls were the most sought-after marriage partners. Czech-born women preferred to marry within their own group. Czech marriage figures show influences of the Australian melting pot, revealing that the Czech-born in Australia have intermarried with partners from nearly seventy countries.
By 1960, according to my sample out of 103 persons interviewed, 81 lived in their own houses (76.8%) and 92 (89.3%) had accepted Australian citizenship. Both above factors are indicators that the settlers had made a decision to stay permanently in Australia. Aided by the world political climate, with the Korean War over, and realising that their early return home is out of the question, they accepted the fact that Australia is now their home.80 Altogether 95 (92%) interviewees indicated that by the end of 1960 they regarded Australia as their home.

Organisational leaders were not happy about this desertion from ethnic organisational life.81 By 1955 they still maintained that the organisational life they lead is important for immigrants' needs and for the anti-communist exile. But the problem with the Czech community life was that their leaders were not sensitive to the changes which were occurring, both individual and social. The process of integration was not reflected in organisational changes because of the inability of the organisations' leaders to adjust and to accept the forces of change. The leaders understood that each stage of integration was accompanied by a loss of members.

This disintegration seemed to be unavoidable because the interest and orientation of the settlers. The organisational philosophy which was based on the 'ancestral home model' began to lose appeal among the immigrants.

The tendency to concentrate on the 'homeland' policy was influential in the breakdown in the Czechoslovak Association in Melbourne. By 1955 it was an organisation in name only, supported by a handful of people; the Association's meetings shrunk to one or two per year. Referring about one of the meetings, the Hlas domova

80 At the outbreak of the Korean War in 1951 the Czechs believed that this conflict may trigger off World War III and consequently lead to the death of communism elsewhere.

81 From the leaflet handed to the participants during the meeting of all associations in Melbourne. It was reported in the Hlas domova, 12 June 1955.
stated:

The celebration of the anniversary of the birth of the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, T.G. Masaryk, which was organised by the Czechoslovak National Association of Victoria, had a simple program. The attendance was poor. 82

Attendance to similar attendances two or three years before would have 200-300 people attending, according to one of my interviewees. Organisational life in other states suffered a similar fate as this report from Hobart, Tasmania, indicates:

There is nothing here now. Czechoslovak life is dormant and I think it will never awake again. 83

One important point which may have influenced the sudden decline in ethnic activities at Hobart was the internal migration within Australia. Many Czechs left Tasmania not only after the completion of their working contract but even some time after, looking for better opportunities on the Australian mainland.

The only community where some changes eventuated was in Perth, Western Australia, where political quarrels between two associations resulted in a complete breakdown of the activities. Both organisations ceased their activities as early as 1953 and a new body was formed. The founder of this new organisation realised that to keep the interest of the members, the club must perform some practical and useful purpose; therefore the old political and nationalistic type of conduct was abolished. The club introduced programs about aspects of life in Australia, programs which were conducted either by Czechs who had reached some level of expertise in their employment, or by members of the host society. This move proved successful and prolonged the life of the Perth organisation and attendances figures between 1953 and 1965 were higher than those of any other association in Australia.

82 Hlas domova, 9 March 1955.
83 Ibid., 27 May 1957.
Table 33
Czechoslovak National Association of Victoria
Melbourne 1951–1956

Number of committee meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1952</th>
<th>1953</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1956</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34
Association of People of Good Will, Perth,
Western Australia 1953-1965

Number of people attending meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above evidence it seems to be clear that the re-orientation of immigrants played an important part in the disorganisation of the ethnic life. Gellner and Smerek report similar experience with the Czechs in Canada after World War II. But besides this there was another factor emerging which even split the existing organisations, groups which were already retrenched in numbers by the re-orientation influences, and which caused further defections. This affair which started as an ordinary cultural activity developed into a major crisis in the Adelaide Czech community in 1959. It began when members of the local Czechoslovak Club refused to participate in the festival organised by the University of Adelaide, which was attended by some artists from Czechoslovakia.

When the Adelaide Advertiser published a notice announcing plans for an Adelaide Festival of Music, the organisers of this Festival had decided to have a section on Czechoslovak culture; they invited for this occasion the Czech Philharmonic Orchestra recruited from Prague and arranged to show recent Czechoslovak films and to have speakers on Czech music. To add an ethnic flavour to this venture, the Czechoslovak Club in Adelaide was asked to provide a program of folk dancing in national costume.

When the Czechoslovak community in Australia learned about the proposed participation of the Adelaide Czechoslovak Club, letters criticising the club began to appear in all Czech ethnic publications. The main challenge came from the speaker of the Catholic group, whose objections were published in the Melbourne-based Czech language paper.

---

84 Joseph Gellner and Joseph Smerek, op cit, p.38.
85 Advertiser, 4 June 1959.
86 Hlas domova, 27 July 1959.
The Adelaide Club in its reply stated that they had been asked by the Adelaide University to participate in this festival, and that, as well as the abovementioned program, the Adelaide Conservatorium of Music was going to stage Smetana's opera, Two Widows. The club had accepted the invitation and promised to arrange a performance of a local Czech children's choir and two groups of Czech national dancers in national costumes. Two weeks before the beginning of the festival, officials learnt from the local media that Professor Eckstein from Prague was asked to speak about Czech music. This proposed participation resulted in the club's committee beginning to question the decision to participate and they considered withdrawing from the festival. Finally, it was decided that to withdraw from the festival would be an insult to Adelaide University.

This decision to participate resulted in the most turbulent period experienced by any Czechoslovak ethnic organisation in Australia.87

The festival proceeded according to plan. It was said that Professor Eckstein delivered his lecture to a half-empty room. He spoke for two hours, devoting the last twenty minutes to the friendship between the Czechoslovak people and the U.S.S.R. thus using the occasion to introduce political propaganda.88

An open letter to the Adelaide Club published in the Melbourne Czech language paper, accused the Club of collaboration with the Communist regime. The Adelaide Club defended itself against the accusation that its officials were collaborators and quislings. Letters poured into the ethnic publications, attacking the club, apologising for the Adelaide community, and suggesting what might have been done to avoid this embarrassing affair. Finally, the President of the Adelaide Club stated officially that this body was not and never had been interested in collaboration with Communists.89

87 Hlas domova, 27 July 1959
88 This information was obtained from the Czechoslovak Club's Secretary in Adelaide, Mr. A. Travnicek, who attended Eckstein's lecture
89 Hlas domova, 7 September 1959
The Adelaide Czech community tried to justify their position. Attendance at the Club's meetings more than doubled. All wanted to have their say, to demonstrate that they were democrats and not quislings. They wrote personal letters to all those who attacked them; some cancelled their subscription to the Melbourne Czech language newspaper Hlas domova, which had become the vehicle of the critics.

The committee representing the pre-war conservative political parties in Adelaide issued this statement:

The Committee of the Czechoslovak Political Parties in Exile in Adelaide states that no member of "associated" political parties, that is, Agrarian, Businessmen's and National Democratic, participated in the performance dances and songs during the Adelaide Festival of Music. We are very sorry that this occurred and we publicly accuse the office bearers of the Czechoslovak Club in South Australia of collaboration with the Communists. How to fight without compromise was well shown during the Festival in Edinburgh, Scotland, where the Czechoslovak Communists refused to participate because of the presence of a Hungarian-born refugee artist. 90

This document was an important indicator of the changing state of affairs among the Czech exiles. The Czechoslovak Club in South Australia was controlled by the National Socialists, who were in close contact with the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, based in Washington, D.C., which was the top international organisation of Czechoslovak emigres and was also dominated by the National Socialists.

The Adelaide affair was the first attempt in Australia to put into practice a newly emerging philosophy which was dividing the Council of Free Czechoslovakia and which stressed a gradualist approach towards co-operation in cultural issues with the Czechoslovak Government in Prague. Some leaders felt that the old structure was represented by the Council of Free Czechoslovakia was no longer realistic for the situation in the 1960s.

90 Hlas domova, 5 October 1959.
This lead to the formation of a breakaway organisation with its centre in New York, U.S.A., which became known as the Committee for Free Czechoslovakia. This body felt that a compromise was the only way to settle the situation in Czechoslovakia, should the opportunity ever arise. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia disagreed with this philosophy. This lead to the split in the Czechoslovak organisational life which also affected Australia. Only South Australia and Queensland followed the new body, while Melbourne and Sydney sided with the Council.

To the Australian community at large such an upheaval seemed a mere storm in a tea cup, but to Jean Martin, the ethno-sociologist, these events were evidence of a disintegration of community life. Her findings were described in her book where she stated that:

Dissensions over the issue of anti-Communism became compounded through personality clashes and confrontations between supporters of different political parties in pre-Communist Czechoslovakia. Matters came to a head in 1964, when a splinter group broke away from the Czechoslovak Club in protest against the Club having taken part in the Adelaide Festival of Arts, thus implicitly associating itself with the visiting Black Theatre of Prague, one of the principal Festival attractions of the year. The dissident members accused the Club of refusing to take part in an anti-Communist demonstration organised by the Council of the Voice of Witnesses of Communist Oppression in 1962, exercising censorship over the Club's newsletter Zivot, controlled admissions to Club membership in order to stifle opposition and in general compromising with Communism.91

91 Jean I. Martin, op cit, p.57.
THE BLACK THEATRE OF PRAHCE IN AUSTRALIA

Mr. Khrushchev's Second Front

It's time every Australian citizen considered why Communist Cultural bodies outnumber other Societies from free friendly countries, when Australia has no Cultural Exchange Agreement with the Communist bloc behind the Iron Curtain. This means that all Cultural Communist bodies have come to Australia through the arrangements of private bodies or private persons - not by Government sanction.

Mr. Khrushchev in his speech at the 21st Communist Congress in Moscow ordered the use of Culture in the Cold War in order to influence and undermine the Western Democratic Countries.

Professor J. Bishop - Head West Australian - University of Adelaide. From the Communist Czechoslovakian press we learn, that at the beginning of 1959 a vacancy existed for a viola teacher in the Conservatorium of Music in the University of Adelaide. The Director of the Conservatorium, Prof. John Bishop, in searching for a candidate turned to . . . Moscow, and asked help of the Soviet Minister D. Kouch. Kouch recommended the Czech violist Ludislav Jasko from Prague. So Jasko came to Australia. Then Jasko, with the help of Prof. Bishop, arranged the Festival of Czech Music in Adelaide in 1940, sponsored by the Communist Czechoslovakian Government. The Communist Czech broadcast in Prague described this Festival as not to meet a Cultural as a Political Invasion of great significance to Australia. Prof. Bishop was rewarded by the Communist دورکی Medal from Czechoslovakia.

Music Viva Society. From programmes of Communitic performances in Australia we learn that they were arranged by the Music Viva Society. - Who does this? - What are the Anti-Communist Members of this Society doing? - An ignorance of facts causes a Social Acceptance which could cause the Death of Australia.

Australia-Soviet Union Friendship Association. From members of the Czech Philharmonic Orchestra we learnt that the expenses of this body (over 100,000) were paid by the Communist Czech Government. The fees for their performances in Australia (thousands of pounds) were given to this Association. - The Leader of the Australian Communist Delegation to Moscow, Mr. Sharkey, in the 21st Communist Congress highly praised this Association for its work in respect to the aims of the Communist Party.

DO NOT SUPPORT COMMUNISTIC PERFORMANCES IN AUSTRALIA

DO NOT ENTERTAIN THEIR MEMBERS

BY DOING YOU COULD UNWITTINGLY HELP TO FULFIL MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S STATEMENT TO THE WEST:

"I WILL BURY YOU"

Source: Jean I. Martin, Community and Identity, p.58.
This split added another new organisation to the established associational network. Besides the Central Committee of Czechoslovak Association in Australia and New Zealand, which was the central Australian association for all contacts with the Council of Free Czechoslovakia in Washington, an additional central body was created and became known as the Committee of the Czechoslovak Democratic Associations in Australia and New Zealand. The latter, which was the association for all Australian contacts with the new Committee for Free Czechoslovakia in New York had its centre in Brisbane; the former in Adelaide.

| Table 35 |
| Division of affiliations in Australia (1964) |

- The Council of Free Czechoslovakia (Washington) |
  - Central Committee of Czechoslovak Associations in Australia and New Zealand (Adelaide) |
    - Adelaide |
    - Melbourne |
    - Sydney |
- The Committee for Free Czechoslovakia (New York) |
  - Committee of the Czechoslovak Democratic Association in Australia and New Zealand (Brisbane) |
    - Adelaide |
    - Brisbane |

With the passage of time, some of the bitterness of the early 1960s has evaporated, but the split in the Adelaide Czech community has not been healed. It has deterred many Czech immigrants from involving the Czechoslovak community affairs and has discouraged the development of stable and effective non-political activities.

The evidence offered in this section shows that the translated organisational structures, based on the 'old country' nationalistic model had proved themselves workable only for a limited period of time. The decision to settle permanently in Australia after a few years in the country was undoubtedly an influential factor leading to many other channels such as the purchase of a house, marrying, looking for better employment, studying, retraining and obtaining naturalisation. Through these channels the gradual penetration to the host society began. Strict tendencies therefore lost appeal, the umbilical cord between the 'fatherland culture' and individual was suddenly cut.
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Australia, according to Harris\textsuperscript{92} was a monistic country in the 1950s with the predominant sociological philosophy of assimilation as the most important aim as so far immigrants were concerned. The assimilationists were pleased and an official of the Commonwealth Department of Immigration stated that 'Czechs are one of the most assimilable groups in Australia'.\textsuperscript{93} 

One of my interviewee's evaluated the situation by stating that

After purchasing the house and a car, my life had different dimensions. As I had lived all my life in flats, to look after my house and garden became my hobby. With my family, we travelled to different parts of the country. Through our children, who were attending school we were introduced to English language books and met new people. We entered new world. My life changed and I became busier than ever. I did not want to go back to meetings of my countrymen to hear the same things again.

Another factor, the change of the political situation which was beyond the control of settlers began to influence their way of thinking. Once they left the organisational structures, their attitude towards Communism had also taken a different image. They accepted the status quo of the political situation in Europe and in the early 1960s, after more than a decade in Australia the anti-Communist spirit began to weaken. The described affair in Adelaide, which split the remaining cohesive group in Australia, was the last action ever in Australia in the 1950s. By that time economically well integrated, Communism came to be tolerated as a tragic fact of life.

By 1968 the interest of Czech immigrants in ethnic politics disappeared almost entirely; the only ethnic involvement were occasional social dances. Two decades of life in Australia had changed the passions of the early fifties to a feeling of tolerance for the status quo. To illustrate the change of mood, even the ever anti-Communist paper Hlas domova carried an advertisement promoting Czechoslovak made goods.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{92} Roger McL. Harris, \textit{op cit}, p.
\textsuperscript{93} Hlas domova, 9 September, 1959.
\textsuperscript{94} Hlas domova, 13 November 1967
CHAPTER FOUR

THE 1968 WAVE

Ethnic groups are something like the Rocky Mountains or the Atlantic Ocean - whether we like them or not doesn't really matter very much; they are concrete realities with which we must cope, and condemning them or praising them is a waste of time.

Andrew Greeley, 1971.
4.1 ARRIVAL AND SETTLING IN

Czechoslovakia's history has been outlined in the previous chapters, covering the most important aspects in the development of social and political issues. These issues were often influential in the shaping of the destiny of the Czechs. In this chapter the reasons for emigration of the 1968 Czech intake will be elaborated; it will concentrate mainly on events between 1948 and 1968.

Czechoslovakia was the last country in Europe to be absorbed into the Soviet empire in 1948. After Stalin's death in 1953 Stalinism survived in Czechoslovakia longer than anywhere else. There was rioting in East Germany in 1953, revolt in Poland in 1954 and a revolution in Hungary in 1956. While this was happening, the Stalinist rule in Czechoslovakia remained unshaken. Persecution and trials of 'enemies of the state' continued throughout the 1950s with economic decline appearing in the country, which up to the outbreak of World War II had been one of the most advanced economies in Europe.

The cultural effects of Soviet rule were also disastrous. Soon after the Communist take-over in 1948 a lot of people in official positions had views on what kind of books were needed, what kind of pictures were to be pleasant, what kind of music was the most melodious, which films were the most valuable. In the 1950s, in the same way as during the Nazi occupation, jazz became an underground cult of the young. A special Ministry of Culture and Information was created and censorship was introduced on a wide scale; known as the Central Publicity Administration it was also under the control of the Ministry of Interior. For almost twenty years publishers had to have manuscripts scrutinised by the censors before they could be taken to the printers. Daily newspapers had resident censors attached to them.

It is not a situation Czechs had been used to. The Habsburg Imperial Law of 4 March 1849 provided for freedom of expression. Though it was disregarded and sometimes suspended, the December Constitution of 1867 gave freedom to the press once and for all. In the first Czechoslovak Republic the right of the police censor to issue a confiscation order was used occasionally.
But preliminary censorship was unknown between the years 1918 and 1938.\(^1\)

As a consequence of these draconian rules the first trial of writers took place in 1952 when 15 writers were sentenced in all to 220 years.\(^2\) The youth movement was copied from the Soviet model, and education for a socialist state was the basis of the new socialist education. Besides a Marxist-Leninist philosophy the young people were also trained in para-military and police activity. Young people were encouraged to spy on other people, to take part in demonstrations and to act as informers on participants, to cooperate with the police during various emergencies, to give evidence in course and to join special auxiliary police units.

While these aspects became gradually part of Czechoslovak society, the economy's decline began to cause concern to the rulers of Czechoslovakia. Criticisms began to appear stressing the wasteful use of labour, the large volume of unfinished capital constructions, production not sufficiently geared to the requirements of foreign trade, and unsuitable and untrained industrial management. The managerial positions were given not on the basis of expertise but on the political reliability and were preserved for the party men and women.

The President of Czechoslovakia and the First Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Antonin Novotny, a follower of Stalin's line, developed a cult personality, which was copied by the state's officials. Besides the criticism of the bad shape of the economy, aspects of culture, politics and the government's involvement abroad were also mentioned. By 1967 the proposed economic reforms were still being opposed; the country's economy had nearly come to a standstill.\(^3\)

At the same time a Writers' Congress took place in Prague in the summer of 1967, where quarrels with the Communist Party were aired and writers wanted their freedom to write what they liked and

as they pleased. The party demanded their loyalty, non-interference in political matters, and the occasional use of their skills. The Communist Party ignored the congress.

The problems grew and finally the reforms emerged favourably with their criticism of the state of the economy. Opposition to President Novotny crystallised around Alexander Dubcek, the First Secretary of the Slovak Communist Party. The demand for the division of President Novotny's functions were made. The central committee meeting unanimously elected Dubcek its first secretary. Novotny remained President of the Republic.

The Parliament asked the President of the Supreme Court to complete the rehabilitation of former political prisoners and soon after President Novotny resigned. Freedom of press was re-established, the sins of the past were criticised, and political pluralism was planned. The Social Democratic Party was re-introduced as a political party, and the most unusual feature of any Communist state-citizens were allowed to travel abroad, including western countries. This was the beginning of the 'Prague Spring'.

The Warsaw Pact Treaty armies planned military manoeuvres and Czechoslovakia was suggested as a possible country. The manoeuvres took place in June 1968, and a few days before the military exercises began, the Czechoslovak Government issued the declaration of the movement for reforms in Czechoslovakia. By opposition to Czechoslovak reforms began to appear sooner. In July 1968, the Soviet, Polish, Hungarian, Bulgarian and East German representatives gathered in Prague and condemned the work and the progress of the reformers. In an official statement they described the situation as 'absolutely unacceptable for socialist countries', and told the Czechs that it was no longer their own affair but the common concern of the states united by the Warsaw Pact.

---

6 Z.A.B. Zeman, op cit, p.156.
In a firm and polite letter the Czechoslovak Communist Party praesidium explained the Czechoslovak position without giving way to pressure. Throughout the three summer months, the Soviets and their allies pushed the Czechs and the Slovaks hard to keep them in line. They used economic pressure and unleashed the fury of their press. On 11 June 1968 Moscow made known its first diplomatic protest to Prague, asking for a ban on anti-Soviet articles. The Czechs were exposed to the war of nerves. The Soviets moved their tanks and troops about at will, reminding the Czechs that, under the terms of the Warsaw Treaty, they could do so on Czechoslovak territory as well.7

Finally, on 3 August 1968 heads of the six Warsaw Pact countries assembled in Bratislava (capital of Slovakia) and put their signatures to a document that, in one essential point, was a complete reversal of the Warsaw letter. The politicians in Bratislava bound themselves to co-operate on the basis of 'equality', national independence and territorial integrity.8

For the Czechs the crisis seemed resolved and they felt they had won an important concession. A feeling of summer affected the people of Prague and the whole country. But the worst was yet to come. On the night of the 20 August, 1968, at midnight, the Warsaw Pact armies crossed Czechoslovakia's frontier and gave the final blow to the Czechoslovak experiment, which had attempted to give socialism a more 'human face'.

7 Bulletin, August 31, p.64.
8 Z.A.B.Zeman, op cit, p.158.
Refugees of 1968 - the means of departure from Czechoslovakia

Since 1948, it had been very difficult for an ordinary citizen to holiday abroad or to even possess a passport. The only way such people could travel and see other countries was to travel as a member of a trade union group, or be an active member of a sporting group or a similar organisation. The choice of countries that could be visited was restricted to other Communist bloc countries. There were no trips to the west for ordinary citizens or even for groups. The fact that for twenty years the authorities had denounced western culture and life as being decadent and the embodiment of capitalism and imperialism, and the restriction on travel, seemed to have had a counter productive effect. For one result of this repressive policy was that a cult of admiration of the west had developed, especially among the young people, those who were too young to remember the democratic conditions which had existed in Czechoslovakia before 1948.

Many people sought other outlets, to compensate for the ban on travel. Many studied foreign languages and developed an interest in the literature and music of their chosen area of study. The Czechoslovak Government often encouraged such activities under the 'banner of socialism' aiming at the promotion of a 'brotherhood amongst the nations for peace'. Those who participated in these studies met other restrictions; if they were interested in the study of English, for instance, they could read only Communist newspapers published in the English language, such as the British Daily Worker, or the Australian The Guardian. The choice of literature was also restricted, and the recommended books were chosen because of their political bias; many works by Australian authors, largely those of a left-wing political orientation.

Despite these restrictions, many literary magazines and books written in western languages were smuggled into Czechoslovakia where they were often translated and circulated by clandestine means. Modern western music was also popular, and there was no way that the regime could stop people from listening to the radio and television programs from abroad. In this way, many people pursued their personal interests, paying only lip service to official policies.
The new leadership liberalized the restrictions on travel to western countries. This policy decision had an immediate impact on previously frustrated travellers. Firstly, it became somewhat easier to obtain a passport. To have a passport in pre-1968 Czechoslovakia was a great privilege; indeed, it was worth a fortune. To obtain such a document meant spending many weeks visiting different departments, filling in forms, and being interviewed by the political, trade union and police authorities. Early in 1968 the Government eliminated many of these complicated procedures.

It is estimated that in 1968 over 50,000 people obtained passports and the other necessary permits to visit western countries in Europe; these were often valid for several weeks or even months. The main holiday season in Czechoslovakia spreads over the months of July and August. When the Warsaw Pact forces occupied Czechoslovakia on 21 August 1968 it was not very difficult for those who wanted to leave to get out of Czechoslovakia. Border traffic was under the control of the Czechoslovak authorities for several months after August 1968, and all travel permits issued in the pre-invasion period were still regarded as valid. It is estimated that about 70 per cent of all Czechoslovak refugees who arrived in 1968-69 to Australia were people who left Czechoslovakia legally, with passports in their pockets. The rest were people who arrived from other countries, where they had lived temporarily as advisers or experts, having been sent there by the Czechoslovak Government; or those who escaped without papers. The passport regulations of 1968 included also a new provision that persons issued with a passport could obtain permission to extend their stay in the country which they worked. Those travellers who used this regulation were automatically given permission for an extension of their stay.

After 21 August 1968 the governments of the neighbouring countries like Austria and Western Germany realised that the Soviet invasion and consequently occupation of Czechoslovakia might produce large numbers of refugees. Provisions were made for those who decided not to return to Czechoslovakia to be accommodated in hotels, schools and even private homes.

9 The estimated number has been quoted in the Report of the American Fund for the Czechoslovak Refugee, Vienna, Australia, 1968.
Besides those two countries, the other countries in Europe and even overseas became sympathetic to these people. Switzerland, traditionally selective in immigrant intakes, offered permanent settlement to several thousand people. But a great interest was shown by traditionally immigrant seeking countries like Australia, Canada, South Africa, New Zealand and even the United States. While the first four countries were still seeking settlers and accommodated practically all those who wished to settle in their countries, the United States had to introduce a special quota, similar to the case of the Hungarians in 1956.

Australia had learnt a great deal about immigration since 1945. In the 1960s the Australian economy was still buoyant and people were needed. Realising this the Australian Immigration Department changed the intake procedures for the Czechs; the immigration process was shortened and consisted of a security check, a medical inspection and an interview with the appropriate consul. Many people, registered for emigration with more than one country, very often accepting the first offer.

Categorizing the refugees of 1968 several different categories began to emerge:

1. Those who were caught by the occupation while holidaying abroad.

2. Those who went abroad after the occupation firmly decided not to return to Czechoslovakia.

3. Those who were caught by the occupation while holidaying, but who learned about emigration possibilities and temporarily went back to Czechoslovakia, either to bring more family members, or to collect some valuables or personal documents.

4. Those who escaped without valid visas or without any documents by crossing the Czechoslovak frontier 'illegally'.

5. Those who were working in other countries and decided not to return to Czechoslovakia.
The frontier traffic after occupation was still controlled by Czechs, and anybody who had a passport and exit visa could return to Czechoslovakia and leave the country again.

The Czechoslovak press was full of interesting news, such as the fact that the Czechoslovak Government might consider bringing about the re-unification of families. The rehabilitation of people serving prison terms for political sentences began, as the trials of the 1950s were exposed as political fabrications. Correspondence between Australia and Czechoslovakia increased tremendously. The Czech paper Hlas domova was sent regularly to Czechoslovakia, attracting a chain of readers. A result of this contact was that notices in this paper began to appear indicating that people from Czechoslovakia wanted to correspond with their countrymen in Australia.

The Czechoslovak Ministry of Culture gave permission to many educationalists to visit western countries and teach there. In Australia, this move led to the appointment of several university teachers at Monash and Australian National University in Canberra.\textsuperscript{10}

It seemed that some new spirit had penetrated the Czech communities in Australia. People began to travel to Czechoslovakia, some receiving their visitor's visas after their first application to the Czechoslovak Consulate General in Sydney. Earlier, people had applied several times without success. The situation was discussed in the Hlas domova. The question was, 'Should we visit Czechoslovakia or not?'\textsuperscript{11} Letters began to pour into the Melbourne paper. These few quotations indicated the mood of the readers:

The best propaganda for the West.
F.K., Fairfield, Victoria.

\textsuperscript{10} Professor R. Zimek was appointed to the Russian Language Department at Monash University in Melbourne and later to the Australian National University. Later, Professor Z. Oliverius took a position at Monash after Zimek's departure for Canberra, and finally Professor J. Naustupny, from the Prague Oriental Institute was appointed to be the head of the Japanese Language Department at Monash. Both Zimek and Oliverius decided to return to Czechoslovakia in 1970, while Neustupný decided to stay in Australia after the 1968 affair.

\textsuperscript{11} Hlas domova, 13 November 1967.
I would lose my respect for myself.
V.H., Preston, Victoria.

Nothing will happen to world politics if you and I visit our ageing mother or father.
M.N., Darlinghurst, N.S.W.

A trip to Czechoslovakia is treason.
J.G., Sydney, N.S.W.

In spite of many disapprovals, the visits continued. One travel agency in Sydney even planned to charter an aircraft to fly local Czech to Prague.

When Alexander Dubček became the General Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in January 1968 and publicly denounced certain aspects of the Stalinist past, its cruelty and injustice, it was obvious to everyone that some radical changes were on the way. Czech refugees in Australia felt that their decision to escape from their homeland in 1948 had been justified.

The defection to the Americans of the former secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and the army's chief political commissar, J. Sejna, with two full cases of highly valued secret information finally influenced even the conservative element among the Czechs in Australia to re-think their past political stance. The interest of Czech immigrants in ethnic politics disappeared almost entirely; the only involvement with ethnic organisations was with social events. Two decades of life in Australia had changed the passions of the early fifties to a feeling of tolerance and the status quo in Czechoslovakia.

The occupation and its aftermath also changed the plane of many of the 150,000 Czech and Slovak refugees of 1948 who had settled in practically every corner of the globe. Many of the Australian Czechs had made their own plans as the exhilarating news of the Dubček thaw spread amongst the local community.

These plans fell into three categories. These were:

(i) Those who planned to visit Czechoslovakia
(ii) Those who wanted to sell their assets in Australia and return to Czechoslovakia to live permanently.

(iii) Those who had decided to stay in Australia but planned to bring their relatives to settle here with them.

But the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact armies, consisting of Russian, German, Polish, Hungarian and Bulgarian units, changed the whole atmosphere. The events which were occurring in Czechoslovakia destroyed all the plans and expectations of the local Czechoslovak expatriates and made them feel once more that they were exiles, physically, emotionally and politically. All the contacts and goodwill which had been renewed and nursed during 1967 and 1968 were now gone. The hatred of Communism which had begun to diminish before 1968 revived and became the main preoccupation of even those who had not participated in any Czechoslovak organisations for many years.

The first 'post invasion' issue of Hlas domova triggered off this dormant sentiment. In an article under the heading '21.8.1968' it stated:

The time has come to get together again, and to begin to hate again. The time has again come that we are exiles, and we should act as such.\(^{12}\)

Another article urged that democratic exiles should not -

. collaborate with any Communist organisation
. buy any products with Communist countries
. attend any social, cultural, or sporting event in which Communist countries participated
. travel to Czechoslovakia or any other Communist country
. keep contract with anyone who showed any Communist sympathies or tendencies.

\(^{12}\) Hlas domova, 2 September, 1968.
This article also suggested that:

. every settler from Czechoslovakia should awake from the sleep of the last 20 years during which everyone had been interested only in his private life and his bank account

. every settler should patronise the ethnic organisations

. every settler should do his utmost to ensure that such events might never occur in Australia.\(^\text{13}\)

The editorial office of Hlas domova at Richmond, Victoria, became the centre of activities; in the words of the editor, Mr. F. Vana, "for the last 18 years my office was never as busy". The telephone rang constantly as people from all parts of Victoria and from interstate and television, radio and daily press reporters sought information on the latest developments.

After the invasion, Hlas domova began to receive a large number of letters from Czechoslovakia and articles written by Czech writers, disclosing the Czech hatred of the invaders and asking the exile organisations to do every thing possible to combat Soviet aggression and imperialism.

Protest meetings were organised in every large city where there was a congregation of settlers from Czechoslovakia. The largest gathering took place in Melbourne, where the protest meeting was held at the Olympic Swimming Stadium. A Government representative, Federal M.P.W. Kent-Hughes, read a message from Prime Minister John Gorton, and representatives of other political parties registered their protests. The speaker for the local Czechs, F. Knopfmacher, asked that diplomatic contact should be severed with countries which had sent occupation troops into Czechoslovakia.\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{13}\) Hlas domova, 2 September 1968
\(^{14}\) The writer attended this meeting personally.
In Hobart the protest meeting was attended by a large number of people; the speakers were the Tasmanian Minister of Education, E. Neilson, representing also the A.L.P., Archbishop Young and Senator Wreidt, A.L.P. The Adelaide meeting was attended by Premier Dunstan and Federal M.P. A. Jones. Similar protest meetings were held in Darwin and Perth.\textsuperscript{15}

In Canberra, as well as the protest meeting which was attended by Federal Ministers Snedden and Fraser, there was an anti-Soviet demonstration near the Soviet Embassy. In Sydney, the demonstration was attended by nearly 2,000 people and finished at St. Mary's Cathedral, where for the first time a Mass was celebrated in the Czech language, and participants prayed for Czechoslovakia. Federal and State representatives and Czechs attended a similar meeting in Brisbane.\textsuperscript{16}

The representatives of all organisations approached Prime Minister J. Gorton, asking that help be given to the new wave of Czechoslovak refugees who might wish to settle in Australia. They received a positive response, the Government indicating that steps were already being taken to arrange immigration opportunities for refugees from Czechoslovakia.

The first practical manifestation of this policy was seen on 14 September 1968, when the first group of Czechoslovak 'August' refugees consisting of 173 persons, landed at Sydney's Mascot Airport.\textsuperscript{17} This group was the forerunner of a new wave of Czechoslovak political immigrants which later swelled to 6,000 persons.

The central committee of the Czechoslovak Association in Australia and New Zealand resolved to give the 'August' refugees every support and to ensure that the 1968 intake should be helped through all processes of settlement into their new country. There was a feeling amongst the 'February' settlers of 1948 that the new arrivals should not have to go through the hardships and indifference which they had suffered after their arrival in 1949-50 and during their re-settlement period.

\textsuperscript{15} Hlas domova, 2 September 1968.
\textsuperscript{16} Hlas domova, 2 September 1968.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid, 16 September 1968.
This decision led to:

(i) The foundation of the Czechoslovak Relief Fund, which made available monetary help.\(^{18}\)

(ii) The formation of Welcoming Committees at Mascot Airport in Sydney and Essendon Airport in Melbourne to arrange accommodation in private homes, so that as many immigrants as possible might be spared the unpleasantness of migrant hostels.

(iii) The establishment of special groups to visit those of the new arrivals who were accommodated in migrant hostels. Many of these who landed in Sydney were accommodated in the migrant hostels at Villawood and Dulwich Hill. The task of the visiting groups was to invite the newly arrived countrymen to their homes and show them Sydney and the surrounding country. Similar groups were formed in Melbourne.\(^{19}\)

(iv) The formation of a club for young people between the ages of 17-20. This body sought to promote friendship between the newly arrived and the young people of Czech background educated in Australia.\(^{20}\)

(v) The opening of a special centre in Melbourne, which was made possible by the help of a firm, 'Decor Centre', owned by a local Czech businessman. In this centre, a group of voluntary workers began to collect gifts of clothes, household goods, prams, furniture and other needed articles. Auxiliary services were also set up to provide employment and accommodation help, an interpreting

\(^{18}\) Hlas domova, 30 September, 1968.
\(^{19}\) Ibid, 16 September 1968.
\(^{20}\) Ibid.
service, and an accompanying service for shopping, visits to departmental offices and medical visits.21

These early arrangements were designed to help the new arrivals to normalise their lives as quickly as possible. As the number of refugees increased, the services offered were expanded:

(i) A local businessman bought a large number of Czech-English dictionaries and distributed them free.22

(ii) A language teacher produced a textbook of the English language, covering the basic steps and pronunciation. This textbook was distributed free to everyone who asked for it. The cost of production was covered by the Czechoslovak Relief Fund.23

(iii) The Hlas domova was offered free of cost to any new settler for the first three months.24

(iv) The ethnic organisations in Canberra and Melbourne organised a Christmas party for all children who were in Bonegilla immigration camp during the 1968 Christmas season.25

(v) A Catholic priest, Father Peksa, arranged scholarships at Catholic schools for three girls.26

(vi) Commonwealth scholarships were offered to Czechoslovak students. These scholarships were available to students enrolled at universities and colleges of advanced education in Australia.

21 Hlas domova, 14 October, 1968.
23 Ibid, 16 December, 1968.
26 Ibid.
The awards carried the same benefits as Commonwealth university and advanced scholarships.27

(vii) Interim language courses in English were offered to Czechoslovak students at the University of New South Wales.28

(viii) After the "distribution" centre in Melbourne ceased its activities, the place began to function as an "Information Centre for New Immigrants" from Czechoslovakia. An advertisement was placed in Hlas domova listing both business and home telephone numbers for use in case help of any kind was required.29

(ix) The Australian Union of Students donated $1,000 to help Czechoslovak students who were planning to study in Australia.30

These services had a tremendous influence on the life of the community. There was a great feeling of service and togetherness; the communities in Sydney and Melbourne went through an experience unprecedented in Czechoslovak ethnic life in Australia. Nearly everyone became involved in one or another sphere of activity, helping with advice and personal service and using the contacts they had with other ethnic groups, various public organisations and departments of government.

A typical example was the introduction of the special English courses by the University of New South Wales, and later by Monash University, for Czechoslovak university students.31 These courses were introduced as a result of the initiative of the representatives of the Czechoslovak organisations, who approached the Departments of Immigration and Education of the Commonwealth Govern-

28 Hlas domova, 6 January, 1968.
31 Hlas domova, 30 September, 1968.
ment, requesting the introduction of a crash course in English and stressing the importance of such a course for these new students. This was perhaps the first time that members of the Czechoslovak community had directly approached the Federal Government requesting changes to benefit their own ethnic group.\textsuperscript{32} The success of this move was due in some measure to the fact that the people who were professional persons knew how to apply pressure to obtain a favourable response from government departments.

Soon after this course was finished, the Minister of Immigration, Billy Snedden, announced that because of the great success of this crash course in English for the thirty Czech and Slovak university students, similar courses would be introduced at Sydney Technical College and the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology and later in other capital cities. Several months after Snedden's statement, these courses were introduced and made available to immigrants from all ethnic backgrounds.\textsuperscript{33}

These courses were designed for immigrants who, because of their previous training, were able to learn basic English in a short time. The course lasted for eight weeks, five days a week, stress being placed on spoken English. Six courses a year were held in both Sydney and Melbourne. During these courses the students received special support from the Federal Government of $25.14 for a single student and $32.73 per week for a married student.\textsuperscript{34}

The welcome and help given to the newcomers through the activities of \textit{Hlas domova} came to the notice of Immigration Department officials in Melbourne, who decided to consult \textit{Hlas domova} before the arrival of any aircraft with refugees aboard.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{32} A Czech settler, Dr. Sklovsky from Melbourne, called a meeting of several Czech professionals who formed a body and through the local representation approached the Department of Immigration and the Commonwealth Office of Education.

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Hlas domova}, 18 August, 1969.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid

\textsuperscript{35} A special committee was set up to help Immigration Department officials and its centre was at the offices of \textit{Hlas domova}. This committee offered the Immigration Department officials all the help necessary for smooth re-settlement of the new arrivals.
The voluntary helpers resolved many problems quickly, bypassing the lengthy process of official governmental decision-making. Their bilingual knowledge and sympathetic understanding was a great advantage especially in the first days after the arrival of the settlers in their new country.

The refugees were transported free to Australia and accommodated in hostels (not in the ex-military camps as their 1948 predecessors) consisting of separate quarters for married people and single rooms for those arriving on their own. The newly arrived were also provided with financial support from which the cost of accommodation and food was deducted, leaving them enough for personal expenses.

The next table shows that re-settlement of the 1968 Czechs was a continuous process lasting from August, 1968, until June 1970.
Table 36

Czecholovak-born refugees arriving from August 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Assisted</th>
<th>Full Fare</th>
<th>Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 1968/69</strong></td>
<td><strong>3357</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>3430</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 1969/70</strong></td>
<td><strong>2057</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>2106</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total number</strong></td>
<td><strong>5536</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another factor, and a very important one which helped the re-settlement of these refugees was the general sympathy for the newcomers from Czecholovakia. The Australian public had witnessed the occupation of Czecholovakia on their television screens. The local coverage included interviews with many representatives of ethnic organisations and many Australians critical of the Soviet attitude. The host country sympathy greatly assisted the absorption of the 1968 refugees.
The university students of 1948 had been given no help and their qualifications were rarely recognised. In contrast, the Czechoslovak university students of 1968 received much more sympathetic treatment. Australian universities recognised generally all of the qualifications they had obtained from the Czechoslovak universities\textsuperscript{36} and the Federal Departments and students' organisations gave them practical assistance. This is a statement prepared for these students.\textsuperscript{37}

As you may know, the World University Service in Australia contacted students who left Czechoslovakia, and about forty of them, studying in Sydney and Melbourne, received Commonwealth Scholarships. At the beginning of this year many of the students we contacted postponed their studies till 1970. We would like to get in touch with these students. The should contact us immediately, indicating if they are still interested in studying at local tertiary institutions. It is important that these students should apply now for admittance, as later applications may not be considered.

World University Service in Australia,
Carlton, Victoria
B. O'Dwyer, Executive Secretary.

The crisis of 1968 did not mean, however, that the Czech community refused to help any representatives of Czechoslovakia visiting Australia, as some of the community leaders suggested. Such visitors were helped on a number of occasions. The Czechs settled in Australia felt that any members of sporting teams or scientific groups were just ordinary and non-political people. And as such they should be helped as much as possible irrespective of what some community leaders said. It also became known that members of the sporting team were told not to attempt any social intercourse with refugees living in Australia and their leaders were made responsible and accountable for anything that might happen during their trip.

\textsuperscript{36} Except legal and medical qualifications, all other tertiary training was recognised and accepted for immediate employment without passing any additional examinations in 1968 (even partial knowledge of English was accepted).

\textsuperscript{37} Hlas domova, 15 September, 1969.
Also the advice of ethnic leaders was not taken seriously as the "community leaders" no longer represented the community effectively. Between June and October 1969, Australia was visited by a Czechoslovak scientific expedition. In the December issue of the Československý Svet, published in Prague, a member of this expedition wrote about the expedition's experiences in Australia. He described the meeting with Czechs in the Northern Territory, mentioning the help given to the expedition during its scientific safari by the settlers.

At the time we realised that our expedition would not have reached such a successful conclusion if it had not been for the material and moral help of our countrymen.38

Australian Czechs reacted in a similar way to the visit of a Czech basketball team from Prague. The organiser of this visit, the Basketball Association of Australia, in an attempt to cut expenses, asked the representatives of the Czech community if they could billet members of the basketball team.39 The manager of the team was very pleased with this proposal, as this meant that they could save a lot of money. But the Australian officials had not mentioned to the Manager of the Prague team that they had approached the Czech community. The Czech team manager was under the impression that his players would be accommodated with Australian families. When he learned what was proposed, he stated that none of the players should be accommodated in the homes of people of Czech origin.

The deterioration of the political situation in Czechoslovakia, influenced by the pressure of the Soviet occupants, may have been a reason for the behaviour of the officials of the Czechoslovak basketball team.

The experience gained during the arrival of the 1968 group was an important step forward by the Czech organisers who again became involved in ethnic organisational life. They had learned how

38 Československý Svět, December 1969.
39 This information was received from the Secretary of the Soccer Club Slavia Port Melbourne, who was instrumental in arranging the accommodation.
to "work successfully in the larger society". By that time they all spoke English well and had many contacts which they approached. For instance a Czech secondary teacher contacted some other educationalists that some special English language courses should be offered to the newly arrived. This move was taken onto the Commonwealth Department of Education and Immigration, which approved this proposal and this was the beginning of English courses for immigrants with professional backgrounds. The community's efforts achieved results which would have been impossible several years earlier.

One example of a successful intervention was the case of two Czech television technicians, K.C. and M.H., who had escaped from Czechoslovakia in 1969 without any documents.40

They did not report to the authorities on arrival in Western Germany but travelled directly to Holland. In Rotterdam they embarked illegally on a West German freighter, hoping to get to America. But the ship's destination was Australia.

In Sydney, they stowed away on the liner Arcadia, where they were discovered en route to England. They were then sent back to the shipping company, which put them on its liner, the Oronsay. They asked for asylum in six countries, including Australia, but without success. When the Oronsay came close to Australian shores, the Czechoslovak Relief Fund decided to help K.C. and M.H. An approach was made to the Immigration Department, and the Fund provided a guarantee. The department decided to give the two men permission to land and stay in Australia for one year. Later, both men received permission to settle in Australia permanently.

40 Hlas domova, 29 June, 1970.
4.2 GROUP ATTITUDES

The aim of this section is to present in a fairly succinct fashion of the nature of the responses to the questionnaire. It will contain the analysis of the responses of the 1968 intake. The number of the interviewees of the 1968 background was 94 (N=94).

Like the 1948 group so the 1968 settlers regarded themselves as refugees, who left their homeland because of political reasons. In this table the interviewees were asked about the reasons for their escape.

Table 37

Interviewees' responses: What was the main reason for your departure from Czechoslovakia?

N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal persecution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Opposition to the regime</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Escaping military service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other reasons</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates that 'other reasons' option was the most numerous, following by opposition to the regime and personal persecution. No answers were received to the question 'escaping military service'.

Answers to the option 'other reasons' included the following statements:
N=80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of living under the Soviet domination</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of political consequences</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longing for life in a free world</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of Communism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38 deals with the reasons why the interviewees selected Australia as their place of settlement.

Table 38

Interviewees' responses to: Which of these reasons made you decide to emigrate to Australia?

N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Australia is a democratic country</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. English language is used in Australia</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Australia is far from Europe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Australia has sunny weather</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Australia offered the shortest waiting time for emigration from Europe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest number indicated option two, which was chosen by 40.5 per cent of interviewees, followed by options one and five sharing the second place and option three being third. The last one was option four.

The knowledge of the country of settlement plays an important role in emigration. The pre-knowledge of Australia was therefore considered in this table and following results were produced.
Table 39
Interviewees' responses to: What was your knowledge about Australia before your arrival?
N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quite a lot</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondees who answered the 'quite a lot' option indicated that they had read about Australia in books published in Czechoslovakia; some of the books were translations of books written by Australian authors. They were aware of the main geographical, botanical, historical and social aspects of Australia. Those who claimed as having a limited knowledge had some knowledge of Australia as one of the interviewee put it: A travel brochure knowledge. Those with a limited knowledge of Australia represented the highest figure reaching 43.6 per cent of all interviewees. The second option, nearly a third, indicated some knowledge of Australia. These figures, considerably different from the 1948 intake, will be discussed at length in the next chapter.

Important was the consideration concerning the study of the English language and the interviewees were asked to indicate where they began to study English.

Table 40
Interviewees' responses to: When did you start to study English?
N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where exposed to the English language?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. After being accepted for emigration to Australia</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In Australia</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table reveals that although the majority of the interviewees began to study English in Australia, a substantial proportion of them had been exposed to the English language in their home country, reaching nearly one third of the interviewees.

Educational level data are an important factor in evaluation of immigrants' background. Generally, it can be expected that the educational level is higher among refugees than economic immigrants because of the diversity of their backgrounds.

Table 41

Interviewees' responses to: Show the highest educational level you have completed.
N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tertiary qualifications</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Secondary qualifications</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basic qualifications</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table indicates that the highest number of interviewees has completed tertiary education, reading 41 per cent, followed by secondary education 34 per cent, and finally basic qualifications amounting to 25 per cent.

The organisational activity of the sample was also considered and the following table shows the questions asked.
Table 42

Interviewees' responses to: Czechoslovak organisational life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Did you belong to any Czechoslovak organisation between 1968-70? N=94</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If yes – which of the organisations were useful to you? N=23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastic</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did you belong to any organisation in 1975? N=94</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the above result indicates the majority of the 1968 intake, amounting to 71 per cent did not belong to any organisation after their arrival in Australia. Only 24.5 per cent participated in some form of organisational life, and gymnastic associations were the most popular choice. By 1975, nearly seven years in Australia their interest began to decrease and only 7.4 per cent stated that their frequented some of the organisations.
The follow up to the table was the question why the interviewees had distanced themselves from Czech organisational life.

Table 43

Interviewees' responses to: Why did you not participate in the support of Czech organisations by 1975? Indicate only one answer out of the five, according to your choice.

N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not interested</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Waste of time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Old country nostalgia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I live in Australia now</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that lack of interest was the main reason for not supporting the organisations. This choice was selected by 55.3 per cent of respondents; the next choices 'Waste of time' and 'I live in Australia now' were selected by even numbers of interviewees, 14.9 per cent. The option 'Old country nostalgia' scored the lowest number of responses, 7.4 per cent. The option 'Old country nostalgia' was associated with the general content of organisational life, like commemorating the days of Czech saints, political events in Czechoslovakia, and birthdays of famous figures in Czech history.

To ascertain their political inclinations the members of the sample were asked to indicate their support for particular political parties during their first federal elections and which political parties they would support if a federal election would have been held in 1984.
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Table 44

Interviewees' responses to: Which political party did you vote for in your first Australian election?
N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political parties</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Australian Labour Party</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Liberal Party</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Democratic Labour Party</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No answer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45

Interviewees' responses to: If a federal election were to be held in 1984 which political party would you support?
N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political parties</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Australian Labour Party</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Liberal Party</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Democrats</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No answer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction in Australia was another point of enquiry and the questions for this purpose were divided to indicate positive and negative answers.

Table 46

Interviewees' responses to: How satisfied were you in 1972 and how satisfied are you now in the 1980s in Australia?
N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Were you satisfied with choice of the country of your emigration during the first 2 years in Australia?</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you satisfied now?</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The duration of stay in Australia was influential in this question. The longer the respondents live in Australia the more were they satisfied with the country of their choice.

In the following table the interviewees were asked to indicate if they would consider returning to live in Czechoslovakia.

Table 47

Interviewees responses to: Would you return to live in Czechoslovakia?  
N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Never</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Temporarily</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Permanently</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The temporary visit was the most popular answer in this table indicating led by 61.7 per cent. In the first question nearly a third (31.9%) gave a negative answer. Those indicating permanent return stated that they would return only of the conditions of Czechoslovakia would be different.

The purpose of the Table Number 48 was to find out how the group felt about their own culture as compared with the culture of Australia after being in Australia for several weeks.

Table 48

Interviewees' responses to: Would you say that your national culture was superior to that of Australia's? If so, which aspects of the Australian way of life would you use to support your statement?  N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second part of the above question the following aspects were mentioned:
1. Food and eating habits: (26 interviewees)
   - food was not good
   - low quality of bread

2. Dress: (6 interviewees)
   - limited selection of winter clothing

3. Housing: (21 interviewees)
   - houses too expensive
   - furniture style too simple
   - not enough flats
   - timber houses

4. Institutional: (13 interviewees)
   - expensive medical insurance
   - inadequate hospital services
   - not adequate provision for housing of old people

5. Miscellaneous: (10 interviewees)
   - poor workmanship of Australian tradesmen
   - entertainment too expensive
   - books too expensive

The above table was followed up by a question "When did you change your opinion about the superiority of your own culture?" Out of 76 persons who indicated that their culture was superior, 74 (97.3%) stated that their attitude has changed after several years in Australia.

Accommodation facilities were the aim of the next table, where the respondents were asked how they live.

Table 49
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Interviewees' responses to: In what type of accommodation do you live?

N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation possibilities</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. House</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Flats</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rented accommodation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates that over half of the interviewees lived in houses of their own, followed by flats and finally by the rented accommodation.

A question to find out how the 1968 group felt about the 1948 intake was designed. This question consisted of two parts and the following responses were indicated:

Table 50

Interviewees' responses to: Do you think that the 1948 intake was/is different to your group of 1968? If yes, why?

N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do not know</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The answers were categorised and the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. They lived in the past</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Czechoslovakia has changed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Their political structures and thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Their plans are unreal</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                                                                   |                              |        |            |
| 1. They seem to keep a distance from us, even distrusting us                    | Mistrust                     |        |            |
| 2. Not everybody in Czechoslovakia was a Communist                            |                              | 21     | 22.4       |
| 3. They feel that we were members of the Communist party                      |                              |        |            |

|                                                                                   |                              |        |            |
| 1. They seem to be polite but often it is hard to establish some further contacts with them | Isolates                     | 13     | 13.8       |

|                                                                                   |                              |        |            |
| 1. We were always told how hard their emigration beginning in the D.P. Camps were and their early days in Australia | Disbelief in past suffering  | 4      | 4.3        |
| 2. They feel that we had an early immigration and that they suffered more vocationally and socially |                              |        |            |

|                                                                                   |                              |        |            |
| 1. Their Czech language patterns have changed                                   | Differences in historical Context | 36     | 38.3       |
| 2. They think differently                                                        |                              |        |            |
| 3. They are more materialistic                                                   |                              |        |            |
| 4. They like to show always their accomplishment in Australia                   |                              |        |            |

|                                                                                   |                              |        |            |
| 1. This is prevalent in their ignorance of the literary development in Czechoslovakia during the last 30 years | Communication differences    | 8      | 8.5        |
| 2. They missed 20-30 years of Communism and therefore cannot understand our way of reasoning |                              |        |            |
To find how the 1968 intake felt about the help given to them upon their arrival in Australia was the purpose for this table.

Table 51

Interviewees' responses to: It is said that you were helped upon your arrival by the established Czechs of the 1948 intake. How do you feel about it?
N=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Were you helped by the 1948 intake upon your arrival in Australia?</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If a situation like 1968 would repeat itself happened again and new refugees arrived, would you help them?</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table indicates that the great majority of the 1968 arrivals were helped by their predecessors upon their arrival in Australia. The 1968 intake also indicated that they would be willing to help any new wave of Czech refugees.
In the 1980s the existence of different ethnic group networks is a common phenomenon. When the 1948 intake of Czechs arrived in Australia there were no efficient organisations or other helpful structures in existence which could assist individual settlers upon arrival. Although there were small communities in Sydney and Melbourne, their numbers made it unfeasible to have efficient organisational network in existence on a large scale. By 1954 the situation was different; the Czechoslovak-born community consisted of over 12,000 people. Such a number warranted the establishment of structures which would enrich the Czech community life. Development which followed was responsible for the growth of the Czech communal enterprising during two decades between 1948 and 1968, made the Czech communities self-sufficient as so far Czech communal life and aspects of communication were concerned. This made it possible that people without any knowledge of English would obtain any service they needed in their own language; it was therefore a tremendous advantage for the 1968 group upon their arrival.

The 1948 intake had established a very elaborate network of professional, occupational and business structures which provided the newly arrived with practically everything they needed. The services to accommodate the new settlers after their arrival have been mentioned previously. Once the initial aspect of re-settlement was completed, the Czech immigrants had a wide organisational network ready for them. From this network the newly arrived could expect sympathetic hearing and help, and, most important of all, they could communicate in their own language.

These structure could be divided in two categories:

(i) Primary structures,
(ii) Secondary structures.

Primary structures could be described as those needed for the survival and societal existence needed for in daily life. These structure covered important areas as:

(i) Sustenance
(ii) Shelter
(iii) Religion
(iv) Medical and dental help
(v) Social

Secondary structures could be described as organisations existing to hold the ethnic groups together.

When the 1948 refugees arrived in Australia there were not any primary structures which could offer any help or services to the new settlers. There were no businesses owned by Czechs; similar was the lack of Czech speaking tradesmen and professionals.

Any needs in the areas of sustenance, shelter, religion, medical, legal and social had to be supplied to the English speaking Australians. As far as the secondary structures were concerned, there were only two clubs with very small membership available for the 1948 settlers.

The 1968 settlers were more fortunate than their predecessors. After their arrival in Australia they found an efficient primary network run by Czechs, covering practically every form of business and professional activity.

Although there were professional people among the 1948 refugees their services could not be used as many professional activities were regulated by licensing or registration, conditioned by strict control of Australian professional bodies or trade associations. For instance the first Czech speaking registered physicians and dentists began to practice after completion of additional studies in Australia around the end of the 1950s. Other professionals, like accountants, teachers, lawyers, nurses and others had often to study again to obtain registration in their professions.

Areas of needs which were supplied to the 1968 newcomers by their 1948 countrymen (the newly arrived could communicate in Czech when seeking help in areas of needs):

(i) Food
   Delicatessen
   Butchers
   Bakers
   Pastry cooks
   Small goods manufacturers

(ii) Real Estate
    Flats for rents
    Housing purchase
    Private accommodation
| (iii) | Interpreting and Translations | Editorial office of Hlas domova
Private agencies
Solicitors
Banks |
| (iv) | Medical | Physicians
Medical specialists
Nurses |
| (v)  | Dental  | Surgeons
Technicians |
| (vi) | Legal   | Barristers
Solicitors |
| (vii) | Religion | Roman Catholic clergy |
| (viii) | Insurance | Life
Property
Miscellaneous |
| (ix) | Recreational | Restaurants
Hotels
Guest Houses
Chalets
Recreational |
| (x)  | Motor car needs | Taxis
Used car dealers
Repairs
Garages
Driving instructor
Taxi trucks
Hauliers |
| (xi) | Business Matters | Taxation
Book keeping
Accounting |
| (xii) | Education | Primary teachers
Secondary teachers
Tertiary teachers |
| (xiii) | Newspapers | Booksellers
(Czech language books) |
| (xiv) | Tradesmen and Miscellaneous | Tradesmen -
Printers
Carpenters
Cabinet makers
Painters
Electricians
Plumbers
Builders
Bricklayers
Tailors
Shoemakers
Seamstresses |
Miscellaneous -  
Optometrist  
Osteopath  
Masseur  
Jeweller  
Watchmaker  
Gunsmith

The above services, although they seem an obvious part of living in a society, had a tremendous influence and helped in the initial stages of the 1968 re-settlement. A married woman remembering her first shopping day stated -

I did not want to believe it. I was taken by car to do my shopping by one of the 1948 settlers and during our outing we visited a Czech speaking delicatessen, butcher, milkbar, hairdresser and the newsagent who also ran a dry-cleaning sub-agency. My first shopping days in Australia therefore became very easy.

Another interviewee who purchased a home several weeks after his arrival indicated how useful his countrymen's help was

We went to a Czech estate agent whose business included the suburb we wanted to buy a house in. We had found a home which we liked. The estate agent recommended us a Czech solicitor and took us to a bank, where they had a Czech translator. The estate agent also gave us the names of Czech speaking tradesmen. Our task of purchasing a home, which procedure for a non-English speaking person could have been a nightmare was very easy because of the 'older' Czech settlers.

A similar appreciation of primary structures was very common in those early for the 1968 intake. The structures covered not only basic needs such as sustenance or repairs, but also professional services. A medical practitioner in the eastern suburbs of Melbourne had a clientele from different suburbs, and even from the country. A secondary teacher received many calls from numerous new settlers who were trying to find out where and how to place their children in schools.

44 This summary is based on the availability of such services in the Metropolitan area of Melbourne.
To help the new-comers with the familiarisation of the educational system a community meeting was organised in Melbourne where all aspects of education in Australia were discussed; conducted in the Czech language, it attracted nearly 60 parents. During this meeting it was learnt that no bookshops in Melbourne had any English-Czech textbooks from which the new arrivals could study English. The teacher volunteered to prepare a basic Czech-English reader, which he completed in four weeks. The Czechoslovak Relief Fund paid the cost of paper and printing, and these books were distributed free of charge to those interested.

The Czech primary structures therefore played an important role in the re-settlement of the 1968 Czechs. They functioned as a 'cushion' in the initial stages of their life in Australia.

Secondary structures

After the basic needs were satisfied, the 1968 settlers had a further option, the organisational network which offered them supportive social ethnic interaction. These organisations formed the secondary network in 1968 and 1969, and could be divided into:

(i) social
(ii) cultural
(iii) sporting

The social organisations covered areas such as membership in local state associations, whose main activities consisted of social evenings, dances, and organising commemorative celebrations. The cultural activities included Czech language theatres, Czech language schools, and Czech language libraries. In the sphere of sport, there were several clubs available offering soccer, volleyball, basketball and gymnastics.

The organisational leaders expected that the influx of over 6,000 Czechoslovak-born was the impetus they needed. They believed the new blood would rejuvenate the dormant Czech communities' life. The organisational leaders were encouraged by responses of people rallying to help newcomers. The rallies which took place after the August occupation of Czechoslovakia in all Australian capital cities were the biggest ones ever seen in Czech ethnic life. They were the only rallies taking place in the 1960s; they were also very different
from the previous ones in the 1950s when they were frequented by
Czechs only. This time also members of the host society took place.

_Hlas domova_ began to inform the newly arrived settlers
about all different organisations. The members of the organisations
provided transport and the doors for the newcomers to enter were
fully opened. _Hlas domova_ was sent to them free of charge. A member
of a Melbourne social club stated:

> We did not charge them anything to come
to our dances. We even gave them a free
meal, free transport and an invitation to
join us.

By the end of 1968 and early 1969 the attendances in social
events had increased and these functions were the only ones the new
settlers patronised. The sporting clubs initiated by the 1948 group
had either disappeared or had gone through the process of ageing,
therefore were clubs in name only, while the team members were either
Australian-born or immigrants from other ethnic groups. Also by
1968-9 the 1948 group was older, averaging between 44-50 years of age
therefore it was out of the question for active sporting
participation.

The younger people therefore had a need for sporting
activities and this led to the establishment of several sporting
bodies. Table 51 shows these new associations:

**Table 52**

**Sporting associations founded by the 1968 intake**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech Volleyball Club</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1969-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Volleyball Club</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1969-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovan</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1970-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovan Soccer Club</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1972-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis Club</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1972-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemians</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above sporting organisational bodies were frequented mainly by the 1968 settlers. Besides these bodies they also formed associations of a social nature.

Table 53
Social organisations founded by the 1968 intake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents association</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1969-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Boomerang</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1972-73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some associations were rejuvenated and returned to their original activities and both, 1948 and 1968 groups, participated in the lives of the organisation. They are:

Society of Arts and Sciences  Melbourne  1971-1986
Society of Arts and Sciences  Sydney     1972-1986
Folklore Dancing Group       Melbourne  1971-1982

In 1986 only the first and second organisation exists with very scanty activity. It therefore can be deduced that the 1968 intake did not contribute much to the ethnic organisational life. Comparative evidence shows that the 1948 settlers were far more organisationally oriented.

Table 54
Comparative table of organisations formed by the 1948 and 1968 intakes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Intake 1948</th>
<th>Intake 1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social organisations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastic organisations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The non-involvement on the 1948 scale took the organisational leaders by surprise and the partial answer began gradually to appear. By the beginning of 1969 when the excitement of arrival for the new settlers and the initial stages of immigration were over and it appeared the impact of several months in Australia had produced a feeling of frustration and confusion. In many cases this feeling was manifested in the form of criticism of Australia. Letters couched in these terms began to reach ethnic publications. One letter, written by a 1968 refugee stated that:

Amongst the latest immigrants are many dissatisfied and pessimistic people. They do not know why they escaped and now they constantly abuse the Australian Government because it has failed them and things are different from what they were told.42

The representatives of the Australian Immigration Department apparently stated that refugees would be able to find employment according to their qualifications and experience. Many of the immigrants had come from professional and specialist type of employment, based on the linguistic backgrounds of their native language. There were some economists, experts in Slavic languages and people of similar professional background. They came from the type of employment which are the most unpractical and often useless from a point of employment in a new country. And even if employable, perfect knowledge of English is a prerequisite for such employment. In spite of this many found their type of employment even with insufficient English.

There was another important point which began to emerge.

The Czechoslovak Government began to appeal to all 1968 refugees, asking them to return. Some refugees approached the Consular office in Sydney, where they were told that should they decide to return to Czechoslovakia, the Czechoslovak Government would help them financially to cover the cost of the return trip. This became known throughout the ethnic community, and more letters began to appear. One reader wrote:

42 Hlas domova, 20 June 1969.
It is noticeable that for a group of the new immigrants the question of personal freedom became a secondary matter, and even now they still admire the philosophy which persecuted freedom.43

People who fell into the category of persons described in the above letter made contact with Prague newspapers, one of which, Zitrek, published a letter signed by four immigrants living in Sydney, saying:

Here in Sydney we are political emigree, refugees from Communism. The paradox of this is that we are members of the Dubcek Communist Party. Australians and older immigrants have a wrong picture about our situation at home. Our small group is trying to rectify this. We do not hide our position. We publicly acknowledge and associate ourselves with the post-January development and the line of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. We hope to return eventually to live among the people at home whose values are more than a full refrigerator and a fat bank account. We used the opportunity given to us in the crucial time to travel abroad. Many of us wanted to see Australia. Now there is a great number of us here who would like to return. We did not escape because of persecutions. We just used the opportunity to see something that was impossible for us to see under normal conditions.44

J.L., D.L., J.K., V.H., Sydney, N.S.W.

The writers of this letter were not only critical of older immigrants, but also of the Australian society as a whole. They had left Czechoslovakia with official passports and special exit permits. Their letter was reprinted in Hlas domova, 20 December 1968, and it added more fuel to the discussion about new immigrants. It was well known that there were among the refugees a large number of members of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. What angered the community in Sydney was that these people who publicly associated themselves with Czechoslovak Communist political line were simultaneously enjoying the hospitality of Australia. Many letters to the editor reflected this feeling. I quote some of them to show the attitude of the community.

I would like to ask the authors of this letter only one question. Since when did they begin to act as active members of the Czechoslovak Communist Party again? Have they mentioned their party membership to the Australian Consul during their interviews when applying for immigration to Australia?

K.W., Melbourne, Vic. 45

Many of them talk about what has happened in 1968 in Czechoslovakia and would like to get credit for this. What about the other things such as 127,000 political prisoners in Communist jails?

D.K., Sydney, N.S.W. 46

Some stated that the reason they escaped was that they had no flat or home of their own.

M.C., Melbourne, Vic. 47

For the first time I am arguing with Czechoslovak Communists when they have not got the support of the police or any other form of totalitarian state.

K.W., Melbourne, Vic. 48

How can they as Communists shelter in a capitalist country? This is a matter of morality which in their case is very low.

J.L., New Norfolk, Tas. 49

These people are confidence men, human leeches with whom we should break off contacts. They all escaped because of mass hysteria and a longing for materialism in capitalist world.

J.V., Melbourne, Vic. 50

45 Hlas domova, 15 January 1969.
48 Ibid.
49 Ibid.
There were also a number of letters which tried to placate readers. The writers stressed that the experiences of the 1948 and 1968 refugees were different, and thus the issues which emerged after 1968 in Australia should be looked at from this point of view. An interesting letter which summarises this view was sent to Hlas domova from Sydney.

I would like to say that as people the 1948 refugees are different from us, settlers of 1968, who for the last twenty years lived under Communism. If anyone is incarcerated for a long period of time, he usually bears the scars of this imprisonment. We were for twenty years isolated from the rest of the world. To live through this, we had to believe what we were told. We isolated ourselves from our surroundings, we were frightened to talk to a fellow worker about what we really thought once we knew he was a party member. It was like the German occupation during World War II, but even worse. We lived in isolation and it will take a long time to dispose of this feeling, especially among us older people, who have come to enjoy the taste of freedom. People at home believed that everything in the west, in the capitalist system was fantastic, rich, and money could be earned without special effort. Officially we were told that everything in capitalism was rotten and decadent. A small country like Czechoslovakia always lauded its achievements. Any success became a national issue and the government tried to show the superiority of our system. The development of this false set of attitudes resulted in a lack of objectivity, and this was one of the reasons that we have never fully understood what the refugees of 1948 have had to go through in Australia.51

The above letter was written by a settler of the 1968 intake and shows the deep seated differences which suddenly began to appear in Czech community life.

51 Hlas domova, 14 April 1969.
At the same time the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia began to consolidate its pro-Soviet pre-1968 position and started with the re-construction of its diplomatic service. Since 1965 the Czechoslovak Consul-General in Sydney had been K. Franc when in 1969 he was informed that he should return to Prague for reporting, he understood the Communist jargon well, knowing that 'reporting' meant the end of his consular career. He asked for political asylum for himself and his family, which was granted by the Australian Government. This act of granting him asylum displeased the Czechoslovak communities in Australia, as K. Franc was described as being instrumental in not recommending approvals for many 1948 Czechs to visit their country between 1965 and 1968. When the communities learnt about his application to asylum, petitions from Melbourne, Adelaide and Sydney were sent to the Prime Minister, asking him not to grant K.F. political asylum. There were other consular officers and members of their families who preferred the realities of Australia to the promises of Czechoslovakia.

52 Hlas domova, 13 July 1970.
4.4 A COMPARISON OF THE 1948 AND 1968 WAVES

Discussing Czech settlers of the 1948 and 1968 intakes, it would be expected that both groups display a certain amount of basic similarities; they hail from the same country in Central Europe, speak the same language, both groups became refugees, and both display similar patterns in their ethnic expressions and behaviour to a certain extent.

In the previous parts of this thesis the characteristics and attitudes of both groups were discussed. In spite of their basic commonalities there were many aspects of disassimilarities which are important to understand about their behaviour and their integrative moulding into the structure of the host society. The information used in this section comes from several sources, such as the questionnaire, official publications, literature and the personal experience of the writer.

Both groups regarded themselves as being refugees, escaping from a communist dominated country. As such both groups were given the protection of organisations overseeing the re-settlement of political refugees. In spite of this common beginning the differences between the two groups emerged very quickly.

In finding why settlers left Czechoslovakia interesting facts begin to emerge. The personal persecution among the 1948 group was the most reported answer, claimed by 73.8 per cent of the interviewees. The same question was posed for the 1968 intake and only 1.9 per cent indicated that they had escaped because of being persecuted. Also opposition to the Czechoslovak regime was higher in the 1948 group (21.4%) than in the 1968 intake (12.9%).

Analyzing the option 'Other reason', out of the 80 (1968) respondents, the most common choice was the "Fear of living under Soviet domination" (37.5%), followed by "Fear of political consequences" (20%), and "longing for a free world" (21.2%). It therefore appears that the 1948 group was more directed personal pressure and threat while still in Czechoslovakia after the Communist take-over. The case of the 1968 groups appears to be different; consisting of different pressures and threats. The people of that
group were not threatened overtly, but feared what may happen in the future.

The 1948 group became refugees in the post-war era when Europe was just beginning to emerge from the post-war years and economic chaos. They therefore had to share often their destiny with other nationalities and were shielded under the terms of Displaced Persons.

After living in substandard camp conditions, without an income they had to learn to appreciate and tolerate the limited comfort which was offered to them. They accepted the realities of hardships and what was in store for them; their stay in refugee camps gave them enough time to prepare themselves for the up-rooting, to prepare themselves psychologically for the process of re-settling in foreign lands.

Some began to study the language of the land which would probably accept them for emigration. Others, with no practical or utilitarian qualifications sought re-training provided by the International Refugee Organisation. Before being approved for emigration they had to proceed through a rigorous clearance, consisting of screening by a Czech refugee organisation, military screening and finally by the International Refugee Organisation. After this long procedure, the Australian Security and Australian immigration officers were the final instances scrutinizing the prospective emigrant. Once accepted, after waiting for several months for the clearance procedures, the emigrants prepared themselves for the long voyage by sea to Australia, a voyage lasting between 5-7 weeks, depending on the type of the vessel.

These emigrants therefore had ample time to prepare themselves physically and psychologically for the prospect of re-settlement. The long sea voyage to the distant continent gave many the opportunity to study English. Some, after several years again had some decent food aboard the ship. They discussed their future and their plans in Australia with other passengers and many long lasting friendships were made during such a voyage. The time between their departure from their home country until they reached their port of disembarkation varied from one and a half to three
years. When they finally made port, they knew that they were penniless immigrants and not tourists.

The experiences of the 1968 group were entirely different. Western Germany and Austria were by 1968 highly prosperous countries, with some of the highest living standards in Europe. The high living standard was therefore reflected in institutional behaviours in those two countries, including the treatment of those seeking asylum.

The escapees were not accommodated in dilapidated refugee camps, but offered shelter in hotels, hostels, summer camps or accommodation in private homes. The general sympathy of the world at that time was on the Czech refugees side. The television screens told their story in every corner of the world. Combining this with altruism and the experience with the Czech settlers in immigrant receiving countries were undoubtedly positive factors which led to the fact, that several countries, including Australia, opened their doors to the prospective settlers. In case of Australian immigration possibilities, the process of acceptance for emigration was short, consisting of an appointment with the Australian immigration officer and the consul. Though the background of an applicant was investigated, there was none of the rigour of 1948 screening. Once accepted they were flown to Australia, a trip lasting 16 hours. Often, within a month after their departure from Czechoslovakia, they were in Australia.

Because of the short period of time between their arrival from Czechoslovakia, the 1968 settlers did not have the time to develop organisational networks in Western Germany or Austria while waiting for emigration. Also other pre-departure aspects of the 1948 intake would have been difficult to re-create for the 1968 group. Although the conditions of the 1968 settlers were hard, the 1968 was affected by different stresses; the psychological pressures on the 1968 group may even have been greater.

Comparing the respondents' answers so far as the decision to emigrate to Australia is concerned diverse results were obtained. While the 1948 group selected Australia because it offered the shortest waiting time for emigration from Europe (according to 91.5% of respondents), the 1968 intake's most popular choice was, that English is used in Australia (answered by 38%).
The pre-knowledge of the country of planned settlement is regarded as an influential factor for their emigration decision according to some researchers. Although in both cases the interviewees indicated that their knowledge of Australia before their arrival was limited (in both cases the most numerous answers) the number of those answering this question differed. While 72.8 per cent 1948 refugees stated their limited knowledge, the figure for 1968 group was lower, reaching 43.6 per cent. While the knowledge of Australia by the February refugees was based on 'heresay' attitude, the knowledge of the 1968 intake had been supported by opportunities to read either books about Australia by the Czech authors or by the translated Australian literature.

Pre-knowledge of Australia

The 1968 group were informed as well about Australia as the 1948 immigrants. Literary culture is strongly established in Czechoslovakia. The land-locked Czechs have always been interested to read about the distant world and lands.

While the only introduction to Australia for the post-war immigrants had been the film The Overlanders and the very successful visit of the Australian musician Graham Bell and his popular jazz band, who toured Czechoslovakia for several months in 1947, the 1968 arrivals had had a chance to read a great deal about Australia.

Not being permitted to travel abroad, they compensated for this loss by reading about the outside world. Czechoslovakian publishing houses published many works by Australian authors, largely those of a left-wing political orientation.

Many of the 1968 settlers were therefore well informed about Australia, its history, its tradition and its contemporary society. This knowledge came not only from Czechs who had visited Australia and had written in Czech about their experiences, but also from Australian writers whose works were translated into Czech and were widely read in editions which ran as high as 100,000 copies, as in the case of Eric Lambert's The Twenty Thousand Thieves.

The first major introduction of Australian literature to Czech readers took place when a Prague magazine Světova literatura (World literature), published a special Australian issue in 1957. It
was here that the Czech reader met for the first time the works of Henry Lawson, Vance Palmer, Alan Marshall, John Morrison, Frank Hardy, Dal Stivens and some of the Australian bush balladists.

The publications of Australian writers began shortly after World War II with the publication of Katharine Susannah Prichard's *Manby's Circus*. Frank Hardy's *Power without Glory*, Marcus Clarke's *For the Term of his Natural Life*, Alan Marshall's *I Can Jump Puddles*, Judah Waten's *Shares in Murder*, and others.

Patrick White's work, *The Tree of Man*, published in the early 1960s, was received with considerable literary respect and interest. About the same time an anthology of Henry Lawson's stories was published in a prestige series of world classics. This collection was edited by Ian Milner, whose lectures on Australian literature at the Charles University of Prague have greatly contributed to a deeper knowledge and understanding of Australian writing.

Of special interest, perhaps, has been the success of Dal Stivens' collection of stories, *Ironbark Bill*; these were not only published but broadcast as well, and one of them forms the basis for an amusing animated cartoon. The Australian writer who has the most appeal for the Czech reading public is undoubtedly Alan Marshall, especially his book *I Can Jump Puddles*.

Czech readers have been won not only by his sensitive description of life in an Australian township in the horse-and-buggy days, but above all by the moving story of a little boy facing up to a life on crutches and refusing to be excluded from the ordinary activities of his school mates and friends or to surrender to self-pity. Marshall's book has, incidentally, been of very great encouragement to many afflicted people in Czechoslovakia. This story was filmed in Czechoslovakia under the same title in 1965; the film has been shown in many countries including Australia.

Despite the wide interest of Czech readers in translations from other sectors of world literature, Australian writing does seem to hold a special place for many of the reading public in Czechoslovakia. To demonstrate this, the list of Australian works translated into Czech between 1953-1973 reached thirty-five
publications. This interest could be explained by the fact that Australia still has, in the European mind, some of the aura of the Wild West. European readers are fascinated by stories of the gold rushes, adventures in the bush, and the unique environment. There may also be an imaginative longing for the free and simple existence which is commonly thought to be connected with life in a young and pioneering country.

The learning of English offers also a different proposal. As indicating before the way of emigration from Europe after the war as compared with the late 1960s were entirely different. While the 1948 intake had more time before their departure for Australia, 61.3 per cent indicated that they began to study English after being accepted for Australia. Because of the shortened period of time before being accepted for Australia and their departure, the short time played a negligent part in this aspect and only 15.9 per cent indicated that they began to be exposed to English learning after their arrival. The majority of them took up learning of English in Australia.

Educational data collected favoured the 1968 group. While only 14.4 per cent of the February refugees had tertiary qualifications the figure for the 1968 group reached 41 per cent. The explanation for the lower educational standard so far as tertiary qualifications are concerned lies in the fact that during World War II (1939-1945) all tertiary institutions were closed by the Germans. They were reopened in September 1945, and that would offer some explanation for the lower number of the tertiary graduates among the 1948 group and for the large number of tertiary students among them, who began to study in 1945.

The 1968 graduates were qualified mainly in technical areas, which are the most popular and supported section of tertiary studies in Communist countries. For instance there were no law graduates among the 1968 university trained people; among the 1948 graduates, it is estimated that a third of them had degrees in law. Also, Czechoslovakia introduced and supported generously part-time study in the 1950s in the area of technological studies; this may be an important factor, why so many had technical qualifications. Any person in technological employment had a change to complete higher qualifications receiving time off once approved.
Again, secondary qualifications standard was higher among the 1948 refugees (47.4%) than the 1968 intake (34%).

Organisational ethnic life was far more favoured by the 1948 group than that one of 1968. In the first five years of their stay in Australia, the 1948 group supported positively the organisational life and 75.7 per cent indicated their support for this activity, against 24.7 per cent in the case of the 1968 group. While the support for national organisations in the first intake reached 78.2 per cent, in the case of the second intake it was only 3.9 per cent. The support of ethnic organisations after 8-10 years in Australia had declined and only 11.5 per cent (1948) indicated some support while 7.4 per cent (1968) were organisationally supportive.

The reason for the differences in both groups could be explained from a historical point of view. The 1948 group was deprived of any political activity and associational participation during the war years and some (like some pre-war political parties) even after World War II. After World War II different organisations in Czechoslovakia had been established in large numbers during the two and a half years between the end of the war and the Communist take-over, and the refugees had taken this social phenomenon with them into the exile.

The 1968 refugees were exposed to Communist pressures not only politically, but also in trade unions, schools, places of employment, para-military organisation, army, daily press and in sectarian social organisations. These pressures consistent of obligatory membership of trade unions, attending regular trade union meetings and subscribing Communist Party daily and trade union newspapers. "Voluntary working brigades" were formed helping during harvest seasons, potato harvesting, fruit and hop picking with no pay received for this work. Similarly the citizens were working once or twice per month on Saturdays; like previously, no pay was received for this work. Also compulsory were protest meetings against any western 'imperialist' country, celebration of the work achievements of some group of people, etc. As one of the interviewees indicated that
The most remarkable point of 1968 in Czechoslovakia was that the organisational pressure ceased and that meant the end of the numerous and useless meetings which had to be compulsory attended.

The interviewees indicated that the organisational pressure imposed on them in Czechoslovakia formed some resistance among the 1968 settlers to full participation in the organisational life even in Australia. Also the ethnic organisations had meaningless purpose for them; they were based on nostalgic memories of an era they could not understand. Over half of my interviewees were educated between 1948-1968 and therefore the celebrations of the birthday of the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic and other nostalgic celebrations were meaningless to them.

The political aspects show an interesting result. The 1948 group favoured the Democratic Labour Party in their first election in Australia, followed by the Liberal Party and finally the Australian Labour Party. The support of the Democratic Labour Party among the Czech voters lasted till 1972, the year during which a federal election was held and which was disastrous for this party.

By the 1980s the voting pattern has continued and when the 1948 interviewees of this sample were asked how they would vote in 1985, the result indicated that 79.7 per cent would vote for the Liberal Party. The 1968 group showed the same voting preference for Liberals in their first election in 1975 (40.4%), followed by the Australian Labour Party (35.1%). When asked how they would vote in 1985, the highest figure went to the Liberal Party (47.7%), followed by the Australian Labour Party (38.4%), and finally the Democrats (13.9%). Although both favoured the Liberal Party, the Australian Labour Party has more followers among the 1968 group than among the 1948 intake.

As far as the satisfaction with Australia was concerned the 1968 group were happier after their arrival in Australia than the 1948 group. The ratio indicating satisfaction was 44 per cent to 11.6 per cent. The reason for this would be the characteristics of the initial re-settlement period when the 1948 was obliged to complete the contract under conditions previously described. The 1968 group had a different 'welcome' to Australia as far as
accommodation, employment and social conditions were concerned. One of the interviewees indicated:

My first six weeks in Australia before I started to work were very pleasant. It was like a holiday.

The satisfaction with Australia in the 1980s reached higher figures when this question was answered positively by 90.3 per cent of the 1948 group and 88.2 per cent of the 1968 group. Those who answered this question negatively felt that the different type of work they have to do is the reason why they are not fully happy in Australia.

Both groups displayed mixed feelings so far as Australian culture is concerned. Both felt upon their arrival that their culture is superior to that of the host society. This attitude which is common in Europe has been transplanted to Australia and is common to other ethnic groups. The time of residence gradually changed this attitude.

The differences arose among the members of both groups soon after the arrival of the 1968 group. These differences were soon noticeable in the declining participation of the 1968 settlers in the ethnic organisational activities.

The August refugees were regarded by their predecessors as people indoctrinated by the Communist ideas and some were even accused of being ex-members of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.

Analysing the vital statistics data of the Czechoslovak-born a picture of diverse characteristics begins to emerge.

The number of male migrants to Australia have normally exceeded the number of female migrants. The Czechoslovak-born were no exception. In 1954, there were 2.4 per cent more males than females in the population of Australia as a whole, a surplus slightly larger than that recorded seven years previously when the sexes were almost balanced. The increase in the surplus of males in the total population was brought about by the intercensal immigration, which increased the masculinity rate of the overseas born from 127.5 in 1947 to 132.7 in 1954. The figures among Czechoslovak-born were
higher, indicating that in 1947 there were 165.95 males per 100 females, and in 1954 the ratio had increased to 204.44 males per 100 females. Only the figures of Yugoslav-born were higher.

Table 55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males per 100 females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3,380,324</td>
<td>3,454,857</td>
<td>97.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>165.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>4,281</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>270.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census 1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males per 100 females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3,812,435</td>
<td>3,887,629</td>
<td>98.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>8,515</td>
<td>4,165</td>
<td>204.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>15,473</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>209.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males per 100 females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5,037,098</td>
<td>5,139,222</td>
<td>98.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>10,179</td>
<td>6,427</td>
<td>158.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>74,695</td>
<td>55,121</td>
<td>135.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of the 1968 intake the masculinity ratio has decreased, according to the 1971 Census.
The figures of males per 100 females show a reduction from
204.44 males per 100 females in 1954 to 158 males per 100 females in
1971. During the 1970s mainly married immigrants arrived, those
registered as single in 1971 Census married and by 1981 the
male/female ratio of the Czechoslovak-born was 59:41.

Age

The 1948 intake consisted, as in the case of other
Displaced Persons group, of a large number of young people. In 1950
altogether 42.5 per cent of the Czechoslovak-born were in the 21-30
age group. Also they showed the highest percentage of males of all
foreign-born in the age group of 15-64 years, and shared with the
Dutch the lowest number of people over 65 years of age. Also the
number of children aged 0-14 was the smallest of all immigrant
groups.

The situation among the 1968 was different. As a group
they were 'older' and 36.5 per cent were in the age group between
25-35. The youth of the 1948 intake had some influence on the
marriage pattern. Nearly 60 per cent of the 1948 were single men and
women; out of this number nearly 56 per cent married in Australia.
The number for the 1968 intake was much lower with 29 per cent of
single people and nearly 24 per cent of the married in Australia.
There were therefore more single men and women and fewer married
people in the 1948 group. The situation in the 1968 group was the
reverse. The shortage of Czech-born single women led to a
significant degree of intermarriage with women of different ethnic
backgrounds. As indicated before, the number of children in the 1948
intake was the smallest of all immigrant groups, amounting to 7.5 per
cent. In the case of the 1968 settlers the figure rose to 18.5 per
cent.

Attitude towards Communism

The 1948 refugees, as their history of attitudes indicates,
were very opposed to Communism. This attitude was found in all
aspects of their organisational behaviour, mainly in their
organisational life, newspapers, demonstrations, lobbying and even
social festivities. The anti-Communist notion became a part of
constitutions of many clubs and associations.
It also had a deep seated effect on their voting in Australia. Although nearly two thirds of the refugees were members of two socialist parties (National Socialists and Social Democrats), which were 'middle-to-right' parties, only a small proportion of them would support the Australian Labour Party. In both above mentioned socialist parties, the left-wingers tried to take over the leadership of the parties machines in 1947 Czechoslovakia. This historical connotation coupled with the anti-Communism undoubtedly influenced their stance and voting pattern in Australia.

The 1968 group never displayed any anti-Communist activity on a larger scale as documented by the 1948 group. Living for twenty years under Communism, it is possible that they displayed more tolerance and even acceptance of Communism. For them it was a historical fact, a reality they had experienced for nearly a generation.

**Ethnic Life**

The 1948 Czechs' keeness on ethnic activities resulted in the formation of numerous social associations and clubs. The national ethos was reflected in the celebration of national days. Programs and parades were prepared for such occasions, national costumes were worn and displayed, and musicians played national songs and Czech compositions. Such features were common in the Czech communities in Australia between the 1950s and 1960s.

The intake of 1968 displayed reservations regarding participation in the above or similar activities. Their participation was minimal; those who may have been involved were mainly older people, who could still remember aspects of democratic and pre-Communist Czechoslovakia.

**Working Conditions**

The intake of 1948 consisted of contracted or bonded 'workers', who had to fulfil the two year contract, mainly consisting of menial work. For many the physical and unaccustomed work coupled with their re-settlement beginnings in a country completely different from their homeland, was too difficult a burden. Australians looked on them as being from a labouring class, and realising that they were ingoing a form of indentured labour. The refugees themselves
developed, as eight of my interviewees stated, an inferiority complex. Their self-image, although professionals, had been severely affected, and consequently, according to four of the respondees, after finishing their contract, they did not have enough courage to apply for a different and better job in spite of the fact that their English was by then reasonable and they were fully qualified for some jobs.

This led to the point, that after their contract work, they were willing to do any type of work. Many of them stayed in these types of positions until their retirement.

The history of the 1968 group was different. They did not go through all the hardship of the refugee life as experienced by their predecessors. It could be said that their self-concept had not been 'damaged' to the extent of their predecessors, therefore their occupational entry into the Australian employment scene was entirely different. They therefore had the courage to ask to be employed in jobs they had had in their home country. Some, in spite of their limited English, succeeded, some not.

While the 1948 group members had difficulties with their qualifications the 1958 settlers' educational qualifications were fully recognised except in some cases like medicine and dentistry to a certain extent. They obtained positions with persons with the same qualifications would never had acquired twenty years earlier. While the retraining among the 1948 group existed, it was seldom found among the 1968 intake. In my sample, 12 persons went through retraining whilst none of the 1968 group did.

It therefore could be said that the earlier group tolerated hardship more; the 1968 displayed less tolerance in this aspect. While the majority of the 1948 people accepted any work proposed to them, the 1968 were more selective. In my sample 24 interviewees or 24.9 per cent refused the first offer of a job, regarding it as unsuitable to their background and qualifications.

Tertiary Students

Among the 1948 refugees were a large number of tertiary students who were either expelled from Czech universities or who left of their own will. Some attempts were made by some to study in
Australia again. At that time no help existed for refugee students and recognition of studies was not very common in most areas. Individual attitudes were crucial, as well as the ability to overcome the initial disabilities.

In contrast, the 1968 Czech university students received much more sympathetic treatment. Australian universities were more liberal minded so far as recognition of previous studies was concerned, and the Federal Department of Education and students' organisations gave them practical assistance.

In 1969, the student body placed a statement in the Hlas domova (September 15, 1969) which indicated that:

The World University Service in Australia contacted students who left Czechoslovakia, and about 40 of them, studying in Sydney and Melbourne, received scholarships. At the beginning of this year many of the students we contacted postponed their studies till 1970. We would like to get in touch with these students. They should contact us immediately, indicating if they are still interested in studying at local tertiary institutions. It is important that these students should apply now for admittance, as later applications may not be considered.

World University Service in Australia, Carlton, Vic. 54
B.O'Dwyer, Executive Secretary

Also an extensive language training was offered to all Czechoslovak-born university students. Out of forty students only twenty-three completed the courses in which they had enrolled.

The willingness to obtain Australian qualifications was probably higher among the 1948 group than 1968. This finding is based on the experiences of ex-students, who attended Australian universities in the 1950s and 1960s, remembering the number of students as small but sufficient enough to form Czech students group.

54 Hlas domova, 15 September 1969.
Czech and Slovak Relationship

Czechs and Slovaks form the two main nations of Czechoslovakia. Both nations were part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy; Czech under the Austrians while the Slovaks under the Hungarians. The Czech leader T.G.Masaryk met the representatives of a number of Czech and Slovak societies in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, U.S.A., on June 30, 1918, and together they signed protocol, known as the 'Pittsburgh Agreement'. The document, a program rather than a Constitutional Act, since it was signed by American citizens and by Masaryk (not yet elected, at that time, as Czechoslovakia's President), proclaimed the desire of the Czechs and Slovaks to live in an independent state, and agreed that Slovakia should have its own administration, its own parliament, and its own courts.55

Unfortunately the Pact was to become one of the most controversial documents in Czechoslovakia's history. In Czechoslovakia there was a conflict over the meaning of the agreement between those who supported a strong central government in Prague and those who favoured 'state's rights'. For the Slovak 'autonomists', later known as 'separatists', the document meant the promise of larger state's rights. Hitler used this division to his own benefit to make the country easier to overcome and when his armies occupied Czechoslovakia in 1939, he created a Slovak state, which lasted till his fall in 1945.56

The President of this Slovak state, which was set up by the Nazis in March, 1939, was Josef Tiso, a Roman Catholic priest, who was later executed after the war as a Nazi collaborator. This act of execution resulted in an even wider split between separatist Slovaks and Czechs, which resulted also in complete ethnic separation in the refugee camps created for the Czechoslovak refugees from Czechoslovakia. About a third of Slovaks were favouring a co-operation with the Czechs, the rest were anti-Czech. The relations upon arrival in 1948-50 remained very tense between these two groups and led to separate ethnic development in Australia.

56 Harriet Wanklyn, op cit, p.212.
Twenty years of communist rule changed not only the influence of the Catholic Church over Slovaks in Czechoslovakia, but also changed the attitude towards Czechs. The distrust had faded away and the lack of co-operation is not so noticeable among the Slovaks settlers of 1968 as it was among their compatriots thirty-five years ago.
CHAPTER FIVE

IMMIGRANT TYPOLOGIES

The decision to emigrate is the decision between the fear of the known and the fear of the unknown.

5.1 TYPES AND MOTIVES

Evidence and documentation from previous chapters indicates the complexity of refugees' re-settlement and re-establishment. To obtain a clear picture of refugees' behaviour a taxonomy of immigrant types according to the main motive departure will be discussed.

The knowledge of how migration processes began is important to understand the basic issues concerned with emigration and immigration. The first categorisation of processes of migration appeared in the 1920s and since then the social sciences have been enriched by additional theories. One of the first was Fairchild's classification which identifies several categories of population movement such as invasion, conquest, colonisation, and immigration.¹ This typology is useful in suggesting that subsequent integration and assimilation varies with the causes and manner of migration.

A more complex typology is presented by William Petersen, who applies two main criteria: the migratory force, i.e. the ecological push, and the conservative versus innovative type of immigration.² Julius Isaac divided migration into two broad categories: Free (seasonal, nomadic, temporary, permanent); Forced (refugee, slave, population transfer).³ Although these typologies contain some distinctions, they have considerable value in determining various kinds of migration and, consequently, various assimilation situations. While the typologies seem to be easy to understand, the complicated issues of motives need more detailed consideration.

To understand the motives, the approach needs to be more oriented to the individual than to grand deterministic causes, and the resultant taxonomy will categorise emigrants. To obtain a clear understanding to the proposed model will be used to demonstrate the motivational issue. Also the differences between the legal and illegal emigrant need more detailed explanation as these two concepts, mainly the 'illegality' of emigration are often misunder-

---
stood. Similarly, the relationship between the non-economic and economic emigrant will be elaborated.

Table 57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emigration motives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main features of this model are two criteria - motive (i.e. pre-dominant motive) and legal status (i.e. in the eyes of the old country).

While a Czech refugee may be a legal immigrant in Australia, in Czechoslovakia he is regarded as an illegal emigrant, because he left his homeland as an escapee without official permission, without a passport and visa, or he was escaping from some form of possible detention.

The terms of legality and illegality are of fundamental importance as far as immigrants and their future integration in the new country is concerned. Whereas categories A + B, and C + D are not mutually exclusive, all the remaining combinations of categories are exclusive. For instance an immigrant who departed from Kampuchea may have been running both from the dictator Pol Pot and from starvation. Yet, he cannot be both a legal and illegal departee at the same time.

To clarify the basic forms of legal and illegal emigrant and immigrant the following explanation may be helpful.

Emigrant:

Legal : A person who leaves the country with the necessary documents such as passports, visas and acceptance from the country he wishes to settle.

Illegal : A person, usually a citizen of a country ruled by a government who leaves the country because of a threat to personal liberty or because he disagrees with the political system. He leaves his country
usually without permission of the authorities, often without any travel documents. Since 1948 Czechoslovakia has viewed these actions as a breach of the law and the perpetrator, if found, is automatically arrested.

**Immigrant:**

**Legal** : A person accepted by a country where he wishes to settle.

**Illegal** : A person who enters a country of his choice without necessary documents indicating that he is permitted to visit or settle in that particular country.

Returning to Table 57 with the heading 'Emigration Motives', the details in this table could be explained accordingly:

**A.** : Legal emigrants who left the old country for Australia not basically for predominantly economic reasons. The eventual political motivation within this category could be exemplified by, say, West Germans who fear Soviet expansion in Europe or Britons who fear non-Caucasian immigration to the United Kingdom.

**B.** : Legal emigrants who left for the new country for predominantly economic reasons constitute the most numerous of these categories. British in particular are the most representative group in Australia.

**C.** : These are emigrants from countries occupied by Communists in Europe and Asia, Indonesians in Timor, and, to some extent immigrants from Chile. These immigrants are commonly known as refugees, exiles or emigrees. The last two terms imply continued political orientation and even attachment to the old country.

**D.** : Emigrants who flee from their homeland (together with genuine political refugees) for truly non-political reasons such as to advance economically, and in the case of many young people, to see the world and to even taste adventure.
However, a non-political departure, too, is viewed by the old country as a hostile, political act, indeed a crime, and its perpetrator - often with his family - acquires political and legal stigma in the eyes of the old country. As indicated earlier, the C and D categories are not mutually exclusive and rather complement each other.

Generally speaking, as N.S. Eisenstadt observed in his immigration theory in 1954, immigrants are motivated by some kind of insecurity and inadequacy in their social setting, and at the same time they are attracted by the opportunities in the country to which they contemplate moving. 4

However, one's real motives may not coincide with one's stated motives. Strictly materialistic motivation may be camouflaged as highly idealistic motivation to the outside world, the social environment, to immigration authorities and even to one's self. Deception or self-deception could be also common. A person solves his marital and/or parental problems by fleeing abroad and masquerading as a political refugee much the same way as a common criminal would refer to be viewed as a political prisoner.

The importance of the prime motives may well be outweighed by the circumstances of the departure, i.e. whether this departure was legal or illegal. Illegal immigrants cannot return to their homeland with impunity. Their departure implies permanency, burned bridges. Achievement of the status quo ante is beyond reach. In contrast, legal immigrants may view their decision as one of a reparable trial and error, with a return to the old country as an available and acceptable solution. Legal immigrants have the option to remedy their mistakes. Illegal immigrants proceed on a one way street with no return. The realisation of this predicament may have a salutary effect on accelerated integration in the new country.

If the Czech Communist regime were overthrown tomorrow, the return to the old country would not be as spontaneous. Only six per cent of the 1948 sample indicated that they would spend their old age in Czechoslovakia should the conditions change. The number for the 1968 group was slightly larger, reaching 8 per cent.

4 N.S. Eisenstadt, op cit, p.39.
Government attitudes in regard to the legitimacy of permanent departure of their citizens varies widely - from very positive to very negative. The so-called export of unemployment is practised by some countries: Yugoslavia permitted its idle manpower to work in the European countries. While expulsion of ethnic minorities, such as was the case of Indians from East Africa, is one extreme, erection of the Berlin Wall is the other extreme. In between are the posture of non-interference or even indifference to emigration desires of one's citizens. Even the liberated regimes may take exemptions to its permissive exit law, a dictatorship may ease its prohibitive exit law by making allowances on account of age (i.e. aged citizens permitted to leave Czechoslovakia), family relations, and various socio-ethnic characteristics, such as race and religion (Jewish emigrants from the U.S.S.R.).

Theoretically, there are as many countries of emigration as there are of immigration. Practically, peoples of the Eastern Hemisphere have emigrated to the Western Hemisphere, and especially since World War II, peoples of Eastern Europe have moved to Western Europe and not vice versa.

The number of immigrant receiving countries is in reality small, consisting of the United States, Canada, Brazil, Argentina, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand. Motives for letting strangers enter are economic, political and humanitarian. Conditions of entry are always restrictive by that on grounds of skills, race, age, health or political clarification. The United States' immigration laws of 1921, 1924, 1925, the Australian Restriction Act of 1901, and the Amending Act of 1925 excluded "those deemed unlikely to be readily assimilable" provide an appropriate illustration of such practices. The entry for entire ethnic or other groups may be severely restricted or excluded altogether.

The official welcome extended to immigrants may not be met by the welcome of the public. Such conflict in the policy of the state and the attitude of the society can adversely affect the chances for a smooth trauma-free integration.

5 Francis J. Brown, Society in transition (Sydney, Antheneum, 1965), p.26
A person in desperate circumstances runs from something, from somewhere, rather to something, to somewhere. Circumstances of his momentary predicament do not make him choosy. His sole aim is to escape the status quo. Once beyond the reach of the old country power, the fugitive will eventually select the new country on the basis of a single criterion: the length of the waiting period for the entry permit. This was the case of many Displaced Persons who instead of waiting for their entry permits to the United States in European refugee camps for two or three years, preferred immediate re-settlement in Australia. Twelve settlers in my sample of the 1948 refugees (N=103) had sponsors in the United States. The additional waiting period was the decisive point for their Australian immigration.

In most cases of immigrants of whatever category both the pros and cons for leaving the "old country" and seeking the "new country" are carefully weighted. As far as the old country is concerned the choice is a straightforward either/or proposition: to leave or not to leave. To choose the new country is a more complex matter since there is usually the chance of moving into more than one country. According to Richardson, apart from the choice of a marriage partner or the selection of a career the decision to emigrate is probably the most important most individuals ever make. Numerious factors, objective and subjective, rational and impulsive, irrational and even fathomless may effect the crucial decision.

Even in the realm of subjective motivation, certain characteristics which form a repetitive pattern can be identified: the more adventurous, resourceful, healthy, and the young will depart rather than the more timid, the older, in poor health who are eventually responsible for very aged, bed-ridden parents, those who are nostalgically attached to the fatherland, and those who are intensely status conscious and for who beginning at the bottom of the social ladder in the new country is for them unthinkable.

6 Alan Richardson, British Immigrants and Australia: A Psycho-social Inquiry. (Canberra, Australian National University, 1974), p.9
The determination of many potential illegal emigrants is thwarted by the physical impossibility to realise their intent. The Berlin Wall is discouragingly high and so is the percentage of the would-be defectors who are caught.

The risks undertaken by refugees are manifold:

(i) The physical difficulty and danger involved in leaving an old country

(ii) Great likelihood that the departee will leave penniless

(iii) In addition to danger and poverty, there is the earlier mentioned commitment of irreversible decision, not being able to return to the old country with impunity. The only remedy is to move to another new country to try one's luck once again.

Despite these risks many illegal emigrants, especially of the politically motivated variety, are of middle class and upper class background. Perceived or real danger in their old country, status and lifestyle in general made them wish to leave. European refugees illustrate this case in contrast to the immigration of the uneducated working class immigrants, say from Turkey. The social structure of the original country would also play an important role.

The tyranny or hunger for freedom and bread is a simple and, indeed, simplistic formula based on various factors. In addition to the personal, subjective drives, some objective quantifiable assessment of alternatives is certainly the rule with the majority of immigrants of whatever types. Hence, economically motivated individuals will not move from the old country to a poorer but a richer new country; a Czech will seek entry to Switzerland rather than to Portugal, to the United States rather than to Argentina. Switzerland provides far more political stability than Italy. For a German speaking East European, West Germany will be an attractive place to move on several counts: political stability, language, economic prosperity, cultural standards, and similarity of lifestyle in general. With some particularly older immigrants historical animosity toward the Germans will outweigh all these advantages.
Marketability of skills in the new country and recognition of academic qualifications may be of paramount importance to emigrating professionals. Personal contact; friends, relatives in the new country are a potent encouraging factor. For others the motives may vary from romantic youthful dreams about the country, to guaranteed, pre-arranged employment in the new country.

In weighing pros and cons, discouragingly numerous dilemmas may beset a putative immigrant: is he reconciled to the prospect of lower socio-economic status as compensation for acquired political freedom?

To obtain a better overview as to why people leave and why they are attracted by other countries, the push and pull factors should be considered. The decision to leave the old country can be well characterised by the push factors, which represent the general conditions prevailing at the time a prospective legal or illegal emigrant departed.

The other factor, the pull factor, highlights the conditions of the new country. Both push and pull factors shall further be divided into those of socio-political or essentially non-political category. These factors may exercise a positive or negative role; they may encourage or discourage the old or new country leap.
### Table 58

**MOTIVATION FACTOR**

**Push factors**

*(To leave the Old Country)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-political</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Socio-political</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-economic</td>
<td></td>
<td>-economic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tyranny</th>
<th>Famine</th>
<th>Prospect of moderation</th>
<th>Chance of economic progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persecution</td>
<td>Low living standard</td>
<td>Amnesty</td>
<td>Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger of:</td>
<td>Low economic opportunity</td>
<td>Ruler is dead</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaping</td>
<td>conscription or unpopular war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Needless to say, this is not an exhaustive list of a full catalogue of possible motivation factors but only illustrative sample.
### Table 59

**MOTIVATION FACTORS**

**Pull factors**
*(To move to the New country)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Encouraging</th>
<th>Negative Discouraging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-political</td>
<td>Personal economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bias</td>
<td>Career advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and cultural similarity</td>
<td>Marketability of skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration policy</td>
<td>Short waiting period of entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Country helps to adjust</td>
<td>Assisted immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Needless to say, this is not an exhaustive list of a full catalogue of possible motivation factors but only an illustrative sample.
5.2 FROM ILLEGALITY TO LEGALITY

According to the international law, a person who enters a country of which he is not a citizen and does not possess a necessary permit, breaks the law. With the emergence of people moving from one place to another this ruling has become pronounced since the beginning of the twentieth century. Only recently, in some parts of the western world, has this practice been ameliorated, due to the mutual agreement of countries concerned, and a greater tolerance towards refugees and immigrants.

However, in 1948, when the exodus of the Czechs began, the established frontier's entry laws were still common, and any Czech who left Czechoslovakia, was an illegal escapee from the Czechoslovak point of view and an illegal arrival from the point of view of West German and Austrian authorities. Because of the enormous post-war problems with refugees and people, such as Allied ex-servicemen, Prisoners-of-War, forced labourers and even ex-concentration camp inmates, who did not particularly want to return to their countries of origin, because they were occupied by the Soviet or pro-Soviet regimes, the International Refugee Organisation was formed in 1946.

The purpose of this organisation, which was an offspring of the United Nations, was to support these people and find some solution to their problems. Before the formation of the International Refugee Organisation, these people were treated as illegal inhabitants in places of their abode and often their destinies were at the whim of the military commanders of the particular occupational zones of Germany. Often at the request of Soviet occupational authorities, the Soviet citizens were extradited from the U.S.A., British and French occupational zones.

The International Refugee Organisation's protection meant legalisation of their stay, one their refugee status was established. The Czechs who escaped in 1948 were, after several screenings given the status of a refugee under the protection of the International Refugee Organisation. This procedure from illegality to legality took different steps in both groups, the 1948 and 1968 settlers. Each group will be dealt with separately.
The February Refugees

Frontier crossings in the early months of 1948 were relatively easy compared with the situation in later years. Refugees escaped by negotiating the mountains and forested region between Czechoslovakia and occupied zones of Western Germany and Austria. Soon after February 1948, several centres for refugees were established in Western Germany which began to co-ordinate the activities of these refugees.

Upon arrival in Germany or Austria, a refugee had to pass a special inquiry and screening by the American Counter Intelligence Corps and International Refugee Organisation. Those who failed to satisfy this initial investigation were not examined later. The severity and thoroughness of this procedure was proved by the fact that, by the end of 1949 in the U.S. zone of Western Germany alone, 1,500 of estimated 10,000 Czechoslovak-born persons had been refused I.R.O. eligibility.  

These people, having had no I.R.O. protection, were not eligible for any emigration schemes. This happened when it had been proved that the person in question did not flee Czechoslovakia for political reasons but for reasons other than those recognised by the I.R.O. They were thereupon transferred to the control of German authorities. They finally found work in Germany and some emigrated after 5-7 years, after acquiring West German citizenship.

After a refugee was given I.R.O. eligibility, he was provided with a Displaced Person's Card and was placed in one of many camps all over Europe. Old army camps were used for this purpose, being in Western Germany, Austria and Italy. A Displaced Person received accommodation, personal maintenance, medical care and the right to emigrate, free of cost, to a country which accepted him as an immigrant.

8 Council of Free Czechoslovakia, op cit, p.8.
9 Pacific, January 1952.
10 Council of Free Czechoslovakia, op cit, p.12.
Besides the screening by the C.I.C. and I.R.O., another check, this time by Czechoslovak refugee organisations followed. Every refugee camp committee had a special officer whose duty it was to screen the camp inmates and to control their activities during their stay. This officer co-operated closely with the camp police of the International Refugee Organisation. He was subordinate to a screening officer of the Alliance of the Czechoslovak Democratic Refugees, to whom he reported. If the immigration mission of a country admitting a Czech refugee asked for details on an applicant, the Alliance provided the files and conducted a special screening in co-operation with the camp committee, interviewing each applicant individually. This type of check was introduced in 1948, when the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia tried to infiltrate refugee camps with agents who would both report to Prague and create confusion and distrust among the refugees. A negative report by these committee could revoke the legality of stay of refugees.11

Generally, every refugee has a story to tell. The several case studies collected during my interviewing for this dissertation show the types of problems some of the 1948 settlers encountered prior to their departure from Czechoslovakia.

A regional secretary of the National Socialist Party in Bohemia, he was arrested for his post-war political activity and accused of sabotaging nationalisation of industry. Sentenced to detention in a labour camp, he escaped during transfer from one camp to another and crossed the frontier.

A consular official at the Czechoslovak Consulate in Hamburg, Western Germany. A member of the Populist Party, he received an order to return to Prague in March 1948 for another posting. He understood what "another posting" meant and decided to ask for political asylum in Western Germany.

11 Josef Josten, op cit, p.49.
A Major in the Czechoslovak Army, dismissed in March 1948. A member of the National Socialist party, he received notification that because of his negative attitude towards socialism after 1945, there was no place for him in the new "people's army". He was notified to report to the local employment office to work in industry; he left four days after his dismissal from the army.

If not directly arrested, people received letters indicating that their services have been terminated. Reasons were often the same - a negative attitude towards socialism.

The August Refugees

Since 1948, it had been very difficult for an ordinary citizen to holiday abroad or even possess a passport. The only way such people could travel and see other countries was to travel as a member of a trade union group, or be an active member of a sporting group or similar organisation.

The choice of countries that could be visited was restricted to other Communist bloc countries only. There were no trips to the West for ordinary citizens or even for groups. The fact that for twenty years the authorities denounced western culture and lie as being decadent and the embodiment of capitalism and "imperialism", seemed to have had a counter-productive effect. For one result of this official and representative policy was that a cult of admiration of the west had developed, especially among the young people, those who were too young to remember the democratic conditions which had existed in Czechoslovakia before 1948.

The 1968 period made it possible for many hundreds of Czechs to see the west. It is estimated that in 1968 over 50,000 people obtained passports and the necessary permits to visit western countries in Europe; these were often valid for several weeks or even months. The main holiday season in Czechoslovakia spreads over the months of July and August. When the Warsaw Pact forces occupied Czechoslovakia on August 21, 1968, it was very difficult for those who wanted to leave to get out of Czechoslovakia. Border traffic was

under the control of the Czechoslovak authorities for several months after August 1968, and all travel permits issued in the pre-invasion period were still regarded as valid. It is estimated that about eighty per cent of all people who left Czechoslovakia legally, with passports in their hands. The passport regulations of 1968 included also a new provision that persons issued with a passport could obtain permission to extend their stay in the country which they visited.

The occupation of Czechoslovakia caught many people abroad. Those people used this regulation and were automatically given permission for an extension of their stay,

In the case of the 1968 group the term illegality was practically unknown. Some of my interviewees had their stay extended by the Czechoslovak diplomatic representations in the countries which they visited, sometimes by three or even six months. It therefore appears that the refugees of 1968 may be the only refugee settlers in the history of Australian immigration who possessed valid passports after their arrival in Australia. One informant indicated that this procedure of extending the visas was a standard procedure by the Czechoslovak Consulate General in Sydney. This may be the reason why so many of the refugees of 1968 stayed as settlers in Western Germany and Switzerland.

Once beyond the reach of the old country power they used their legality of stay to achieve their emigration aims more easily, quickly and satisfactorily, to the envy of the "older" post-war emigrants. The state of illegality was never deeply imprinted among the 1968 refugees as the interviewing had shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 60</th>
<th>LEGALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1948 Settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you a legal traveller or an illegal escapee?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal traveller</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal escapee</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another important aspect emerged showing that 87 (84.4%) of the February refugees regarded the August refugees as 'economic refugees', people escaping not because the democratic politics was denied to them in the old country but because of the economic chaos and decline of the living standard caused by the bureaucratic Communist regime.

The statement about the crossing of borders, as told by one of my interviewees, gives an interesting insight into the 1968 situation.

About fourteen days after the invasion of the Warsaw Pact Treaty military forces I left Prague by air for Vienna having had tourist visas for the whole of my family. After the flight lasting about 40 minutes we landed in Vienna and booked our accommodation in one of the hotels. Next day I went to the Australian Embassy and enquired about the possibility of emigration to Australia. An interview with the immigration officer was arranged for the same day and I was given an address of one of the local hostels run by the Austrian Red Cross. Accommodation and sustenance was free of charge. In several days I was notified by the Australian Mission that we were accepted for emigration to Australia. We landed in Melbourne three weeks after our departure from Prague. Actually I still had valid tourist visas for the whole family to stay "legally" abroad.

Comparing the circumstances of the leap from illegality to legality of the 1948 and 1968 groups, the differences seem obvious. While the 1948 refugees went through different types of screening, through which the authorities tried to find the genuineness of refugee status of these people, they also had to wait for many months even years before setting foot in the country of their settlement.

The illegality and legality of escape had some repercussions on the relationship between the two groups, creating tensions, which spread over to many sectors and will be discussed later.

Further, their experiences which may have been the cause for their defection seemed also to be different as compared with those of 1948. The case studies cited below show that it was not as much the unemployment threat or possibility of direct incarceration
from which they were escaping, it appears that the dissatisfaction with living and political conditions was the main motive for their decision to leave their country.

The publisher of the Czech language paper in Melbourne and a songwriter who was banned in August 1968 for writing Songs for Prayer.

"It was a prayer for my country. I was banned for eight years but I kept writing songs using different names as authors. But after eight years things got worse. He went with his family for a holiday to Yugoslavia from where they escaped to Austria. He was sentenced for three years' imprisonment in Czechoslovakia because he left his country illegally.

A library assistant, left two days after the invasion. Just before the invasion she arranged to visit Britain and left for her destination by train. She would up in Australia. She is pleased settling in Australia and would never return under the present regime. She worked as a teacher in Czechoslovakia. Originally, she wanted to be a laboratory assistant but the regime would not allow her because her political background was unsatisfactory. She hated teaching because of "all the garbage we had to tell the kids—even in primary school we had to instill them with the spirit of Marxism and Leninism".

An importer who first came to Australia as a member of the commercial sector of the Czechoslovak Consulate in 1964. He and his family heard of the invasion news in Singapore. They decided to come to Australia as immigrants one year later in July 1969.

A dentist, explains how they had to sneak across the border from Yugoslavia to Italy during the daytime. "Luckily, the Italians were having a siesta" he said. His brother Mr. H., a physician—who was then 12, two years younger than Mr. M. added: "It was an organised tour to Yugoslavia. Half of the family couldn't go across the border because they didn't have visas. So we all got off the train—two families with eight children—and crossed the border near Trieste. Other people who crossed at the same time (1970) faced bullets, but we didn't. I
have been back in my dreams, but I find myself on a train station and I can't get a ticket out of the country. Lots of other exiles have the same dream”.

Discussing his reasons for leaving, Mr. H. stated that he began running into trouble at the age of 10 because he was critical of an exhibition of Lenin's photographs and his brother had an anti-Communist friend. "The teacher called my parents to tell them what I had said. Kids at the age of 10 were going to the authorities to report their parents. I find difficult even today to understand that. My parents had to give me a hiding because their future was at stake even though they agreed with me. 1984 is really happening thousands of kilometres away”.

Mr. O. worked in a factory as a maintenance man and in 1968 he was 26 years old. He stated "when the occupants entered our country I realised that the dull and dreary life we had before August 1968 would get even worse, so as a single man I packed my bags and left for Austrian borders”.

The above case studies show the diversity of push factors for individual immigrants. They indicate that every immigrant has his own motives for emigration. The push and pull factors affect both, the economic and non-economic immigrants alike. Nevertheless, even if the reasons for emigration are based on voluntary decisions, often aiming for personal betterment, the process of re-settlement can be traumatic enough.

The problem of illegality becomes very complicated for any refugee and those aspects associated with it stay with a person even if he obtains citizenship in his new adopted country. Some of the settlers, now Australian citizens are haunted by the spectrum of illegality even after more than thirty years of their being in Australia. The illegality of departure became a strong anti-refugee weapon of the Czechoslovak Communist regime and the aspects of this will be discussed later. The above case studies also show the different ways of departure from the old country. While the 1948 refugees left because of direct actions (arrests, sackings), the case studies of the 1968 refugees show difference in push factors affecting this group. They left because of indirect actions, that
means they still had their work and no threat of arrests or sacking. But among the 1968 intake were also numerous people who suffered badly during the twenty years of Communist rule and those who became politically active during the "Prague Spring", the era of political thaw in Czechoslovakia.

The response in my sample indicates that the majority of the 1948 refugees escaped because of the fear of persecution (as stated by 82 per cent of the interviewees), while in the case of the 1968 intake, the disagreement with the status quo in Czechoslovakia was the main reason for their departure (as indicated by 73 per cent of the participants).

Push and pull factors were important issues in an individual's decision to emigrate. The ultimate decision depends on conditions and circumstances which could be both - political and economic. The graph below indicates the relationship between the push and pull factors. If these factors are summed up some general proposition can be reached. Expressing this proposal graphically the following picture emerges.

Table 61

Push and Pull Conditions and Circumstances
(Both Political and Economic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAVOURABLE</th>
<th>UNFAVOURABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Country Push</td>
<td>Negative (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Country Push</td>
<td>Positive (C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code: OC Old Country
      NC New Country

In the above table the push is not activated when the conditions in the OC are good, favourable politically and economically, e.g. (A). When the conditions in the old country are unfavourable, resulting in hardships, e.g. political tyranny or unemployment, the conditions encourage the push and people either emigrate or escape (B). In the case of the NC the pull is activated when the conditions to accept political refugees or economic
immigrants are favourable and people are needed (C). When the conditions for settlement in a particular country are non-existent, the pull conditions are therefore negative (D).

In this taxonomy, a decision to emigrate will take place only if B+C > A+D. To our hypothetical political refugee what solely matters is Category B. Such also will be the motivation of fugitives from natural catastrophes or war conflagrations. The indicators of the push for a new country may be motivated politically (e.g. stability, democracy), economically (prosperity), culturally (similarity of language), socially (reputation of social mobility and acceptance) and personally (friends and relatives).

For an immigrant the old country provides the standard against which to judge life in the new country. As time progresses, an immigrant's understanding of the old country atrophies. His absence from the old country and his life in the new country mold pre-emigration images in a number of ways.

First, we have to distinguish between these twin capacities:

(i) Cognition which could be described as an accurate recall and understanding of the old country prior to emigration and access with correct comprehension of the development of the old country.

Second, we have to distinguish both in cases of the old country and new country between:

(i) Fatherland, which as a term symbolises the history and cultural heritage of the old country.

(ii) Management, which stands for the political system, the current regime and similar aspects.

The next table introduces the concept of the old and new country and its relationship to the 'Fatherland' and 'Management' in a more comprehensive way.
Table 62

Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Country</th>
<th>FATHERLAND</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czech castles</td>
<td>One party system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full jails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Country</td>
<td>Sandy beaches</td>
<td>Civil liberties, law and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meat pies</td>
<td>order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As could be expected the intensity of cognition - affection toward the OC at the time of departure will vary, from High to Low to Indifferent in approximately this pattern:

Table 63

Old Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FATHERLAND</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>(A) varied</td>
<td>(B) varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>(C) varied</td>
<td>(D) low, indifferent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both cognition categories (A,B) will depend on immigrant's education, sophistication and experience. In C. category the experience and motives for departure (e.g. patriotic exiles versus cynical adventurers) will be the dominant factors. D. appears to be the only category in which the high level affection would be very unlikely and indeed illogical: devoted, loyal citizen does not desert.

The above taxonomy relates to perceptions of the old country at the time of departure. It is proposed that the perception after departing from the OC and settling in the NC will undergo a process with these uneven results:
Table 64
Post-emigration Perception of the Old Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FATHERLAND</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An immigrant's cognition of the old country is bound to decline in time; an exception to this rule of atrophy is very unlikely. Even such a person as a Czech newspaper editor whose professional responsibility is to specialise in the affairs of the OC, will lose his psychological 'feel' for the fine nuances and subtle development in the homeland. This atrophy is not entirely offset by his access to data and information which make him de facto better informed than the population in the OC, restricted, as in the case of Czechoslovakia, by domestic censorship, fear and societal atomization.

The cognition atrophy regarding the OC - F category is likely to proceed at a slower speed then it will be in the case of OC - M. After all, 'Fatherland' is more stable than 'Management' not only in Czechoslovakia, but anywhere in the world.

The following graph relates to cognition capacity process.

Table 65
Cognition Capacity Process

![Graph showing the decline in intensity and volume of Old Country and the increase in intensity and volume of New Country over time.](image)
The graph shows that the rate of cognition decline (in case of the OC) and the cognition rise (in the case of the NC) will vary depending on a person's education, satisfaction in the NC, etc. With respect to the OC a social scientist would have left the OC better informed than a fellow refugee, a person with low education who fled communism because of onerous alimony obligations. Hence, the starting point of cognition level varies.

Also, the cognition decline varies. Immigrant A gets a job in the foreign newspaper section of a university library. Immigrant B gets a job at the Carlton Brewery. Their ability to keep up with developments in the old country therefore will be dissimilar.

With respect to the new country the starting point of cognition is not the same; it may be high, it may be close to zero, as was the case of Lebanese settlers, who, when they landed in Australia, thought they were in New York, U.S.A. At opposite extreme we may find a diligent intellectual who has learned in advance the language of the new country, about its history and contemporary society. It could be hypothesized that, say, a young tertiary student of immigrant background will become acquainted with the new country much faster than a lonely dweller in a metropolitan suburb.

From cognition capacity we shall move to the 'Affection' category. After an immigrant has settled in the NC, his affection for the OC also changes.

The majority of immigrants - economic and non-economic, legal and illegal - are likely to retain and even to increase over the years of their stay abroad a positive affection for the OC. These are the sentiments woven by romantised childhood memories, youth, first loves, ancestral homes, and scenic landscape.

The 'Old Country - Management' is viewed differently and it is the responsibility of the rulers. The political immigrants (central and eastern Europeans) are likely to remain more embittered and less forgiving in this respect that the economic immigrants (hence the South Europeans). IN either case, 'Old Country - Management' is perceived as an evil case - the evil case - which forced them to take risks of uncertain new existence in a strange land.
Affection process vis-a-vis the OC-M may be expressed in this graph:

![Graph showing affection over time with categories: Positive, Negative]

In the case of political exiles the affection change for 'Old Country-Management' is unlikely to reach the positive part of the scale. The farthest point of their attitude modification will be the zero level, i.e. indifference. Such a state of indifference deserves to be considered as a significant indicator of integration which could be expressed as 'I don't like her (i.e. OC), I don't hate her, I don't care'.

In contrast the highest affection for the OC-M, i.e. the present political system in Czechoslovakia is found among the economic immigrants of the earliest date possible. In the case of Czechs, this is common in the case of pre-war immigrants and war-time refugees. Their sympathetic perception of OC-M may well bear no resemblance to reality. No surprisingly, the OC government view this overseas kin folk with great sympathy and attention.13

13 The Czechoslovak Government publishes a monthly called Ceskoslovensky Svet (Czechoslovak Life), which sent free to every pre-war and war-time emigrants. It is devoted solely to the OC-F themes. Czechoslovak state agencies advertise in this periodical nostalgic art-crafts, traditional books and visits to Czechoslovakia.
To sum it up, the settlers leave the OC images at a particular date of departure. In addition to biological generations\textsuperscript{14} we present a concept of political generations\textsuperscript{15} which are formed by traumatic political events be that revolutions, occupations, or wars. Such traumatic political experiences fragment ethnic ties. Within each ethnic group there are subgroups clustering around their specific experience. In variable the new arrivals are contemptuous of the old timers (because of their "broken clock" handicap). The broken clock factor fragments ethnic groups according to their OC departure.

An impediment to ethnic cohesiveness is salutary to the integrative process. Instead of a singular ethnic entity we encounter a multilayer ethnic cake in which the extent of commonly shared values is limited. As Jean Martin suggests, the different political generations of the same ethnic group disagree on issues of vital importance:

It was particularly in the minorities from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia, whose numbers have been increased by recent waves of refugees and immigrants, that these developed confrontations between hard-line anti-communists and moderates.\textsuperscript{16}

Distorted perception of the old country is the work of numerous facts. Retrospective accuracy varies from person to person; retrospective of realists and idealists, of the successful and heartbroken exiles will not be the same.

The images of the old country usually freeze at the point of emigration. Ota Ulc uses the term "Broken Clock Phenomenon" for this situation.\textsuperscript{17} The carrier of these frozen images suffers a further atrophy in the old country perception because of the impact of acculturation, being influenced by the new country.

\textsuperscript{14} Biological generations: Group consisting of children, parents and grandparents, etc.
\textsuperscript{15} Political generations: Group consisting of different waves of immigrants, i.e. Pre-war settlers, War-time refugees, Post-war settlers, Refugees of 1948 and 1968, and the arrivals in the 1980s (Czech sample).
\textsuperscript{16} Jean Martin, op cit, p.56.
\textsuperscript{17} The 'Broken Clock Phenomenon' means that an immigrant who has settled in a new country often remembers his old country as it was at the time of his departure. (Research proposal: Post-War II Immigration of East Europeans to USA and Australia, Univ. of N.Y., Binghamton, 1980).
Of the multitude of factors affecting the OC images, and in process affecting immigrants' chances of integration in the new country a list of factors will shed some insight in this phenomenon.

**Table 67**  
*Broken Clock Phenomenon*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atrophy factors</th>
<th>Accelerating</th>
<th>Impeding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of cognition</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of affection</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent in the NC</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction level in the NC</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration level in the NC</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives of departure from the OC</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Non-economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-emigration OC contract maintenance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Events in the old country in the post-emigration period cannot be ignored. Even the non-political immigrants may be significantly affected by old country developments. Their ethnic cohesiveness may suffer and various destructive passions may surface. The 1967 coup of the colonels in Greece split the Greek community in Australia rather substantially.

5.3 INTEGRATION

The process by which an immigrant blends into the new country and gets attuned to its lifestyle has been variously identified, analysed and labelled. There are numerous examples and the main one's of this terminological proliferation are: acculturation (which is likely to occur first when an immigrant reaches the new country), accommodation (which will denote an immigrant's partial acceptance of the new mores), adjustment (used in reference to individuals, adaptation (used in reference to groups), absorptions (Eisenstadt's term describing the entire process of transformation in the new country, from the first contract to total invisibility), and amalgamation (in reference to biological process, to ethnic and racial mixing by intermarriage or out of wedlock).

Some of the terms describe different phases and intensity of transformation, other terms overlap somewhat and could be and indeed are with no great particular care by many scholarly writers - used interchangeably.

Whereas the term 'acculturation' is used mainly by the anthropologists, the sociologists, and almost everybody else for that matter, have preferred until recently the term assimilation.

'Assimilation' is a term of respectable vintage. Edmund Burke applied it in reference to the American colonies: "When this child ours (the colonies) wishes to assimilate to its parents".19

The dictionaries define the term as meaning 'the act of making alike'. Sociological sources of the 1940s defined assimilation as "the process by which persons who are unlike in their social heritages come to share the same body of sentiments, traditions and loyalties, and as the process by which different cultures, or individuals or groups representing different cultures, are merged into a homogeneous unit... I essence, assimilation is the substitution of one nationality pattern for another".20

20 Milton Gordon, op cit, p.64.
Whereas the goal is homogeneity, the process of assimilation is rather heterogeneous. It should be treated as a function of many variables. Literature distinguishes a variety of assimilation types: cultural, structural, marital, as to the absence of prejudice, discrimination and alike. As first social contact initiates interaction, assimilation is its final desired product.

This concept of assimilation as a unilateral surrender of immigrant's identity has been losing ground along with the rigid postulates of Anglo-conformism. Accordingly, the interpretation of assimilation changed, reflecting rather the melting pot philosophy. Henceforth, in order to assimilate the immigrants are not required to surrender totally their identity. Rather than complete uniformity, complementary differences will be in order.

However, the legitimised abandonment of required conformism did not entirely rehabilitate the term "assimilation". Instead the term "Integration" was adopted at an official level at the UNESCO conference on assimilation in 1956. This change is illustrated by the statement of Phillip Lynch, the Federal Minister of Immigration, in these words:

The earlier desire to make stereotype Australians of the newcomers has been cast aside. The use of the word integration instead of assimilation is a sign of a fundamental change in attitude of the Australian Government and people.

Integration legitimises cultural pluralism. It assumes that newcomers will retain and, if they so desire, maintain the cultural traits they hold dear. But, at the same time, they will respect Australia's institutions, e.g. language (English), laws, parliamentary system, etc.

21 Ibid, p.60
22 Ibid, p.70.
23 Ibid, p.71.
24 Ibid, p.80.
The integration process became an object of numerous studies: the work of Glazer and Moynihan in the U.S.A., and Ronald Taft in Australia have highlighted aspects of this process. Glazer and Moynihan recognise a three stage assessment of the transformation of ethnic groups, envisioning in the third stage (the future) the gradual disappearance of ethnic groups into a division of colour and division.\(^{28}\)

Ronald Taft, identified the following sequence of stages in the integration process: knowledge of the culture of the new country; change of attitude to the new country and old country culture; assumption of roles within the new country's society; acceptance by the new country society; entry in the new country society’s groups and convergence of immigrant’s norms and those of the new country society. All these stages are divided into matters internal to the individual (e.g. perceived acceptance) and external to him (actual acceptance).\(^{29}\)

Taft further elaborates his constructs and arrives at the two basic categories which he calls "primary integration" (satisfaction with the life in the new country, identification with the new country, desire to stay and become naturalised) and "secondary integration" (uses of the new country language, mixing socially with the new country's society and adoption on new country's behavioural norm).

These categories correspond partly to Alan Richardson's stages of identification and acculturation and partly to Milton Gordon's cultural and structural assimilation.

There are many integration variables which play an important part in settler's life. Obviously, tolerant and friendly country and people will positively affect one's integration whereas intolerant and unfriendly environment will retard, and eventually reverse such a process. In a racially rather homogeneous Australian


society a Turkish immigrant will be more noticeable than in the more heterogeneous American setting. A numerous cohesive Greek ethnic group will affect integration of its group members in a different way that will be the case of a solitary Afghan fugitive.

Economic, personal and social success or failure will play an even more substantial role in this process of transformation.

The following table of integration variables is based on categories in which the relation between the immigrant and the factors affecting positively or negatively, differs noticeably, from matters of personal volition to deterministic circumstances and forces beyond anybody's control. The enumeration of factors is of course meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive.
Table 68
Integration variables originating with immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>New Country</th>
<th>Vis Major and Elements beyond Anybody's control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>size</td>
<td>political climate</td>
<td>recency factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>geographic</td>
<td>economic climate</td>
<td>passage of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>dispersal</td>
<td>compatibility of</td>
<td>unforeseen events (e.g. personal tragedy, lottery win)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td>tradition of cohesiveness</td>
<td>cultural similarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td>physiognomic factor (differential visibility)</td>
<td>tolerance</td>
<td>intolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marital status</td>
<td>(inter-marriage)</td>
<td>mobility opportunities (residential occupational social class membership in formal organ.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigration motives and circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>econ. success (failure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social acceptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC primary group contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude toward OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the factors are purely subjective, others are objective and absolutely independent of one's will. In the category of personal characteristics factors a distinction should be made between integration potential and integration performance. A young healthy, handsome, educated, resourceful, gregarious, multi-lingual immigrant possesses superior integration potential than an old, sick, illiterate, cantancerous loner. Needless to say, high potential is no guarantee of high performance but merely an indicator of a probability of success. In addition, it should be kept in mind that a difference exists between willingness and ability to integrate.

Finally, the host society, the new country plays an important and influential role in the integration of immigrants. The gradual change between 1945-1972 in governmental thinking influenced societal structures in Australia to re-think their stand on ethno-sociological issues. The institutional tolerance resulted in the move from monism to pluralism and finally the recognition of multiculture.
A man can abandon everything - home, country, land - but he cannot abandon himself, that by which he lives and by virtue he is what he is.

Milovan Djilas, 1962
In the previous chapters the process of settlement of the Czechs in Australia has been outlined. The first chapter introduces the background to the study analysing previous research and methods of research. In the second chapter events in the Czech history were highlighted as they often resulted in the process of forced emigration, and consequently these forced departures have become part of Czech history over the last 300 years. Traces of these tragic times can be found in Czech literature, puppetry, theatre and music.

The notion that the historical past of Czechs was may be responsible for the growth of nationalism which has been a characteristic of Czechs in this century, and that this characteristic has also been an important element after their arrival in Australia were explored.

The third chapter discusses aspects of settlement of the 1948 intake, which arrived as part of the post-war Displaced Persons settlement program. Their general experiences as refugees and later settlers in Australia are presented to show the difficulties encountered by these settlers.

The interviewing data of the 1948 intake show that 73.8 per cent of them left Czechoslovakia because of fear of personal persecution, and the rest because of opposition to the regime. They settled in Australia because it was the shortest waiting period for emigration (91.5%) in spite of the fact that knowledge of Australia was limited (72.8%), and only a small percentage of them had studied English in their own country (7.7%). Being reasonably educated (61% had better than basic education) the penetration into the structures of the host society, after mastering English, posed relatively small problems. Their satisfaction with Australia, as a country of their settlement, grew from 12 per cent upon their arrival to 93 per cent nearly a quarter of a century after; the majority (81.7%) stated that Australia is now their personal home. During the period of re-settlement the 1948 group established an active ethnic network, consisting of political, national, social sporting, gymnastic, cultural and religious bodies. To the nationalistic essence of these organisations an element of anti-Communism was added. The message for the organisational life was therefore very clear: nationalism and anti-Communism were the only viable forces which would hold Czech exile life together. This pan-Czech exile tendency was projected
generally in the behaviour of the Czech ethnic groups in Australia from the early 1950s till the early 1960s.

During the period of re-establishment, the re-orientation of settlers began to affect some organisations. The politically and interest narrowly based bodies were the first to cease functioning; others were gradually reduced in numbers. The demographic and sociological variables were responsible for the gradual disintegration of Czech ethnic life established by the 1948 group.

The fourth chapter contains aspects of the settlement of the August refugees, the intake of 1968. Although hailing from the same country as their 1948 predecessors, their life experience and background in general were different. Also different were their re-settlement and re-establishment experiences. Arriving in the era of cultural pluralism, their entry into Australian society was easier, therefore different to the 1948 group. Their reasons for leaving Czechoslovakia had different origins. While the 1948 stated personal persecution and the fear of personal persecution as the main reason (73.8%), the 1968 group indicated that fear of living under Soviet domination was the main reason for their departure (37.5%), followed by political consequences (25%), and a longing for life in a free world (21.2%). The fact that English is the national language in Australia was the predominant factor of their emigration choice (40.5%). This may have been supported by the fact that 34 per cent indicated substantial knowledge of Australia whilst 43.6 per cent had limited knowledge of the fifth continent. Another important fact was that nearly a third (32.9%) of them had studied English in Czechoslovakia. Also their educational standard was reasonably high with 75 per cent having better than basic qualifications.

Although the 1948 group had established an organisational life it was not functioning as efficiently as it had done in the 1950s. Therefore that the expected rejuvenation of the ethnic life has failed to eventuate and that the 1968 refugees were critical of the established network and their participation was negligible led to a further breakdown in organisational life.

The fifth chapter contains theoretical issues applied to situations in which both groups were involved. It deals with migratory types and motives, stressing the differences between
economic and non-economic emigrants (or free or forced emigrants). It also raises the issues of legality and illegality of refugees' status from the point of view of their ancestral country. Finally, the typologies of immigration procedures and issues for the latter part of the chapter.

Evaluating the changes which influenced both groups, 1948 and 1968, and analysing their behaviour and relationship, there were some important which were responsible in this matter. These factors separated into two main areas, the Australian and overseas based factors, both of which are applicable to both groups.

Group: 1948

Australian-based factors

1. Re-orientation of settlers

The change in outlook was caused and influenced by the length of stay in Australia and establishing priorities in their lives.

2. Lessening of the anti-Communist stand

Realisation of the status quo in Czechoslovakia and the political stability of their adopted country changed their attitudes.

3. Changes in the host society

The recognition of the immigrants' contribution to the development of Australia had an effect on their wider acceptance by the host society, thus lessening their dependence on ethnic organisational life.

Overseas-based factors

1. A change in the world politics

The belief of an early return to the country of their origin was extinguished soon after the Korean conflict in 1950-52. The expected World War III, leading to the defeat of Communism had not eventuated.
2. An emergence of a new concept in Czech exiles

This new concept appeared in the early 1960s and considered a gradual approach to their relationship with Czechoslovakia in matters of culture and arts. This concept originated in the United States and has had an influence in Australia thereby creating a schism in the remaining ethnic organisations.

Considering the above factors, changes among the 1948 settlers were caused by influences originating within and outside of Australia. Some of these changes depended on the will of the settlers, others were beyond their control.

When the 1968 settlers began to arrive the remaining Czech organisations had a national character based on the culture and heritage of pre-war Czechoslovakia. As mentioned in previous chapters the rejuvenation of Czech organisational life has not eventuated as had been expected by members of the 1948 group. Soon after the 1968 group's arrival the difference in their experiences and cultural values was noticed. The 1948 group classified them as being different. The majority of the 1968 group were educated under Communism and those educated before Communist take-over, were affected by the communist regime, which had eliminated many aspects of Czech heritage, the result of which affected the 1968 group's perception of Czech nationalism. By the 1960s and early 1970s, a new set of factors began to emerge among the 1968 group, as in the previous group, they had either domestic or overseas origin.

Australian-based factors.

1. Attitudes towards 1948 group

The difference in background meant that the 1948 settlers were accused of having a distorted perception of the old country and that their image of Czechoslovakia had frozen at the point of departure from their own home country. Invariably, the 1968 arrivals became contemptuous of the 1948 'old timers' because of the 'broken clock handicap'.
2. Change in the host society

Another factor which lessened the dependence on the organisational life of the 1948 settlers was the better acceptance of immigrants by the Australian society by the end of the 1960s. Employment possibilities were still excellent and trade and professional qualification were more readily accepted than twenty years earlier.

Overseas-based factors.

1. Attitude of the home country

When the first of the 1968 settlers arrived a great number still possessed valid travel documents. Legally, from the Czechoslovak Government's point of view, they were still within the concept of Czechoslovak law. Many of them, after their arrival, applied for prolongation of their permit to stay abroad, which equalled in some cases to 3-5 months. But upon the issue of the necessary permits they were instructed by the Czechoslovak Consulate in Sydney not to establish any contacts with existing Czech organisations. In other words, do not have any contacts with the exiled 1948 Czech vintage. This politically motivated move was a masterly stroke and was a further blow to Czechoslovak ethnic life in Australia.

This new approach towards Czech settlers in Australia soon had deeper significance, as it also affected members of the 1948 intake. In this new move against settlers in Australia the Czechoslovak Government used the status of refugees 'illegality' of emigrants from the Czechoslovak legal point of view. This would include all 1948 refugees and those of the 1968 group who became 'illegal' emigrants either by crossing the frontier without permission or after expiry of their official permits.

It was a different and more thoroughly prepared move which differed markedly from the anti-refugee activities introduced by the Czechoslovak Government in the 1950s and 1960s. In the eyes of their home country the Czech settlers, although Australian citizens for more than thirty years in the case of the 1948 settlers, and 18 years so far as the 1968 intake is concerned, they are regarded as
'criminals' by Czechoslovakia. The reason: as refugees they left Czechoslovakia and lived in Australia without official permission.

In connection with this a very important document appeared in the 1970s, when the Central Bulletin of the Czech Socialist Republic was published by the Czechoslovak Government on June 1, 1977, and outlined the guidelines about the 'normalisation of relationship' between 'illegal' Czechs living abroad and the Czechoslovak Republic. It outlined four possibilities as to how the relationship between the settlers and Czechoslovakia could be normalised (Appendix B).

The term 'normalisation' means that Australian citizens of Czech ethnic background are asked to 'beg for forgiveness' and ordered to deposit a substantial amount of money to the Czechoslovak Government to 'buy themselves out' from their 'illegal status'.

By doing so they will receive an official Czechoslovak passport, which will enable them to visit their ancestral country. Simultaneously, they must cease all the activities with the existing ethnic groups run by the Czechoslovak refugees; they must promise never to participate in any anti-Communist activities either against Czechoslovakia or any other socialist country in the world.

This move of the Czechoslovak Government divided Czech community in Australia into two main groups; those who kowtowed to the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia and those who still oppose it.

This document is the most powerful move ever taken against the refugees by the Czechoslovak Government, with the view to prevent and destroy any Czech communal cohesiveness and consequently their ethnic life in Australia.

Generation apart

An important issue which emerges from this work is that the national history of any refugee group should be considered for understanding of a group in the place of their settlement. Historical aspects should form the initial steps of any sociological study on immigrants. Also valuable are their immediate experiences prior to their departure from their homeland, which could predict
their behaviour in that stage of their settlement. These could also have far-reaching consequences in the next stage, re-establishment.

The circumstances of their national background such as culture, education and the political climate of their homeland are of utmost importance. These aspects were helpful in evaluating the actions of both, 1948 and 1968 groups.

The 1948 group, being brought up in a nationally based independent state, guided by the democratic ideas and values of pre-war Czechoslovakia, displayed entirely different attitudes to the group of 1968, where the national and democratic elements have gradually been eliminated during the period of twenty years under a political climate, which is based on an internationally controlled political doctrine. The outcomes of this pedagogico-sociological experiences showed in the comparison of both groups of Czech settlers. Other factors worth mentioning are those of the attitudes learned early in life, such as heritage and national awareness based on the 'Fatherland' capacity which is cognitively more permanent and impressive. The 'Fatherland' capacity has longer duration and more permanent impression than the 'Management' capacity, connected with the type of government and political climate, consequently leading to a stage when once embittered and hostile refugees evaluate the political doctrine and regime which forced them out of their homeland by an attitude of 'I don't care' or even forgiveness.

This aspect is more noticeable in the case of 1948 group than of the 1968 intake. The length of the stay in Australia has undoubtedly much to do with this attitude.

The retaliatory directive about the 'normalisation of relationship between the place of their birth and their adopted country', invented by the Czechoslovak Government, left an impressive mark on the communal and personal lives of both groups. By that they not only became exiles far from their homeland, but even lonely exiles among themselves: the Czechs, even some old friends, stopped speaking to each other.
The question often asked among Czechs in Australia is: What does the future hold for Czech ethnic life in Australia? For those who would like to carry on with Czech cultural heritage, the only hope lies with second and consequent generations. If they wish to continue in perpetuating Czech traditions, Czech ethnic life may be preserved to a certain extent. If the conditions remain as they are either in Czechoslovakia or in Australia, it may become difficult to identify a distinct Czech community in Australia in the future.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Before I began to interview members of my sample I stated to the prospective interviewees that:

- no name or address or any other personal details will be mentioned on any page of this questionnaire
- no information obtained during the interviews would be revealed to anyone
- all the information gathered was collected solely for research purposes and will be destroyed after the completion of my research.
1. Name: ________________________________

2. When did you leave Czechoslovakia?
   
   After 1948      After 1968

3. Marital status in Czechoslovakia? ____________________________

4. Your age at the date of your departure? ________________________

5. Occupation in Czechoslovakia shortly before your departure?
   ____________________________

6. Completed education: basic, secondary, tertiary (State the type)
   ____________________________

7. Was the crossing of frontier difficult? Indicate how did it happen?
   ____________________________

8. Did you leave any members of your family behind? _____________

9. Would you consider yourself a legal or illegal emigrant from
   Czechoslovakia? ______________________________

10. How long did it take you to decide about your defection? Was this
    a sudden decision or did you think about it for some time?
    ______________________________

11. At the time of your defection how would you describe your living
    standard in Czechoslovakia?
    
    About average _____ Average _____ Below average _____

12. Your present occupation in Australia is:
    ______________________________

13. Are you a naturalised Australian citizen? Yes ____ No ____

14. What was the main reason for your departure from Czechoslovakia?
    
    (i) Personal persecution _____
    (ii) Opposition to the regime _____
    (iii) Escaping military service _____
    (iv) Other reasons: ______________________________
15. Which of these options made you decide to emigrate to Australia?

(i) Australia is a democratic country ____
(ii) English language is used in Australia ____
(iii) Australia has sunny weather ____
(iv) Australia is far away from Europe ____
(v) Australia offered the shortest waiting time for emigration ____

16. What was your knowledge about Australia before you arrived?

(i) Quite a lot ____________
(ii) Limited ____________
(iii) None ____________

17. When did you start to study English?

(i) In Czechoslovakia ____________
(ii) After being accepted for immigration in Australia ____________
(iii) On the ship ____________
(iv) In Australia ____________

18. Show the highest educational level you have completed:

(i) Basic qualifications ____________
(ii) Secondary qualifications ____________
(iii) Tertiary qualifications ____________

19. Did you belong to any Czechoslovak organisation in Australia between 1950-1954? (1948 group only) ____________

Did you belong to any Czechoslovak organisation in Australia between 1968-1970? ____________

20. If yes – which of the organisations were useful to you?

Political ____________
National ____________
Sporting ____________
Gymnastic ____________
Cultural ____________
Religious ____________
21. Did you belong to any organisation in 1960? (1948 group only)

Did you belong to any organisation in 1975? (1968 group only)

22. Why did you not participate in the support of Czech organisations by 1960 (1948 group only)

by 1975 (1968 group only)

Indicate only one answer out of the four, according to your choice:

(i) Not interested

(ii) Waste of time

(iii) Old country nostalgia

(iv) I live in Australia now

23. Which political party did you vote for in your first Australia federal elections?

Group 1948: Group 1968:

(i) Australian Labour Party Australian Labour Party

Liberal Party Liberal Party

Democratic Labor Party Democratic Labor Party

No party

24. If federal elections would be held in 1984 which political party would you support?

(i) Australian Democrats

(ii) Australian Labor Party

(iii) Liberal Party

(iv) No party

25. How satisfied were you in 1952 (1948 group only)

(1972 group only)

and how satisfied are you in Australia in the 1980s
26. Would you return to live in Czechoslovakia?

(i) Never __________________________
(ii) Temporarily ______________________
(iii) Permanently ______________________

27. Would you say that your national culture was superior to that of Australia's at the time of your arrival? If so, which aspects of the Australian way of life would you use to support your statement?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

28. In what type of accommodation did you live in 1960

(1948 only)? (i) House _________________________
(ii) Flat _______________________________
(iii) Rented accommodation _______________

(1968 only)? (i) House _________________________
(ii) Flat _______________________________
(iii) Rented accommodation _______________

Answer point (i) and (ii) only if you owned the property.

29. Do you think that the 1968 intake is different to your own group of 1948? (1948 group only) __________________________

Do you think that the 1948 intake is different to your own group of 1968 (1968 group only) __________________________

30. For 1948 group only:

Helping the 1968 and possible refugees from Czechoslovakia:

(i) Were you involved in helping the 1968 group members after their arrival in Australia? __________________________

(ii) If another situation would arise as in 1968, would you help the newcomers again? __________________________

For 1968 group only:

It is said that you were helped upon your arrival by the established Czechs of the 1948 intake. How do you feel about it?

________________________________________________________________________

31. Your present occupation in Australia is: __________________________
32. Would you advise anyone from overseas to settle in Australia?
   If yes - why? _________________________________
   If not - why? _________________________________

33. Have you visited your home country since you have been in Australia? ______________

34. Did you subscribe to Hlas domova between 1950-1979?

35. Do you subscribe to the present paper Hlasy Cechu a Slovaku v Australii?
   Yes _________________________________
   If not - why? _________________________________

36. What language do you speak in your own home?
   (i) Only English _________________________________
   (ii) More English than Czech _________________________________
   (iii) Half and half _________________________________
   (iv) More Czech than English _________________________________
   (v) Only Czech _________________________________

37. What language do you speak when not at home?
   (i) Only English _________________________________
   (ii) More English than Czech _________________________________
   (iii) Half and half _________________________________
   (iv) More Czech than English _________________________________
   (v) Only Czech _________________________________

Additional information:
APPENDIX B
NORMALISATION OF RELATIONSHIP

This document makes the division between the legal and illegal emigrants. Legal emigrants are those who left Czechoslovakia with the permission of the Czechoslovak authorities. Although this group is very small in numbers, it consists usually of women who married foreigners or ex-Czech nationals, being now citizens of both countries (e.g. Czechoslovakia and Australia).

In addition to this the Czechoslovak Government also claims that even if a person has Australian citizenship, he is still regarded as a Czechoslovak citizen. Australia never signed an agreement with Czechoslovakia according to which once a Czechoslovak settler obtains an agreement with Czechoslovakia according to which once a Czechoslovak settler obtains Australian citizenship, he loses his Czechoslovak citizenship. A similar act was signed between the U.S.A. and Czechoslovakia in 1928.

According to the directives, an "illegal" emigrant can:

- apply to return to live permanently in Czechoslovakia
- apply for permission to live permanently in Czechoslovakia
- apply to be released from the Czechoslovak citizenship
- be deprived of the Czechoslovak citizenship.

The analysis of these points indicates that in point:

1. The emigrant can apply for permission to live permanently abroad even if he holds Australian citizenship. As such he must obtain a Czechoslovak passport and fulfil certain conditions such as not being involved in any exile organisational activities and organisations which act against the Czechoslovak Republic.

2. The permission to live permanently abroad can be issued only if the applicant receives a pardon for the "illegal" departure from the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. A person must sign a statement that he will act abroad as a citizen of Czechoslovakia and as such he will not participate in any emigre organisational life. Once the application is approved a person is issued with a Czechoslovak passport (even if he holds an Australian passport), which make it possible for such a person to travel freely to Czechoslovakia and back.

3. To obtain a release from the Czechoslovak citizenship is considered only if

- a person does not intend to return to live in Czechoslovakia permanently
- an applicant acquired a citizenship of another country
- a person committing an act against the state was given a pardon either through the general amnesty or by the decision of the President of the Republic.
4. To be deprived of the Czechoslovak citizenship follows if a person:

- is active in any ethnic organisation which is engaged against the policies of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic
- is publicly engaged in broadcasting, television or gatherings which are against the status quo in Czechoslovakia, against the Czechoslovak allies and their institutions.

Persons who lost their Czechoslovak citizenship from the above reasons are not allowed forever to enter Czechoslovakia.

The above information therefore indicates that an ex-refugee, who is now an Australian citizen and wants to visit his native land, must complete the prerequisites such as indicated in points 2. and 3. In both cases the applicant has to reveal all details about his past going back to pre-World War II days if born before 1939. These detailed data include: personal data, details on all relatives, the way he escaped, where the escape took place, names of refugee camps, all details about his life in Australia, membership of exile and other ethnic organisations, how much he earns, etc.

Besides the complicated bureaucratic procedure about a person's past in Czechoslovakia and concerning applicant's property, taxes, debts and military service he has to engage an attorney and pay accordingly for the services rendered. Once this is completed, the worst is to come, when an applicant is asked to pay up to $4,000 to "buy himself out" from Czechoslovak citizenship. This was revealed publically in The Australian (April 24-25, 1982), when this paper wrote that the Czechoslovak authorities in Australia are charging former countrymen enormous sums in a multi-million extortion campaign before allowing them to make short visits to their homeland. The Australian Federal Government and a Senate Committee have known about this since 1976, but have done little to stop it. The settlers who objected to this charge were told by the officials of the Czechoslovak Consulate in Sydney that the money is needed to "normalise" their relationship with Czechoslovakia and to pay for their upbringing. Some of the objectors, even if educated before the communist take-over, were required to pay.

The reaction of The Australian was summarised as that Czechoslovakia has one of the most appalling human right records in Eastern Europe and they have ways of dealing with their refugees that Australians find quite unacceptable. The paper continues, that the sad part is, "That in many instances Czech refugees were denied visas by the Consul in Sydney even after paying over large sums of money and fulfilling the conditions."