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ABSTRACT. Collecting efforts by the Hoover Institution among Russian émigrés in China is a little-known story, told in this article through the biographies of Harold H. Fisher, Elena A. Varneck, Ivan I. Serebrennikov, and Robert V. Smith. The collection of documents, diaries, reports, books, and periodicals focuses on two broad topics: the Russian
civil war in Siberia and the Far East, and the history of the Chinese Eastern Railway. The problems involved in collecting materials connected to events that recently occurred largely centered around money (especially the lack of it) and trying to decide whose materials were the most valuable.

Have you ever wondered how the Hoover Institution Library and Archives acquired some of its Russian materials? Most of the story is well known and recorded, but the saga of the Russian emigration to China, especially Manchuria, is a fairly recent area of research. What printed materials and archives were available for purchase have not been explored. Originally, Elena Varneck’s and Robert Smith’s role as collectors was the focus of interest for this essay, but it soon became clear that Harold Fisher and Ivan Serebrennikov needed to be added. Each plays an important part in the acquisition of materials from China and in the development of the Hoover collections, as well as in overlapping roles in each other’s lives.

**BACKGROUND**

During a research trip to California in the spring of 2002, I was able to work in the Hoover Institution Library and Archives for five weeks. Vladivostok historian Amir Khisamutdinov had encouraged me to explore the fact that Hoover had agents in China buying books and archives. This intrigued me. Who were the agents in China? Robert Smith was the person Khisamutdinov encouraged me to pursue. A footnote on page 36 of the now-published Vologodskii diary notes that his widow, “acting through a certain Robert Smith, an American collecting . . . for the Hoover,” had arranged to sell the diary.
The story of Herbert Hoover’s famine relief program to the Russian people during World War I is well known. Further, the collection efforts in Europe and Russia of agents like Frank Golder on behalf of the Hoover Institution are well documented. E. D. Adams invited Ralph Lutz to join the collection team Herbert Hoover organized in Europe right after the Great War ended. The task that Hoover set for his collectors was to purchase not only manuscript material, but printed sources as well, for he conceived of a library and archive as a single research entity. The undertaking was to be broad in scope and systematic in collecting. The dynamic force and devoted triumvirate of Golder, Adams, and Lutz carried out Hoover’s idea to create a library and archive.

The annual reports of the Hoover War Library summarize the accomplishments in collecting and research regarding Siberia, the Far East, and Manchuria. Some of the materials collected by agents in the European parts of the Soviet Union also pertain to the history of the Far East. For example, the Railway Service Corps Papers that Hoover obtained hold the papers of Charles H. Smith, an American participant in the supervision of the Chinese Eastern Railroad (CER) and Trans-Siberian Railroad from 1918 to 1923. In Paris, Boris Nicolaevsky, while looking for materials, often told Fisher of purchases that could be made on Siberia, the Far East, and China. These might be printed in Russia or the Soviet Union, or China, or Europe.

Selected excerpts from the annual reports provide a portrait of the work being done regarding the Far East under Harold Fisher’s direction. Further investigation showed that many of the noted acquisitions have Elena Varneck’s “fingerprints” on them—although she is not always mentioned by name. The following highlights are an instructive review:

1929-1930

- A translation of a work by Lt. General N. Horvath and W. Klemm: The war and revolution in the Russian Far East was begun in 1928 and is about half finished; it is due to be completed in 1931.
- The Russian Revolution Institute (at Hoover) is in contact with and receives materials from the Siberian Regional Archives, Novosibirsk; Russian Historical Archives Abroad (RZIA), Prague; and the Association of Siberians in Czechoslovakia; Slavonic Library, Prague.
- The Institute has purchased newspapers from Harbin, Vladivostok, and other cities.
1930-1931

- Exchanges of duplicates continue with RZIA in Prague, and in Manchuria with the Central Library of the Chinese Eastern Railway, Harbin.¹⁰

1931-1932

- A well-selected collection of books and journals about the Far East was acquired, among which may be mentioned *Viestnik Azii*, vols. 1-54, 1909-27.
- Russian newspapers received: *Viestnik Vremennago pravitel’stva Avtonomnoi Siberi* [Herald of the Provisional Government of Autonomous Siberia] (1918), published in Vladivostok; old émigré newspapers; and files of newspapers for the revolutionary period published by the various anti-Bolshevik forces in Russia and Siberia.
- A rare collection of typewritten manuscripts, including General M. Kolobov’s *Bor’ba s Bol’shevikami na Dal’nom Vostoke, 1918-21* [Battle With the Bolsheviks in the Far East]; I. I. Serebrennikov’s *Vospominaniia, 1917-22* [Memoirs]; and materials relating to events in Sakhalin and Nikolaevsk-na-Amure, 1920.
- General N. N. Golovine has continued his valued services to the library in securing manuscript and published materials of the Russian emigration.¹¹

1932-1933

- Through the generosity of Professor Payson J. Treat (Stanford U) the Library has received an extremely valuable and extensive collection of materials dealing with political, economic, and social conditions in modern China, with special reference to the influence of Soviet Russia and communist agencies. These materials were collected by the late Jay Calvin Huston, Stanford, during his service as an American Consul in China (1917-1931). They include a number of unpublished manuscripts, pamphlets, translations of placards and leaflets, original documents in Chinese and Russian, clippings from English language and other newspapers in China and elsewhere, and consular reports. Mr. Huston was at work on an exhaustive study of the Russian influence in China at the time of his death on September 14, 1932, in Shanghai.
- Through Boris Krukov the Library has received an extensive collection of manuscripts, printed documents, reports, and published
materials relating to the Maritime Province, the Amur region, and Sakhalin during the period of the revolution and civil war.

• Through the efforts of General Nicholas N. Golovine of Paris, and Mr. F. S. Mansvetov of New York City, a very extensive group of current Russian émigré newspapers has been received from around the world, including: *Novaia zaria* (San Francisco), *Russkoe slovo* (Harbin) and *Russkii v Argentinie* (Buenos Aires).12

1933-1934

• As a result of the kindness of Mr. Robert Smith, the Library received a collection of laws of the Kolchak government, and the history of the Chinese Eastern Railway by E. Kh. Nilius.13

1934-1935

• Manuscripts from N. Makarov (Vladivostok) on social-economic sketches, 1917-1920; from Von Arnol’d, *Razvitie bol’shevizma na Dal’nom Vostoke* [Development of Bolshevism in the Far East].
• Honorable Shu Tomii, Japanese Consul-General, San Francisco, gave numerous books and pamphlets on the Far East, especially Manchuria.
• Prof. P. J. Treat gave two books in Russian on the Japanese intervention in Manchuria and 100 propaganda items.14

1936-1937

• Further translations have been made of materials relating to events in Mongolia, the Russian Far East and Central Asia.
• During the summer quarter five new graduate research courses were offered, one of which was Revolution and Civil War in Siberia and the Eastern relations of the Soviet Union.15

1937-1938

• Translations have been made of Kolobov and Nilus, and V. N. Ivanov’s *Flight Through Siberia*.
• Mrs. Elena Varneck selects and translates materials to be included in the Institute’s documentary collections on the Russian revolution and civil war.
• Five new directed research courses were offered this year, one of which was Policies of the Soviet Government and the Civil War, 1917-21, taught by Mrs. Elena Varneck.16
1938-1939

- Mrs. Elena Varneck has completed the translation of a series of documentary materials relating to events in Mongolia and the Russian Far East during the Civil War, 1918-1923, and she is now preparing a collection of documents on the Bolshevik advance in Siberia.
- Among the graduate courses offered, The Revolution and Civil War in Siberia and the Eastern relations of the Soviet Union by Mrs. Elena Varneck.17

1939-1940

- Mr. Dimitry Krassovsky, of Stanford University, donated files of Russian periodicals and newspapers published in San Francisco and Harbin, 1936 to date.18

From these excerpts, an outline appears of the type of Far Eastern materials Hoover was adding to its collections. From 1919 to 1943, Lutz was the moving spirit in the growth of Hoover library. He had perfected an approach to collecting materials while in Europe. Before leaving, he would spend weeks preparing long bibliographies of the Hoover holdings, as well as want lists for the trip itself. In this work he had the support of his close associate Nina Almond, the first librarian at the Hoover. With the continuing economic downturns in the 1930s Lutz sought to minimize decreased funding by

- Being more highly selective than before; he encouraged his staff to move from a quantitative to a qualitative approach and seek only the best materials; and by
- Selecting experts to write specialized monographs for the library. These were the guidelines under which Fisher worked and continued during his own directorship.19

THE “FAB FOUR”

The quartet of Fisher, Varneck, Serebrennikov, and Smith became in my mind the Fab Four. All are connected to each other—Varneck, Smith, and Serebrennikov have ties to Fisher: all worked for him. Serebrennikov and Smith met in Tientsin. Varneck translated letters and advised
Fisher on materials being offered; these included items from Serebrennikov and Smith. Varneck may have met and/or helped Serebrennikov’s wife when she arrived to help organize the materials that her husband had sent to the Hoover. Fisher, Varneck, and Smith were nearly the same age (the first two were born in 1890; Smith in 1889). Varneck and Smith share the tragedy of each having had a brother killed. Although there are separate sections in this paper for Fisher, Varneck, Serebrennikov, and Smith, the reader will see that they all intertwine with each other.

For all the great collections at the Hoover, it is often sad what is missing. One example is the correspondence between Sir Bernard Pares in England and Harold Fisher; it was Pares who introduced Fisher to Robert Smith.20 The latter worked for Fisher and is mentioned in two annual reports, but there are no personnel records. Nor could the Hoover archivists find any personnel records for Elena Varneck, although she had worked there for 13 years (1929-1942).

Harold Henry Fisher (1890-1975)

When Golder died in 1929, Fisher (Figure 1), who had been at the American Relief Association, was hired to take his place. Described as an “urbane, widely educated man of great integrity and a quick wit,” Fisher made tremendous contributions in many ways to the growing reputation of the Hoover War Library. In particular, present-day scholars working on Far East topics must learn to say his name in the same breath as Golder’s when giving thanks for the treasures they are reading.21

Born in Vermont, Fisher graduated from the University of Vermont in 1911, and went on to obtain an LHD (Doctor of Humane Letters) in 1936. He taught at various schools in Pennsylvania from 1912 to 1917. In the Army he held the rank of captain of field artillery (1917-1918). By 1920 he was working for the American Relief Administration (ARA) and was an assistant to Herbert Hoover during World War I, when in 1922 he began collecting documents in Russia from members of the Tsarist regime and the new Bolshevik government. In 1924, having served as the chief of the history department for the ARA, he was first appointed to the Hoover War Library and began teaching history at Stanford. He was named Director of the Hoover Institution in 1943 and held this position until his retirement in 1955. He remained active, teaching for five years at San Francisco State College and accepting many visiting professorships, including one at Tokyo University.22
FIGURE 1. Harold H. Fisher
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With everything else he was doing, Fisher managed to publish many books.\textsuperscript{23}

The acquisition of materials on the Russian revolution that Golder began continued under Fisher. Not only was he running the Russian Revolution Institute, but also hiring people to work for him both in California and abroad, overseeing a translation and publishing program, and maintaining a prolific correspondence. During the tight budgets of the depression years, he tried hard to get the most for the money he was allotted, and often would reject or send items back to those who offered them.

Elena Varneck was Fisher’s right-hand assistant. She translated letters from Russian into English, and Fisher’s replies from English into Russian. It seems that Fisher would first read his letters and mark certain paragraphs with a note: “Mrs. Varneck,” or a check mark. In return one finds Varneck’s notes behind the letters, giving her evaluation about what materials would be good to acquire. Many of the primary documents, memoirs (published and unpublished), and printed materials about the civil war and other political events in the Russian/Soviet Far East that were acquired and now reside in the Hoover Institution Library and Archives have Varneck’s hand in them. She often humanized Fisher’s letters, adding personal notes. In some cases she began her own correspondence. An interesting example can be found in the Boris Nicolaevsky archives. Varneck corresponded with Nicolaevsky on her own (1934-1935, 1938). The notes she writes to him are very warm. She tells of her plans to write for the Paris émigré journal \textit{Sovremmenye zapiski}.\textsuperscript{24}

A biography of Fisher would be most welcome. His contributions to the library and archives should be more fully documented, as well as his work as an early teacher of and publisher on Russian history. His former co-worker and longtime Western language bibliographer, Agnes Peterson, recalled that Fisher was a liberal Republican; was very good with staff in the library; and had a resonance in the community. During the height of the McCarthy era the National Council for American Education published a report in 1950 as part of its campaign “to rid the schools and colleges of socialistic, un-American teaching and teachers. It identifies Communist-front affiliations of the faculty members of three universities in the state of California. It is not to be assumed that because a professor or instructor is included in this list it is conclusive evidence that he is a Communist. He may be simply naive. This dossier merely states the \textit{fact} of the affiliation.”
Fisher, Harold H.—Chairman of Hoover Institute & Library; Professor of History; American Pushkin Committee, Sponsor; National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, Signer of Petition, Jan. 1943; Statement in Defense of the Communist Party, Signer, *Daily Worker*, March 5, 1941.25

It is hard to imagine Fisher would have endorsed Communist ideology. The how and why of these organizations and his connection to them is left open for now. According to Peter Duignan, retired African specialist at the Hoover, Fisher was very energetic and hard-working, but was not treated well at the end of his career; he retired from Hoover a very bitter man. More insights into Fisher can be seen below, in the sections on Varneck and Smith.

**Elena Alexeevna (Alekseevna) Varneck (1890-1976)**26

For those who study the history of Siberia, especially the civil war period, *The Testimony of Kolchak* remains a crucial source, not only for the documents presented, but for the excellent annotated bibliography on pages 389-440.27 While Harold Fisher and Elena Varneck jointly compiled this collection, there is no name given for the compiler of the bibliography. I have always thought of it as Varneck’s work, and wondered who she was (Figure 2).

When the two boxes labeled “Elena Varneck” arrived, I anxiously set myself up at a table in the Hoover Institution Archives reading room, and settled down to discover the history of this woman, who the inventory says was a research associate at Hoover from 1929 to 1942. The first piece of paper was a memo:

April 28, 1976

To: Dr. Milorad Drachkovitch

From: Wayne S. Vucinich

Dear Milo:

We inherited the enclosed two-volume manuscript by the late Elena Varneck, a one-time Hoover employee. The material apparently consists of her autobiographic notes, most of them of little consequence, and some perhaps of a certain amount of historical value. The material certainly does not belong to us. Perhaps it may be of interest to you.
On the one hand, we must be thankful that Varneck’s autobiography, written when she was 80, was not discarded. On the other hand, this harsh comment from a prominent historian dismissing thirteen years of service to the Hoover is a good lesson why repositories like archives are important.

Elena Varneck was born on March 17, 1890 in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine. Her autobiography precociously begins with a description of Easter in 1893: memories of the smells from the bakery, making preserves, and other preparations for this greatest of Orthodox holidays.

FIGURE 2. Elena Varneck

Printed with permission.
Her observations are an upstairs/downstairs of class distinctions—the family’s maids wouldn’t talk to izvozhchiks (drivers of horse-drawn carriages), for example. The descriptions are quite amusing at times. Her paternal great-grandfather was a furniture maker from Danzig, Germany. Her father, Alexei Ivanovich Varneck, was an army officer, and her mother, Maria Petrovna (Usova), was a school principal. She was very close to her father, who read poetry and fables to her; they went for long walks. She describes the role of religion—everyone had to learn Zakon Bozhii (God’s Law). They went to a Lutheran service, but couldn’t go back for fear of her father losing his job. He was a government employee, and everyone had to be Orthodox. Later Soviet practices were just the opposite: anyone seen at an Orthodox service could lose his or her job. They had to go to Christmas and Easter services at a minimum to remain respectable. Several times Elena mentions metal wreaths prepared for funerals. The strong influences of age-old adages remained with her all her life: never step on a piece of bread—this is the greatest sin of all; you must put the right stocking and shoe on first.

Unfortunately, Elena’s father died when she was almost ten. In 1901, her mother used her connections to get Elena into Smolnyi Institute, the very elite St. Petersburg girls’ school. The atmosphere was on the Dickensian side, and Elena likened it all to prison. There are detailed descriptions of the school dress. Elena was often in detention, walking the halls for long periods of time. She described what she calls “adoration” among girls, that sometimes developed “lesbians” (autobiography, p. 205); Elena thought this was quite natural. There are tales of filching roast chicken, pirozhki, and other treats from dinners with the princess, a member of Tsar Nicholas II’s family, who was the patroness of the school (p. 267). These dinners were held to increase the girls’ practice at table manners. Her savior in all of this was her voice—she was an active and welcome member of the Orthodox choir.

A most surprising part of her autobiography is her description, after graduating, of what can be described as a Crimean walkabout (383 ff.). It was quite amazing for a young girl to be out on her own; she did not seem afraid. Once she had a hard time finding a place to stay. She was just lying down to sleep, when the police showed up and said her passport had to be registered in distant Yalta! She was up early the next morning and on her way in order to avoid fulfilling this command. She describes kliuvka pudding (a kliuvka is somewhat like a cranberry), and while in Crimea she ate Tatar chebureki (lamb-filled pastry). Another adventurous trip in 1913 takes her to the Tajik-Afghan border. She mentions having a sketchbook with her (pp. 517-570).
Several observations in Varneck’s memoirs reminded me very much of life in the soon-to-come Soviet Union. She describes a common tax scheme: her mother moved to an expensive apartment, but she and the manager signed all the papers showing a lower rent; this meant less taxes would be paid (p. 308). Elena observed during the revolutionary years that “the single great problem everyone had was how to keep eating and pay the rent” (p. 417). The abortion hospital was called the “angel factory” (p. 436); certainly this was the method of birth control available during the Soviet era. Elena’s use of the word “Yum!” to describe ice cream cannot be disputed. Her comment that “many people interested in Russian history seem to have no idea how closely the church and the government worked hand in hand to squeeze the people for their money and curtail their rights” (p. 476), expresses the same goal that the Communist Party had. Elena is critical that nothing seemed to “disturb the sluggish pond of middle-class opinion,” and she often mentions the idleness of the middle class, not wanting to take care of children, or cook, or clean, and so on (p. 479). By January 1917, Elena describes the masses of people jam-packed onto motorized streetcars, adding that it was hopeless to think of getting on (p. 629). Any visitor to the Soviet Union will be all too familiar with this phenomenon.

Alexei Alexeevich, Elena’s younger brother, was very good at mathematics and encouraged her to climb trees. In various descriptions it did not seem to me that Alexei was very nice to Elena, but she adored him. Not only did the Russian revolutions of 1917 create a turning point in the country, the first six months of that year unfolded both good and tragic events for Elena. When she tells her family she is going to America, her brother Alexei says, “You are lucky. You might get to travel via [the] Hawaiian Islands” (p. 658). The Atlantic was much too hazardous to cross at this time, so Varneck traveled from Petrograd to Vladivostok by train, then on to Japan and America by boat. In the meantime, soldiers returning from the war front were in foul moods, and the streets of Petrograd were full of demonstrators on a daily basis. She was with her brother when black-coated workers murdered him.

In addition to a good description of the numerous political parties in early 1917, there are footnotes throughout the text on the correct pronunciation of words. Varneck’s memoirs end on June 6 (old style), 1917, as she is leaving Petrograd to begin work for Premier Alexander Kerensky’s interim government at the Russian Embassy in Washington, DC, under Ambassador Boris Aleksandrovich Bakhmetev. The only hint of her life to come was a sentence about marrying a poor American man and going to live in Minnesota.
Varneck arrived in Washington, DC, to work as a translator in the Russian Embassy. In addition to Russian, she was fluent in English, French, and German, and used several other languages for research and translation: Spanish, Italian, Polish, and Czech. Later in her life, she wished she had started a non-European language. “There is such a thing as too late. I did start Arabic but eyes were ever strained.” In further recollections of this period, she says:

I was raised in a milieu of Russian liberal intellectuals who didn’t see the shape of things when the revolution came. What we saw were the dreams of the Russian revolutionaries of the preceding generation who wanted a democratic government and parliament, and if it hadn’t been for three years of war (1914-1917) . . . After three years the country was in a terrible condition economically and people were desperate. And still we liberals thought that the thing to do would be to have a constituent assembly and make a constitutional government, and that was what the provisional government was about that existed from March 1917 to October. That was the government that sent the embassy to Washington, DC, of which I was a part. I was very sincere in sharing that state of mind.

After the fall of the Provisional Government, Varneck went to New York City looking for work. While there she met Donat Konstantinovich Kazarinoff (February 1892-February 1957), a graduate of Moscow University. Hoping to see him again, she thought he might be attending Easter services at the Russian Orthodox Church, and that is indeed where she found him. Within a short time they were married. Donat’s first position was to teach at Carlton College in Northfield, Minnesota. Their son, Constantine, was born there in August of 1919. Somewhat later they moved to Ann Arbor, where Donat received a position as professor of mathematics. Constantine also was a teacher of mathematics. He died in October 2000.

Elena looked back:

I married and went to the Midwest and had my baby and just didn’t think of politics at all. We were poor all right, my husband on a beginning teacher’s salary. I washed diapers—I just didn’t think about anything for several years and then I began to see the light.

Maria Usova, Varneck’s mother, had emigrated to America, perhaps shortly after Varneck left Russia, and lived with the newlyweds. After Donat and Elena were divorced in 1921, Maria, Elena, and Connie moved to Natick, Massachusetts. A daily trolley ride took Elena to
Boston where she worked for *The Living Age* magazine from 1922 to 1927. In 1927 she took a trip to Europe with her son, and helped him keep a diary of their trip. From 1928 to 1929, Elena worked for the Harvard Medical School as a translator.

It is now lost how Varneck found out about the work in California and/or who invited her. She arrived at the Hoover Library in 1929 and began her work for Harold Fisher. She was one of the first full-time research associates at the Russian Revolution Institute and co-authored one Hoover Library publication.

Looking back on this time, she remembered:

> It was a slow process, and what finally enlightened me was, of all things—you’ll never guess—the Hoover Library! When I started working on that team of translators and researchers I found out that it’s a wonderful treasury of materials. In the line of duty I was supposed to do a lot of reading, and I did, and found that things were not as Mr. Hoover saw them (although he did a good thing feeding the hungry in Russia and elsewhere), but that didn’t make him politically correct. I also saw that we Russian intellectuals—our plans of constituent assembly were no longer possible. You can’t have it when there’s chaos in the country. That’s how and why the party that was most clever in appealing and promising people everything—whether or not they could fulfill their promises—came into power. The Socialist Revolutionary party was a good party, and what they wanted for the country could have been better than what the Bolshevik party wanted, but the trouble was that the masses no longer listened to reason. For the Socialist Revolutionists to succeed, they would had to have had a population that could listen to reason and the majority of soldiers no longer [did]. Another thing about these Socialist Revolutionaries was that they made the fatal mistake of accepting foreign help and helping the intervention in several cases. That was their funeral, of course.

During her time with Fisher, Varneck became a specialist on Siberia and the Soviet Far East, which resulted in their joint publication *The Testimony of Kolchak and Other Siberian Materials*. Varneck translated the documents for this volume.

In addition to the two boxes already mentioned, there are seventeen other manuscript boxes under Varneck’s name containing research notes; drafts of writings and translations; and materials for a proposed publication. This publication was to be titled *Revolution and Civil War*.
in Siberia and the Far East, and to pertain to events in those regions. Varneck and Fisher worked on the book, but never finished it. The outline of it bears many similarities to the outline of a book Anatolii Gutman was working on at the time and had sent with his list of materials to sell.47

In 1931 Gutman began corresponding with Ralph Lutz at the Hoover War Library. His letters are from Berlin, Germany, and bear the title Dr. Jur., indicating he had obtained a doctorate of law. A letter of July 1931 contains a list of documents he was offering for sale, which include the following:

- Official correspondence between governments, diplomats, and commanders of armies and detachments
- Official governmental acts
- Various kinds of notes, memoirs, newspapers, and journals

He wrote:

My task as a participant and analyst of the civil war in this particular case, is to give to your library a complete collection of documentary material to study the history of the civil war...I would offer to give a complete outline and commentary to the documents.48

Sometime later he wrote to Varneck:

I enclose two lists of documents, correspondence, and publications relating to the history of the civil war on the territories from the Volga to the Pacific. On the basis of these materials, some of which I collected here [in Berlin], and others during my twelve-years round the world travels over the Far East, United States and Europe.49

Gutman asks Varneck to report this to Fisher and hopes finally to have a decision on making him an offer.50 The lengthy attachment lists about 150 items, many of which were used in The Testimony of Kolchak book.

By 1939, funding for Varneck’s work at the Hoover ended.51 From 1941, she worked at the Rincon Annex post office inspecting mail, and at a post office in the Palo Alto area, possibly screening mail from the Soviet Union.52

She was a translator for the U.S. Department of State from 1942 to 1945, which included her work at the first United Nations conference in
San Francisco in 1945 as a translator. Harold Fisher also participated in this conference as the assistant to Harold E. Stassen. She taught Russian during World War II at the Navy Language School at Boulder, Colorado, and German at Montana State University in Missoula. Varneck had a German nanny while growing up, and German was her first foreign language.

Returning to Stanford University, she taught Russian from 1948 to 1951. During this period she contacted Charles Rothwell at the Hoover Institution and Library:

> As I tried to tell on the telephone, but probably did not make it clear, I am most of all looking for part-time or temporary work, simply because a steady position, with the present cost of rent and living, would have to be a very good position to pay for living away from home.

Varneck had been hired previously (August 1948, February 1949, April 1949, September 1949, October 1949, January 1950) to do translating of legal and economic documents for the Hoover in her free time.

Varneck pursued an active life after retirement. She was an amateur artist working in watercolors and ceramics, and had some exhibitions. She wrote articles on social issues including old age. She became a member of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom in Palo Alto and worked for anti-war causes, particularly during the Vietnam War. In her later years she became open to the philosophies of Fidel Castro and Mao Tse-tung. It was during this time that Shera Thompson discovered her. Thompson had recently received an MFA in painting from the San Francisco Art Institute. She wrote an insightful article about Elena, photographed and filmed her, recorded her voice, and became her close friend. Susan Kazarinoff, Varneck’s daughter-in-law, put me in touch with Thompson. This was an unexpected treasure trove of information. It is rare when one is writing a biography of someone who has died, to be able to “meet” the person posthumously.

It seems a nice closure of a circle to know that the man who had sent Varneck to America was able to meet her in California; both were at the end of their careers. According to Susan Kazarinoff, during Alexander Kerensky’s nearly ten years at Stanford (see Note 34), he met Varneck at her house, where they visited for quite a while. Kerensky was going blind and was in poor health at the time. Perhaps they met also at other times. If only their conversations could have been recorded!
In her eightieth year, Elena wrote her autobiography and agreed to be interviewed by Thompson, who noted,

She has achieved naturalness, dignity, and wisdom. She supported euthanasia, and didn’t want to be dumped into a home. She lived in a tiny one-room cottage. Her voice is resonant, strong, and full. Blue twinkling eyes. A bright quilt covered her bed-couch.59

At the end of her life, Elena was in a nursing home, but her spirit was bright enough to ask Shera to smuggle in some food: dark rye bread and grape juice.

It could be said that Varneck returned twice to the Soviet Union. In 1964, she traveled there, but nothing remains of her impressions, other than that her friend Alice Richards noted that Varneck was a bit critical. It would have been fascinating to know what her thoughts were—even where she went. The second “trip” was in 1977, when Elena’s son Connie and his wife Susan took the video Thompson made to the Soviet Union; they shared it with a cousin who worked for a TV station, where it was aired.60

After several years of living with a heart ailment, Elena died on February 16, 1976, at Stanford Medical Center. Her remains were donated to the Stanford University School of Medicine.61 In addition to her son and his family, she is survived by cousins Pierre Warneck of Belgium and Tania Protopatoff of France. Memorial services were held in the beautiful Stanford Memorial Church on the university campus. Alice Richards, who knew Elena through their work together in various peace activities, was in charge of the service.

Standing about five feet seven inches tall and 160 lbs, Elena was a tall lady with gray hair and demanding voice, a commanding presence, according to Agnes Peterson.62 She lived in a tiny cottage and drove a VW bug. We know from her memoirs that her favorite Russian authors were Turgenev, Kuprin, Tolstoy, and Solzhenitsyn—especially his *August 1914*. Elena was a naturalized United States citizen.63 She became attached to her three grandsons, often singing Russian folk songs to them. The only hint of unhappiness in her life was when this relationship was curtailed. It was the cold war era and perhaps her son felt that speaking Russian was not a good idea.

Delightfully informal with a great sense of humor, Elena can only be described as a free-spirited thinker. Her presence and influence at the Hoover Institution will remain forever in the rich resources that she and Fisher acquired for researchers.
Ivan Innokent’evich Serebrennikov (1882-1953)

Born in Irkutsk, Ivan Serebrennikov (Figure 3) was a journalist and historian. Among his many activities, he was the secretary of the Irkutsk City Duma (1913) and a minister in Admiral Kolchak’s Siberian Government (1920). That same year he emigrated to China, where he first settled in Harbin, then Peking, and eventually resided in Tientsin from the spring of 1922 until his death. He was a monumental figure of the Russian emigration in China, maintaining contact with most of the prominent figures. His archive consists of twenty-five manuscript boxes, three photo albums, and other miscellaneous materials. The core of his collection is the daily diary he kept from the last days of December 1919 until 1956.65 Aleksandra, also born in Irkutsk, worked as a journalist. After arriving in China, she did some editing work, and taught Russian language and literature. Aleksandra was a poet, and crucial help to her husband after he became ill. In his later years, she recorded all the diary entries. After Ivan’s death she left China in 1955 and ended up in San Francisco, where she was a corrector for the Russian newspaper Russkaia zhizn’. She worked at the Hoover helping to organize her deceased husband’s archive. The Serebrennikovs each have many publications, both books and articles.66

The Hoover War Library was constantly and eagerly searching for materials to enrich its collections. Russian émigrés were usually in moderate to desperate financial need. The first item in the folder of correspondence between Fisher and Serebrennikov is an undated letter telling about the Hoover, and that they are looking for biographical data and memoirs.67 Serebrennikov first wrote about wanting to publish his memoirs and Fisher was very encouraging. He helped Serebrennikov publish an article in English on Mongolia in Foreign Affairs (March 23, 1931), for which he received $75.68

In 1931, Serebrennikov became the first agent in China collecting materials for the Hoover, when Fisher asked him to look for materials about Siberia. He outlined what the Hoover wanted:

- Newspapers and other periodical publications published by local or official institutions
- Documents of official organizations or social organizations
- Memoirs, diaries, and such, of people who held posts in Russia or were in a special situation to observe
Fisher says that Serebrennikov, of course, would be compensated:

For your help, we usually pay 10% of the sum of materials bought for the Library, and 25% of the value of the materials given to the Library. The estimates will be done by the Library. (Fisher to Serebrennikov, January 5, 1932)

Serebrennikov replied that he was willing to be a sotrudnik (worker) for the Hoover War Library:

I have good experience collecting archives. In 1914, I organized in Irkutsk, Siberia the Arkhiv Mirovoi voiny pri Muzei Vostochno-

Sibirskago otdiela Imper. Russk. Geog. obshchestva [Archive of the World War at the museum of the Eastern Siberian Branch of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society]. In 1917 this archive was renamed by me Arkhivy voiny i revoliutsii [Archives of War and Revolution]. From 1914 to 1919, I collected many varied publications for this archive. From 1927, I have been the representative of the Russian Abroad Historical Archive (RZIA) in Czechoslovakia and have been sending them important materials. If the Library does not like my working for Prague, I may refuse them. (Serebrennikov to Fisher, April 23, 1932)

In addition, Serebrennikov was helping professors at Michigan and Harvard obtain materials; he always asked for $200 a month.

One theme predominates on Fisher’s side: he always mentioned budget cuts and that he had no money. With the major emphasis on collecting in Europe and the effects of the depression years not sparing the Hoover War library, it is amazing what Fisher was able to acquire. The correspondence in 1932 records the following activities:

• In June, Serebrennikov subscribed to Kharbinskoe Vremia and Vozrozhdenie Azii.

• In July, he sent issues of the newspapers Golos Azii and Mukden; the journal Stremia; from Shanghai he sent Filimonov and P. P. Shishkin the publication Bol’shevism v Kitaie (Bolshevism in China); from Peking, the journal Russkoe obozrenie.

• In August, Serebrennikov received an offer from Georgii Gustafovich Tel’berg, former Minister of Justice in Admiral Kolchak’s Government in Omsk, who had a collection of five documents. Tel’berg thought about the Hoover War Library or the Prague Archives, but would sell only if he could get a good price. Fisher asked if no. 5 was the most important one. Serebrennikov agreed. Fisher said the price is really more than Hoover can pay. No. 5 was “Sobranie ofitsial’nykh kopii zhurnalov Sovieta Ministrov Omskago Pravitel’stva, polnyi komplekt, noiabr 1918–April 1919 [Collection of official copies of journals of the Council of Ministers of the Omsk Government, complete set, November 1918-April 1919]. Price $100.” (Fisher to Serebrennikov, August 9, 1932; and Serebrennikov to Fisher, September 1, 1932)

• In a November letter, Fisher acknowledged the receipt of the Filimonov item, and stated that he was “interested mainly in publications about the emigration in the Far East relating to politics,
history, and social questions, and also to some degree belles lettres.”
(Fisher to Serebrennikov, November 28, 1932)

During the next year, Serebrennikov continued to send Fisher materials with no mention of payment, and articles for him to try to publish. In August, mention of Smith was made when Fisher wrote:

The Library’s possibilities to pay for materials sent to it grows less and less. Agreeing to the request of Mr. Robert Smith, I will write the publisher of *Kharbinskoe vremia* with a request to set up a subscription to send us regularly the numbers of this newspaper and wait for further instructions from him. (Fisher to Serebrennikov, August 11, 1933)

Fisher told Serebrennikov:

If you care to send us some of the materials which you have mentioned in your recent letters we shall be glad to give them the most careful consideration. As far as we can judge from the titles, those which would be most likely to interest us are: *Kaigorodvshchina,72* diary of the military official Efimov,73 diary of the soldier Mokrousov, memoirs of Pershin.74

The focus on money—the lack of it by Fisher and the pleas for it by Serebrennikov—continued for many years. Fisher’s letters always reported on what materials were received, but at the same time relentlessly insisted that missing issues be found for the newspapers and journals. One hopes that Serebrennikov was receiving some compensation.75 While the mail seemed to have worked fairly quickly, the correspondence tapered off. Serebrennikov reported:

Soon I’ll have a serious operation. I have lost my work and live in the most difficult of circumstances. Isn’t it possible for you to find thirty to forty dollars a month to help for all the work I’ve done for the Library? My wife can undertake this work. We can [make a] collection [of] diaries, memoirs, copy documents, as well as books and brochures. (Serebrennikov to Fisher, November 15, 1936)

Fisher replied that he was sorry to hear about his illness, but couldn’t say when he would be getting more money. He suggested it would be nice if Serebrennikov’s wife would write annotations for materials that were offered (Fisher to Serebrennikov, January 4, 1937). A year
later, Fisher was glad to hear that Serebrennikov was better (Fisher to Serebrennikov, February 18, 1938). And a great deal later, Fisher sent $25 for Serebrennikov’s memoirs.76

By February 1941, Serebrennikov was already so sick that he could no longer get out of bed. His wife Aleksandra was assisting him. He told Fisher he would be sending some materials to Hoover for the library and asked that he be allowed to deposit his personal archive.77 The correspondence between the two may have continued into the late 1940s.78 Fisher’s letters are full of profuse thank yous and how’s your health, but any mention of monetary compensation was barely evident. Serebrennikov, however, had another concern that he confided to his diary: he praised Fisher’s former prompt attention to answering letters, but appeared harsh in not understanding why Fisher did not acknowledge his letter of May 17, 1948.79 It is possible that after Varneck left, no one was handling Fisher’s correspondence the way she did. The loss of Fisher as a contact in America was no doubt a real blow to Serebrennikov.

**Serebrennikov and Robert Smith**

The interaction of Serebrennikov and Robert Smith gives us some further details on each of their lives and characters. It sets up a triangle, as both are dealing with Fisher. Life among the Russians in Tientsin has been described as full of hatred and intrigue.80 It is not known what the two really thought of each other.

In November 1932 Serebrennikov received a letter from the Russian Foreign Historical Archive (Russkii zagranichnyi istoricheskii arkhiv, often referred to by its Russian initials, RZIA) in Prague with the news that a few days earlier R. V. Smith had arrived in Harbin.81 Smith had accepted an offer from the Hoover War Library to be a correspondent for that organization. His obligation was to send to America weekly information about Far Eastern matters. Smith is described by Serebrennikov in his diary as an Englishman, but entirely russified. Not long before the revolution he had finished Moscow University in the historical-philological faculty. For some time he had lived in London, where he taught Russian literature in one of the schools. When the famous émigré Prince Sviatopolk Mirsky replaced him, Smith had moved to China. There he occupied himself with commerce, specifically, a large fur trade operation. But one fine day two years ago, wrote Serebrennikov, he went bankrupt and owed the local bankers millions of dollars. It looked as if now he had returned to intellectual work. Smith’s wife
was from Irkutsk (née Stronskaia). She and her sister were at one time famous beauties there.82

On November 29, Serebrennikov’s diary reported:

Saw R. V. Smith, who had arrived here from Harbin with many interesting accounts about present-day life in that city. My interlocutor, knowing about the receipt of my honoraria from America, asked me to lend him a thousand dollars for a certain period of time. I, knowing how much he is in debt, refused. There is no hope of getting the money back.

There was a time, and not so long ago, when Smith and his wife spent thousands of dollars a month, but then a catastrophe occurred. He runs around town looking from whom he can borrow money. I remember that four years ago, I happened to go to Smith in his office and turned to him for a favor:

“Robert Vasil’evich, you are an Englishman and as such, an intelligent and educated man. I have a request for you. I have written a small article in English. May you read at your leisure two or three pages from my manuscript and tell me your opinion about how my article sounds in English, if it is written satisfactorily or not, with special attention to its style?”

Smith agreed to fulfill my small request and took the manuscript. It lay with him for two months. I went to him again. When I received it back, I was convinced he never looked at it. This is the attention he gave to my request.

Today for some reason I unintentionally remembered this incident. (pp. 104-105)

Smith and Serebrennikov met two more times (October 30 and December 13, 1933), noted only in short diary entries. Smith considered war between Soviet Russia and Japan inevitable, but no one knew when. He remained active, collecting different, new, and interesting materials of archival nature and books of antiquarian character for sending to the Hoover War Library (Serebrennikov, Diary, October 30, 1933, p. 84; and December 13, 1933, p. 122).

In early 1935, Fisher wrote to Serebrennikov:

Our book about the Civil War in Siberia is still not published. But we have already sent to press another book about Siberia.83 I have
not received news from Robert Smith for several months, although I know that he is not in especially good health. I am a little worried if he is ill or not. If you have any later news about him, please tell me. (Fisher to Serebrennikov, February 4, 1935)

To this letter Serebrennikov replied:

Mr. Robert Smith is in Tientsin. As I’ve heard, he gets sick from time to time, but he still continues in your service (if I am not mistaken, he works right now in one Chinese trade firm).

Serebrennikov then described his book Velikii okhod.84 Fisher informed Serebrennikov that the manuscript of D. P. Pershin and Baron Ungern85 had been acquired by the Hoover War Library, Committee on Russian Research. Serebrennikov commented:

Fisher asked Robert Smith to pay me forty-five American dollars for the manuscript. This last situation disappointed me terribly. Smith has sunken down and owes money to everyone and pays no one. Will I ever receive money from him? Why hasn’t the money been sent to me directly? Maybe Smith has sold something to America and he received a check for the whole amount to be paid to him and me? Maybe Smith owes money to the Hoover Library? In any case, it’s impossible to meet Smith. We will see what happens. (Serebrennikov, Diary, May 9, 1935, p. 14)

The diary shows that the next day, Serebrennikov visited Robert Smith, who said that he had had no letters from Fisher for a long time. The Hoover War Library considered that Smith owed them 130 gold dollars, which was most likely the payment for the D. M. Pershin manuscript. Smith questioned the amount of the debt. Serebrennikov further noted:

In a word, it became clear to me I will not receive any money from him. I will have to write to America and ask them to transfer the amount to me. It will take more than two months, And here I was so happy to please old man Pershin. How badly all this turned out. (Serebrennikov, Diary, May 9, 1935, p. 15)

Fisher in turn was “very distressed to learn that Mr. Smith refused to pay [Serebrennikov] the sum which we told him to give you. He did not
have any debts to our institution, nor did he say anything bad about us; he is no longer working here” (Fisher to Serebrennikov, June 17, 1935).

**ROBERT (VASIL’EVICH) SMITH (1889-?)**

In the Hoover War Library’s 1932-33 and 1933-34 annual reports, Robert Smith is listed as a research associate, who has sent items to the Hoover and was paid a salary. Further, the 1933-34 report notes that six extensive archive collections were received, for which Fisher is preparing a special report. These may have been the result of Smith’s work (*Annual Report of the Chairman*, 1933-34: 10).

**Fisher and Smith Correspondence**

The letters of Fisher and Smith span the period from July 1931 until April 1935. In them we have from Smith a thick file on current events and comments on the contacts that he made in Manchuria. From Fisher we have his reaction to the materials and can see the decisions that went into which materials to obtain. Fisher’s concern for telling a balanced history, and Varneck’s input into the process are clearly visible.

It was Fisher who first contacted Smith:

> In the course of correspondence with Sir Bernard Pares relative to some research work which I am carrying on here in the Hoover War Library, Sir Bernard has suggested that it would be desirable for me to get in touch with you. [Fisher then explains about the kinds of materials at Hoover.] One of our difficulties has been to get reliable materials on the course of events in Mongolia. Have you any paper of your own relating to your experiences there . . .? Sir Bernard has been kind enough to lend me a copy of the diary which he kept while he was in Siberia. I have several Russian correspondents in China, among them Mr. Serebrennikov, who also lives in Tientsin. (Fisher to Smith, July 17, 1931)

Three months later, Smith replied:

> As regards Siberia I have in my possession a few valuable books. After the Russian revolution I was tied up for 16 months on the Archangel front and naturally know more about that section of Russia than about Siberia. Mr. Serebrennikoff, whose name you
mention is about the best expert on Siberia here in Tientsin and of course knows Siberia intimately.89

Regarding Mr. Serebrennikov, Fisher explained to Smith:

Some months ago, he suggested that we authorize him to act as our agent in the collection of materials on a salary and commission basis. I was not able to offer him a salary, but I did tell him that we would be glad to pay him the usual commission on any material which he might collect which was acceptable to us.

There are several reasons for this decision. One was that at the time we did not have the funds available; secondly, I did not feel that we were justified in paying even a small salary for such work as Mr. Serebrennikov might be able to do for us. He has been very amiable and our relations have been entirely satisfactory to me. I do not wish to injure his feelings, and therefore I hope that if the occasion arises you will explain to him that our arrangement with you is on quite a different basis and primarily for a different purpose.

During the last few months, Mr. F. S. Mansvetov has been acting for us in the collection of materials. He is, as you perhaps know, an S. R. and a former official in the Russian Far East. He has recently established contacts with individuals in Harbin. We have received a few materials from them. I imagine that the majority of those with whom he is in contact belong to the left groups . . . although he seems to be able to get in touch with some . . . of the more conservative parties.

To justify the expenditure of funds and show that it was reasonably productive, Fisher suggested that for the work Smith planned to undertake he would “receive $200 a month for a minimum period of six months;” this could be extended up to a year. When Smith was established in Harbin, Fisher expected to hear about “topics of special investigation or collections of materials which are of particular significance” (Fisher to Smith, July 7, 1932).

After Smith began to work in Harbin, Fisher sent the American Consul General, George C. Hansen, a letter of introduction, saying that Smith

is to undertake some research work for us in Harbin. His work is part of a general program which we are carrying on, and which re-
lates to the events that occurred as a result of the Russian Revolution. Mr. Smith will be engaged not only in research of the materials which are available in Harbin, but also in the collection of historical documents and publications of interest for this library. (Fisher to George C. Hansen, October 10, 1932)

It was almost an early version of having a CNN reporter right on the spot. As promised, Smith began to send lengthy observations to Fisher, which were no doubt circulated to the Committee for Russian Research and others at the Hoover and/or Stanford’s history department. There were eight reports in all totaling over 300 typed pages. They date from November 1932 to August 1934, and they cover such topics as attempts to kidnap foreigners, murders, the Su-Ping-Wen rising in Barga, the daily exodus of Russian emigrants leaving Harbin for the south, notes on education, schools, the Manchurian Research Society of Harbin (Obshchestvo izuchenii Man’chzhurskogo kraia, OIMKa) and its current publications, the Mongolian People’s Revolutionary Party, the CER, and an interview with Horvath (in *Nasha zaria*, July 29, 1934).

Many of the notes that Smith sent were excerpts from regional newspapers and not necessarily his analysis of events. The reports do include sections on people who have collections for sale.

One example in the early correspondence illustrates Fisher’s and Varneck’s concern for a balanced picture of events. Fisher wrote:

> Naturally, as you suggest, the materials in the Urga *Izvestiia* must be counter balanced by information from a less prejudiced source. This also applied to the materials which we have here relating to Mongolian affairs. We have a number of books but they are all pro-Bolshevik. The only possible check against these pro-Bolshevik materials is the personal accounts of non-Bolsheviks who have participated in the events in Mongolia since the independence, or who have had access to reliable documents. It will not be many years before such participants in these events will no longer be here where they can set down their recollections. (Fisher to Smith, January 11, 1932:1-2)

The mails seem a concern to Fisher, so that in September he wrote Smith to ask:

> If there is any channel through which I can write you after you have gone to Harbin and be sure that the letters will not be read by
various officials. I assume that ordinary mail to you will be read by
Japanese, but that it is not likely to be read by the Soviet people.
(Fisher to Smith, September 28, 1932 [carbon, not signed])

A few months later he said, “I think it advisable for me to give a num-
ber to each of my letters.”

As an example of how work at the Hoover affected collecting, Fisher
told Smith that since Mrs. Varneck was working on the civil war in
Siberia,

She has special need for Vladivostok newspapers, particularly of
the period of the week preceding the Czech uprising there, June
29, 1918 (new style). The Sibirskaja zhizn’ of June 19, 1918, no.
39, contains an article by Potanin, which we should like to get. . . .
you might arrange to have the article copied from the files which
you will probably find in the [CER] Railway Library. . . . Mr. Kauf-
man, the editor of Rupor, has sent us recent files of his newspaper
through F. S. Mansvetov. . . .

The correspondence often concerned money, so perhaps it is not un-
usual that the last letter Fisher sent Smith was on this subject. It was
very curt:

Will you be good enough to pay to Mr. I. I. Serebrennikov $45 out
of the unexpected funds which we sent you. According to our re-
cords we sent you on October 5, 1933, $300 for the Moravsky ma-
terials, and on April 26, 1934, $300 for the Nilus materials with the
understanding that, if possible, you should pay less than $300 for
the latter materials. Later I asked you not to advance any money
for Moravsky’s materials and to discontinue negotiations for them.
In addition to the amount which you may have paid for the Nilus, I
have asked you to pay $85 for the Golubev manuscript. I hope . . .
that I may hear from you.

Below are two subsections within the Fisher-Smith correspondence.
The first is a list of specific examples and the second is a small section il-
lustrating Elena Varneck’s input into the process of acquiring materials.

Specific Examples

Within the eight reports on current events already mentioned (see
note 90), Smith added a section at the end of each one marked Personal.
Here he included notes on libraries, people, possible collections for
Excerpts from the letters of Smith and Fisher are arranged below by four broad topics: (1) The Chinese Eastern Railway and its library, (2) library materials, (3) archival collections, and (4) individuals.

The Chinese Eastern Railway and Its Library.

Smith wrote from Harbin,

The largest Library here is the Railway Library, and there I intend to work daily from 3 to 8 [pm] starting on the 10th. The city today is decorated with flags due to the 15th anniversary of the Soviet Revolution. All Departments of the North Manchurian Railway, including the Library, as well as most of the shops in the city, are closed. Most unfortunately, the library has only a Card Index and no printed catalogue, therefore my first days will be more in looking over the card index, which, as I have heard, is not very systematically arranged, and in making a list of books for future use.98 Books, periodicals, etc., on Siberia are fairly well represented, the recent acquisitions have not been very large, as the railway grant to the library this year has been cut. (Smith to Fisher, November 7, 1932)

Fisher replied,

With respect to the conditions in the Library of the Northern Manchurian Railway,99 this library might be interested in exchanging duplicates of materials which they have for current materials published in America or Great Britain that are of interest to them. Such an exchange might be worked out along the following lines: the N. M. R. Library could prepare a list of the books, periodicals, etc., which they have available for exchange, placing a value on each item on the list. This list you could then send to me so that I may have it checked for such items as we do not already have. I will prepare a list of recent publications relating to Manchuria, the Far East, or any other topic in which the Railway Library is interested, with an estimate of the price on each item on the list. (Fisher to Smith, December 3, 1932)

A few months later, Smith was successful in forwarding the first short list of the “Exchange Book Fund” of the Library.100 This . . . list is not very satisfactory or interesting. In order, however, to establish connections with the Central Library it
may be worth while to order a few of their . . . books. The prices are on the Gold Rouble basis at a fixed exchange of two gold roubles to one U. S. A. dollar. Please note that I could purchase any book of their first list . . . at about a quarter of the valuation of the Library. (Smith to Fisher, sent February 5, 1933, from Harbin, 130)

Smith reported,

Professor Ustryaloff, Director of the Central Railway Library, is very favourably inclined toward the establishment of a contact with the Stanford Library and the exchange of books. Ustryaloff will check his files for materials that could be typed (i.e., copied). . . but thinks more recent documents cannot be used for publication. He has tried to work on his memoirs, but his position prevents him from getting this done . . . Pr. U. is a first class speaker and writer and anything he may give us would be of considerable value to the Library. 101

Smith continues,

For political reasons, the Central Railway Library, which possesses a splendid collection of books, periodicals etc. on Manchuria is very short of all recent publications on Siberia, Outer Mongolia or the Buryat-Mongolian Republic. . . . [P]ublications in Russian on Outer Mongolia are very scarce. The absence of these materials at the Central Library is easy to explain. There are political reasons. The personal inclinations and interests of the individual Directors of the Library are also to blame for this deficiency. Certain fields of research are better covered than others. Professor Ustryaloff, the present Director is interested mostly in Philosophy and Law. The collections of books, etc. on economics and railway subjects, also the regional study of Manchuria and of China generally have been the main work of the library. The Bibliographical Bulletins published by the Central Library are very valuable books and I think you should have a complete set. The “Asiatica” section of the Library contains also a very valuable set of publications. 102

Smith met with a gentleman named Leonid Aleksandrovich Ustrugov (Oustrugoff) (1874?-1938) several times while the former was in Harbin. Smith said that Oustrugoff
kept a very close and minute Dairy [sic] of all events of a political nature during his participation in the Government but that these–diaries and materials perished in a railway collision outside Kransoyarsk [sic] at the time of his evacuation from Siberia together with all materials he had personally collected relative to the Inter-Allied Board. I believe this to be true. At the same time Mr. Oustugoff's [sic] political ideas have, especially lately, undergone a very considerable change. He is Rector of the local Polytechnic, which is subsidized by the Railway. In this important position he naturally has to be very careful in anything he prints or says. (Smith to Fisher, November [?] 1932:35-39)

Regarding the sale of the railway, Smith commented that it has

effected Isic] hundreds of Russians connected with the railway. [They] will have to leave Harbin and dispose of their libraries or any other accumulation of materials, historical documents, etc. I expect that the next three months I pass in Harbin will be most fruitful for our purposes of collecting materials for the Library.103

It was reported in the Harbin newspaper Zarya about the compilation for publication of the second volume of the Official History of the CER.104

Smith reported to Fisher:

The first volume and the abridged translation in English will be acquired and sent along together with the unpublished materials prepared for the second volume. [They] were published on June 11th 1923 on the date of the 25th anniversary of the railway. The second volume, as you know was never published as the manuscript was completed only after the change of the status of the railway in 1924. The first volume was translated in full into English by Mr. Gibson but this typewritten English text was deposited with the Board and cannot be easily procured. However, I shall try to find out more about this complete translation. In the Zarya article, Mr. Nilus, under whose signature the article appeared, writes that the first Soviet Manager of the Railway was very critical of the published text of the first volume, that he did not approve of the fact that a portrait of the late Emperor was published in the text and
that the activities of General Horvath as Manager were favourably commented upon.

The initiative of Lachinoff (V. D., . . . former Vice-Chairman of the Board of directors of CER), according to Nilus, helped to compile a genuine documentary history the Railway for which the future historian of Russia’s activities in Manchuria will be thankful and which will remain a permanent monument to his memory.105

Fisher directed Smith to buy this history from Mr. Nilus. But Smith was “doubtful that [Nilus] will agree to accept $200-250 for all of the manuscripts. However, I shall try to persuade him to forward the manuscripts to you, provisionally. . . after a careful evaluation you may reconsider the amount.” (Smith to Fisher, July 7, 1933, from Tientsin, 206)


“Not much may be collected ‘by chance,’” Smith reported. However, on daily rounds to booksellers he found many books, etc., which were cheap and worthwhile buying. He wanted to hear from Fisher as to what extent it would be safe to make purchases. Books and printed materials would be cheap, with the exception of Soviet publications of a later period, which were sold in Harbin on the basis of Gold Dollars. (Smith to Fisher, November [?] 1932: 35-39) Fisher sent a list of what Hoover would like, to which Smith replied,

With reference to the first list you sent me, the majority of publications required by the Library are of later origin than 1921 and are, therefore not only expensive as they are based on gold, but likewise are hard to find. The Soviet Trade Delegation people have promised to do their best in executing any orders. Naturally it is easier for them to do this from Harbin than from New York or London. The sellers at the Agency are natives of Siberia, who know the literature of the Civil War in Siberia and the sources from which this literature can be obtained. With a certain amount of persuading, I think, I can make them ransack any Soviet Libraries or other book sources in the Far East. In any dealings with them all transactions would be in gold dollars and consequently expensive, also I should have to order all purchases made to be mailed to my address in Tientsin. (Smith to Fisher, November [?] 1932:35-39)
A long list of materials and documents on Siberia is appended to Smith’s Report 2 (Smith to Fisher, November 14, 1932). Later Smith came across “a collection of books on Manchuria and Mongolia numbering about 420 vol. mostly old editions” . . . that “could be probably bought for about 100 to 150 Gold Dollars.” (Smith to Fisher, December 30, 1932:97) Fisher replied on February 24, 1933, “For the time being we are unable to take advantage of the offer of the collection of books on Manchuria and Siberia. I realize that this is a very good bargain, but we are obliged to watch our expenses.”

Journals and Periodicals.

After visiting Harbin libraries, Smith was sorry to report that hardly anything could be obtained without a subscription. The fees for the first six months would amount to about 100 to 150 gold dollars. He established a connection through Torpredstvo and the Consulate, and felt he would be able to get what he needed by mail.106

Fisher responded,

With regard to the subscriptions to periodicals relating to Mongolia, Siberia and the Russian Far East, I approve of the suggestions which you made, and we will advance $100 with your next salary check to cover these subscriptions. Unfortunately, we cannot afford to make a complete collection of all the journals . . . I suggest . . . that you limit our subscriptions to those which are the most essential for your work and the preservation in the library. (Fisher to Smith, January 10, 1933, letter 3, pp. 1-3, referencing Smith’s pp. 17 and 36)

Archives.

“There is not a general source from which such documents can be obtained,” Smith wrote. Further, he noted,

A number of valuable documents are no longer available, as they have been collected for the Prague Library.107 In the past they were very active in their efforts to collect materials and documents and were especially successful during the early period after the Civil War, as they were intimately connected with the social revolutionary groups. The owners of such archives or private collections are
more reluctant to part with their possessions. In many cases close connections have been established by many of the emigrants with the Bolsheviks or the Japanese, which makes these emigrants extremely cautious when dealing with third parties. One has to proceed with discretion, and get gradually acquainted with people. (Smith to Fisher, November 27, 1932, from Tientsin)

Fisher wanted to know if it was possible for Smith

to ask some of your Russian friends if they would be willing to write out their recollections or to make copies of any documents which they have, or to aid us in any other way in preserving these historical materials. We would, of course, expect to compensate them for this. The compensation would have to be on the basis of academic rather than commercial standards. (Fisher to Smith, January 11, 1932:1-2)

Fisher also realized that

the attitude of those who may possess historical materials is quite understandable, and I fully recognize that many of the most valuable materials have already been collected and that the present time is far less favorable than a few years ago. The Prague Archives, I expect, secured the best of the available materials, and all we can hope to do is to salvage some of the things which for one reason or another the Prague people were unable to get. (Fisher to Smith, January 10, 1933, letter 3, pp. 1-3, referencing Smith’s p. 33)

The commercialization of collecting materials and archives in Harbin, due to the Prague agents, is cited by Smith in the following example:

The Archives and manuscripts of the late General Andogsky are now in the Market. Andogsky, former General of the Russian Imperial General Staff was one of the most talented and literary gifted Generals, tho he lost some of his reputation by having participated as Military specialist in the Brest Litovsk Peace Conference. Later he first escaped from Soviet Russia to Siberia and then to Manchuria, where he made a living by writing. After his death his manuscripts were bought up for speculative purposes and are now being offered at a very high price. [Smith then lists three parts
of the papers. Fisher made a note in the margins for Mrs. Varneck to review.] They were bought from the widow of General Andogsky for less than 500 yen. The present owners don’t want to part with these manuscripts for over 500 Gold Dollars. The market for all such documents has been definitely established by Prague and there are certain individuals in Harbin who are anxious not to miss anything that can be picked up at a small investment and later profitably sold. (Smith to Fisher, December 30, 1932:92-93)

Indeed, Fisher confirmed that “the Andogsky archives have been offered to us once or twice, and we have declined to consider them because the price is ridiculously high” (Fisher to Smith, February 24, 1933, letter 5, pp. 1-4).

The Semenov archives Fisher had heard of from another source, but had never been able to find out where they were or under what conditions it might be possible to acquire them. He planned to “ask Mr. Serebrennikov for further information, and if you [Smith] hear anything more regarding the whereabouts of the archives I shall be glad to know of it.” (Fisher to Smith, January 11, 1932:1-2) Serebrennikov told Smith that “the archives of General Semenoff were somewhere in Tientsin or Peking in the hands of Chinese authorities.”

For three or four years, Fisher was in communication “with Mr. William Klemm, who has been preparing the memoirs of General Horvath which we expect to publish. I have also had some correspondence with Mr. Vladimir Yourieff.” Regarding the Horvath archives, Mr. Klemm assured Fisher “that it is the intention of the General to turn them over to the Hoover War Library for safekeeping” (Fisher to Smith, January 10, 1933, letter 3, pp. 1-3. Horvath’s memoirs are at the Hoover Archives).

In a pre-xeroxing era, in certain cases Smith had “to incur expenses to pay for the typing of manuscripts. For instance the Golubeff Manuscript on Mongolia of the Ungern period could be re-typed and the new copy sent to you. I am at a loss how to act in all such cases as I have no funds at my disposal.”

Individuals.

Smith wrote about the following list of people as possible sources of materials for the Hoover Library. Some could just as easily been mentioned in the archives section above. It was Smith’s habit to underline the names of the people with whom he was meeting. Fisher encouraged
contacts with Gondatti, Golubeff, and Friedlander, all of whom “should have something interesting for us.” Smith wrote about the last: he’s “an old journalist who may have a lot to say about the Nikolaevsk episode and I shall keep in touch with him” (Smith to Fisher, December 8, 1932).

**N. L. Gondatti**

Smith wrote of his two visits to Gondatti that they have been very interesting and fruitful and have considerably helped me to establish personal connections with a wide circle of Russian emigrants. Gondatti is a charming old man and highly esteemed by the local Russian colony. His knowledge of people worth knowing is unique. He is still actively connected with the life of the Russian colony. He is a man of independent means and consequently one of the few who have collected quite a valuable library. His old library and his manuscripts and diaries anti-dating the revolution have all been lost in Russia. He has given me a list of about twenty persons worth interviewing.

With regard to Mr. Gondatti, Fisher recalled that Sir Bernard Pares spoke of him very favorably in his memoirs, and I have read other good reports of him in other sources. It would, as you say, be extremely interesting to have his comments on the Interallied Railway Board, and I hope that when he understands the purpose of our investigations on that matter he will feel disposed to give us the benefit of his knowledge of these events. It would be especially interesting, as you say, to have his comments on the policies of Ostroumov.

**P. A. Chistyakoff**

“Formerly in charge of the Commercial Department of the Chinese Eastern Railway, [he] was also closely connected with the Inter-Allied Board,” Smith wrote. He continues,

I have great hopes of obtaining from him a pile of materials, documents etc. on the activities of the Railway Board. I regard Mr. Chistyakoff, as well as Mr. Nilus, one of the former Secretaries of the Railway Board as the two most valuable sources of information on questions pertaining to the history of the Railway. Mr. Nilus at one time was the official historian of the Railway.
Fisher agreed that both of these men should “be valuable sources of information relating to the railway.” He suggested that Smith ask “each of the railway men to write something so that an estimate of the cost of such a project can be made, since money is always difficult” (Fisher to Smith, February 24, 1933, letter 5, pp. 1-4, referencing Smith’s p. 90).

Mr. Efimoff

“These memoirs and especially the documents, if copies are included in the manuscript, are also of first importance,” Fisher tells Smith. He hopes that Mr. Efimoff will be encouraged to complete this work. Fisher wonders “Does he have any particular reason for ending his account in 1922 and omitting references to Pepeliaev’s adventure and its results?”

Mr. Guins

For the Guins collection, Smith sent along several pages of an inventory of materials in Guins’ possession (p. 148). The list included documents relating to events in the Far East. For example, “The Japanese in the Far East” (group 2, item 5, 17 pages) is written, Smith said, “by a well known person, whose identity is not disclosed. It refers to the period of occupation and events in Sakhalin and Nikolaevsk and cites numerous cases of the violation of international laws by the Japanese” (p. 150). In many previous letters, Fisher had always put the Guins materials as second priority, however, after receiving the inventory he thought it would be a great acquisition.

Mr. Ilyin

Smith said that Ilyin informs me that he communicated with you [Fisher] direct ... and had offered to the Library a collection of newspaper clippings dated 1931-1933, as well as the Diary of an officer of the old Nechaef group. I have not seen the file of clippings neither the Diary. The latter may be the same collection of notes on which Mr. Serebrennikoff has been working for some time trying to put into literary shape the notes of Zubetz. . . . On the matter of this Diary Mr. S., as far as I know, has been in communication with several people in the States. However, he is very pessimistic as to the possibility of any library acquiring this Diary under the present conditions and the retrenchment policies followed by most collecting centres due to financial difficulties all over the world.

Mr. Lavrentieff

In regard to this man’s materials Fisher told Smith,
I have no suggestion as to how you can overcome the argument against disposing of such memoirs for fear that sensational parts will be made use of. For our part, we are willing to agree to keep such materials in a safe place and to make no use of them for a specified period of time. We have many materials in our vault which are under restriction as to their use.122

_F. S. Mansvetov_

Hoover had received some materials from Mr. Mansvetov, the most important being: “Report of the Commission of the Provisional Government of the Far East on the Events of April 4-5, 1920.” Fisher also received through one of Mr. Mansvetov’s Far East correspondents a fairly complete file of the newspaper _Golos_ and _Rupor_, a Russian daily.123

_A. Meschersky_

Smith reported that this man had died only recently and was one of the oldest residents of Harbin. “His very fine collection of books, materials etc will probably be disposed of by his wife. I have been trying to establish contact with friends of the Meschersky family and to find an approach to his Library and archives,” Smith said.124

_V. I. Moravsky_

“Mr. Moravsky, the former member of the Government of Autonomous Siberia in Vladivostok, . . . and his group are definitely pro-American,” Smith commented. This group was in possession of a very extensive collection of materials and documents in Harbin, Tientsin, and Shanghai. Also, Smith said,

For some reason Moravsky is not very friendly inclined towards the Prague Library and would much prefer to concentrate what they have in an American University Library. They may impose the condition that anything sent to you would be treated only as temporarily loaned . . . in case conditions in Russia change and a special Museum or Library is created in Siberia by any non-Bolshevik Government.125

[Generals]

Commenting on what Smith has reported, Fisher said,

With regard to the generals, I can well understand their hesitancy, and especially with respect to anyone who approaches them in the name of an American institution. A good many of the generals, especially the more conservative, cherish undoubtedly very unfavorable memories of General Graves and the Americans whom they
probably still regard as potential Bolsheviks. I do not know whether General Golovine has any influence with the officers in Harbin, but I shall write him of your connections with us so that in case inquiries are made to him he will be able to give the correct reply.  

Varneck’s Advice

As stated earlier, Elena Varneck’s role in the Fisher-Smith correspondence came to light in her notes that were always attached behind Fisher’s letters. The three examples below illustrate her thoughts, directions for her research, and ideas for what the Hoover should collect. Some of the comments refer to people or events already mentioned; others do not. The first example was selected to show the kind of notes Varneck would write to Fisher.

1. Comments for Fisher on his letter to Smith, July 29, 1932:

Mr. Robert Smith might be able to find materials on the following questions: Events in Kamchatka and after the summer of 1918 . . .; The Bocharev story, as complete as possible; The dictatorship and the personality of Fedor Mukhin, the bolshevik hero of Blagoveshchensk . . . What is true and what is legend about him?; Archive or any documents relating to the Merkulov administration . . .; Any additional light on the split between Whites in the Maritime in 1921-22 which finally defeated their cause. [Signed] E. Varneck

2. Selected comments on Smith’s letter to Fisher, December 30, 1932:

Re. Mr. R. Smith’s report.

I believe it has been agreed that from what we know of the Golubev memoirs they seem the most desirable of what we have on Ungern. What Mr. Smith says of the reluctance of the Ungern survivors to publish their material because of possible discredit to the White cause, makes them infinitely more desirable. The White cause and Ungern cause in the Far East is none other than the Japanese cause, and so is just as alive today as it was in 1920.

Gondatti—I never knew that he was such an interesting source. Many writers refer to him as nothing more than an official.

From certain expressions used by Mr. Smith I think that he has a pro-Manchukuo basis, more or less coinciding with the Far-Eastern Russian Whites’ attitude.
Andogsky: from my reading it appears that the most valuable possessions in control of that General were the materials belonging to the Petrograd General Staff Academy, as he managed its evacuation from Petrograd. It would be interesting if Mr. Smith could find out how much of those is left in the Far East. Czechs grabbed a good deal of it when evacuating, I understand, and so did others. There may be nothing left.

The Yakut story—I would hold on to it with both hands. It is, in my opinion, one of the most interesting domains of the Siberian revolutionary history, and of course information on it will never be plentiful. I question—how is it possible for a Yakut to be named Riazansky? Wonder if he is not a fake one.

Moravsky is to me very intriguing. He was of the Derber crowd. Documentary material on the Derber-Yakushev activities, published in *Krasny Arkhiv*, *Volnaia Sibir*, and other places, is comparatively much more plentiful than that on many other Siberia questions—how is it that Mr. Smith finds much new or unpublished in them? Moravsky’s reserve with regard to Prague: I wonder if this means that he is with or against Yakushev? You know that Yakushev’s supply of various materials is extremely poor at present. I wish we could have an approximate, at least, idea of what just Moravsky’s materials are, in case he got around Mr. Smith’s judgment in some way—which would not be surprising on the part of one of the Derber crowd.

The reserved attitude of the Cossacks and the ultra-white military chiefs like Clerge: They most probably expect a new heyday for themselves in connection with Japanese victories as present, so I don’t see how they could be of much use in historical work.

[Signed] E.V.

3. Comments for Fisher on his letter to Smith, December 22, 1934:

Mr. Fisher:

Re. Golubev: I realize that the purchase would be an unproductive one, as we would take very little of that MS. for use, but it would be good to have it on file. Consequently—pay for it a little as possible, is my recommendation. It is not worth much to any one, either as literature or as historical account, especially now that the much superior account in *Vozrozhdenie Azii* exists (I am translating that
now); so that I honestly do not think we can underprice it much, especially if we leave him the right to the Russian text.

Re. Efimov: I am very glad indeed that it seems to materialize.

Re. the latest lot of *Vozrozhdenie Azii* sent by Serebrennikov: It remains very much inferior to its own self in 1933, when it was a well-run paper with a lot of good writing and interesting stuff in it. It is a White-Russian-Fascist-Japanese leaflet now, with only the poorest writers left in it; and even the Japanese contributions some of which used to be quite interesting, are now low quality. I am very curious to know what caused the change. Ataman Semenov is, as before, displayed as the patriarch of the Russian Fascists.

Re. the Smith-Guins collection, I shall write a little later.

[Signed] E.V.

---

**SMITH’S BIOGRAPHY**

“God has given him anonymity with a name like Smith,” said my colleague John Stephan, when I asked him how I could begin searching for more information on this man (Figure 4).

An old card file that contains information on books added from special donors, like Boris Nicolaevsky, sits in the Hoover Institution Library reading room. The card for Robert Smith says, “American visitor to Manchuria and Mongolia.” There are some errors in this small note: Smith was a Russian-born British citizen. He did live in Mongolia in 1921. He may have been a visitor to Manchuria on one level, but he was more correctly a resident of Tientsin, where he was involved in business.

Working for the Hoover Library and Archive collections was only a small portion of Smith’s fascinating life, which began in St. Petersburg, Russia. There was a large group of British subjects who lived and worked in Russia in the nineteenth century and up to the 1917 October Revolution. In March 1890, Robert Smith was baptized in the Chapel of the British Factory, St. Petersburg. He was the son of William Henry Smith, a banknote mold maker employed in the Imperial Russian Government Bank in St. Petersburg, and Emily Smith, who lived on Ekaterinovsky Prospect. William was a widower when he married Emily Frowd in February 1874. From his first marriage William had a daughter, Anna Emma, born in London in 1860. In April 1890, in the
Chapel of the British Factory, Anna married Robert Frederick Oezko (Robert Fridrik Otsko), age 26, who was a molder, as was his father, August Oezko.  

Robert Smith graduated from, and lectured at, Moscow University, possibly from 1912 to 1917. What he majored in is not known, but in a letter to Fisher he said,

My knowledge of Russian, Russian literature, Russian life etc. is still rather good and I consider that it would not take over six months of hard work to get in training again. Up to the Revolution all my life was tied up with reading, studying, books and libraries and I think that after a few months work I could become an asset for any institution, similar to the Hoover War Library. Lecturing in English would be a harder proposition, though I think Sir Bernard would testify that I was quite successful at King’s.

During World War I, he was in the Archangel area working for British intelligence. In the memoirs that Sir Bernard Pares (1867-1949) wrote about Russia, he mentions Robert Smith. Pares was describing the dignity of the Grand Duke in the Crimea when the Germans entered Alupka under the surveillance of a Red Army guard. The Grand Duke finally accepted an offer to be brought out of Russia. Pares footnotes this observation, saying “These details were given me by Robert Smith,
who was close to Alupka at the time. He was in Crimea for his health when the Germans came in, and he trekked across Russia to Archangel to join up as a private.”

In the summer of 1918, Smith fled Moscow and arrived in London where Pares hired him to lecture at King’s College. He stayed from 1919 to 1922. The author of a recent book on Prince Mirsky states:

The most active academic pioneer in Britain was Bernard Pares. With his School of Russian at Liverpool University, founded in 1907, Pares pioneered what was eventually called area studies. After the war and his experiences in post-revolutionary Russia, Pares transferred his operations to London and set up the School of Slavonic Studies, initially as a department of King’s College of London University, where Russian was already on the curriculum.

One longtime associate described Professor Pares’ general character: “an inspiring example of vigour and enthusiasm in everything he undertook or controlled; nearly every time . . . I knew that I would find him at his desk bubbling over with plans . . . ” Pares described Smith as an Englishman, born and bred in Russia, who spoke Russian far better than English, and became a Lecturer in Moscow University. Later he was Lecturer in Russian Literary Criticism in our school in London, till he accepted a business post in the Far East.

Other tidbits appeared from Smith’s time at King’s College. Pares’s secretary, Dorothy Galton, noted: “In 1919, together with Pares, there were appointed . . . a lecturer in Russian philology and literature, Robert Smith, whom I met only briefly much later.” In the spring of 1922, Pares invited Prince Mirsky to apply for the position of Lecturer in Russian. G. S. Smith, Mirsky’s biographer, wrote, “He was given excellent references for the job by the retiring teacher of Russian, Robert L. Smith, and by Harold Williams. Both were written on 26 April, 1922.” Elizabeth Hill, a first-year student in the Russian course at King’s College in 1922, mentioned that the appointed lecturer on Russian literature, a Mr. Robert Smith, was supposed to be travelling from somewhere in Russia—we had a vague idea that he was selling carpets there—but he must have got stuck in Siberia in the Revolution.
N. B. Jopson, longtime staff member at the College, recalled

Miss Elizabeth M. Hill, another ‘Russian’; she was known as Liza to us all and is still so known in spite of her dignity as Professor. After taking a BA she went on to the PhD in 1928 and was a specialist in Slavonic at the Ministry of Information in the last war. Born in St. Petersburg, she had always had Russian equally with English as her native language.139

While working in London, Smith tried to find out about his family. He pursued compensation for his brother’s death, and inquired about his sisters. As with information at the Hoover Institution, many files concerning Smith at the Public Record Office in London no longer exist. Nonetheless, the Foreign Office (FO) register of correspondence does record three documents: Smith’s application for employment to the FO dated October 24, 1919, the FO’s answer to Smith that they had no appointment to offer him, and an offer by Smith for payment of the journey of Mr. and Mrs. Otzko (his brother-in-law and sister) from Constantinople to the U.K. The actual papers no longer exist and/or cannot be found due to the many reorganizations of materials in the archives.140

Among the register of British deaths is a letter to His Majesty’s British Consul, Verkhotur’e, City of Ekaterinburg:

The Verkhotursky Military Commission of Enquiry replied that on the instructions of the former Soviet authorities acting on an order of the Verkhotursky Special Commission (Bolshevik) [Cheka], Alexander Smith, a British subject, was detained in the Verkhotursky District Prison. What Smith was accused of the order does not indicate, but the information of the... Commission is that the only reason for his arrest was the fact that he was a British subject. Mr. Smith entered prison on 30 September 1918 and on 12 October was taken with other political detainees from prison by a detachment of Red Guards and shot on that same day. After occupation of the town by forces of the Government on 16 October, a funeral service for the Bolshevik victims was held at the local cemetery, and the late Smith, whose mutilated body had been found outside the town where the shooting took place, was also buried there.

Signed: President of the Commission Melianin [President of the Verkhotursky Military Commission of Enquiry January 1919]141
In April 1920 Smith wrote to the Foreign Office’s Under-Secretary of State:

I attach hereto copies of letters referring to the murder of my brother Alexander Smith in the Northern Urals, and I should be very much obliged to you for information as to whether any further steps are being taken by the Foreign Office to investigate this murder of a British subject....The contemplated resumption of trade with Bolshevik Russia and the recent exchange of civilian and war prisoners indicate however, that it may be possible, not only to enquire into the circumstances of my brother’s death but to regard the existing Government in Russia as responsible for it....I have also two sisters in Soviet Russia who through marrying Russians have lost their rights of British subjects and I should be most obliged to you for an advice as to whether anything could be done by the British Government on their behalf.

In February 1919, I received a wire...to the effect that my sister and her husband were well and still in the Crimea. Since then all my letters have failed to reach them and I know nothing of their fate. Could enquiries be made by wire through an official channel whether they are still in Yalta and assistance given them if they require such to be evacuated and brought over to England. I attach their full names and address:

Anne Otzko and Robert Otzko. Yalta, Vinogradnaya 26, villa Meller. The Crimea

[Signed:] I am, sir, Your obedient Servant,

Robert Smith, Late Lecturer Moscow University

The Under-Secretary of State made further attempts to locate the sister after Smith wrote again:

With reference to my sister, Mrs. Robert Otzko, may I point out the following: Mrs. R. Otzko was born in England and of British born parents. Though she married a Russian she has not lost her connections with England and her relatives, who have always lived in England. Mrs. R. Otzko has been brought up in England and her knowledge of Russian is limited. Though she is legally a Russian subject she is undoubtedly more English than many of those British subjects who have recently come over from Russia
and whose knowledge of English is in some cases practically nil and who have scarcely any connections in England.

As regards the adequate guarantees you refer to, allow me to state that at present I am able to undertake their maintenance on their arrival and that I am quite willing to do so.

The Home Office may be interested in their former social standing and political notions—in this connection I should only like to mention that my sister’s husband had valuable property in Petrograd and was managing director of a Mining District in the Urals and . . . at present he is a member of the town Council in Yalta (the Crimea).

I appeal to your humanity. I have a very strong suspicions that my brother who was shot by the Bolsheviks suffered his fate in connection with my flight from Moscow in August 1918. May I add that I escaped from Moscow not only for reasons of my own and in order to join the ranks of the British Army, but in the interests of the British Government, carrying ciphered messages for Ct. Hill of the Military Russia in Moscow and leaving that town on the very day when by order of Trotsky all foreign subjects were to be shot if caught in their attempt to reach any of the White guard fronts. I should not have mention this fact in ordinary circumstances and I am doing so only in the hope that it may influence your decision. I sincerely hope that I shall not have to witness the extermination of the remaining members of the family of William Henry Smith and of my sisters who were all British-born subjects and who have remained British though they have married Russians.

I am limiting my interference only to Mrs. Otzko and her husband, as I should dare not interfere at present on behalf of my other two sisters, who are still in Petrograd.

From information I have recently received I learn that during the first occupation of the Crimea by the Bolsheviks, Mr. and Mrs. Otzko were evacuated to Novorossiisk, where it seems His Majesty’s Vice Consul provided for their accommodation in his house. I presume, therefore, that he regarded them not merely as Russian refugees.

I am Sir, Your most obedient servant. Robert Smith, Lecturer, King’s College London University and Inspector of Russian Classes, L.C.C. [London County Council]"
After leaving London, Smith decided to go to Mongolia around 1922, and then settled in Tientsin, China. He wrote Fisher:

Sir Bernard probably wrote to you how I came to give up my academic career both in Moscow and after the Revolution in London. At that time my health was not too good, also immediately after the Great War and the Revolution in Russia it was very hard to make up one’s mind to settle down in London. The idea was to get as near to Russia as possible so as to have a chance to return to Russia immediately after any change for the better took place. Well Mongolia under Soviet rule was pretty close. I also hoped that a few years in Mongolia and China would have made me independent financially which would have enabled me to return later to academic work under more favorable financial conditions. Later my work in Mongolia became too involved and absorbing and still later our firm was caught by the 1929 crash. The Soviet-China conflict over the C.E.R. in 1928 also helped considerably to force us to give up work in Mongolia as the frontier became virtually closed to all independent traders.

One document in the Foreign Office archives gives a little more information about Smith’s business:

Robert Smith and William Henry Miles both British subjects domiciled in Tientsin, North China and Directors of the Robert Smith Company (China) Limited whose registered Office is situated at 70 Rue Pasteur, Tientsin do hereby nominate, constitute and appoint Nicholas A. Kanunnikoff, a Russian citizen...to be the Company’s true and lawful Attorney...

Their was an import/export business. Serebrennikov said they dealt primarily in furs.

The contacts among the Russian émigré community proved not only useful for the Hoover Institution, but also for Smith personally. It might be Gondatti to whom he was most grateful. On April 12, 1928, at the British Consulate in Harbin, Smith married Alexandra Grigorievna Kovalevskaya. Both were 39 years old and resided in Harbin at the time of the marriage. Alexandra Grigorievna (nee Stronskaya), who was the sister of Gondatti’s wife, was formerly married to Konstantin Zakavositch (probably Zakavovich or Zakharovitch) Kovalevsky, from whom she obtained a divorce on October 8, 1927. Her father, Grigory Stronsky, an
Excise Official, was originally from Irkutsk. The witnesses were Walter Smith,149 someone with the single name Shtengel, and P. Grant Jones, HM Consul.150

Some time between September and October 1932 Smith spent two days in Palo Alto. There is nothing recorded indicating that he met either Fisher or Varneck. While on board the ship President Jefferson returning to Tientsin, Smith told Fisher that he had gone to Philadelphia to make a deposition for W. D. Oelbermann. It concerned a lawsuit against a bank in connection with business transactions made through Smith’s old company in 1928 and 1929.151

Smith continued to worry about his sisters. One suggestion he made to Fisher no doubt had this in mind:

It has occurred to me that since the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Soviets the contact of the Library with similar institutions in Russia may be strengthened, in which case you may be interested in carrying out various plans in connection with the collection of materials, documents etc. in Russia itself. If any such plans are being discussed by the members of your committee, please remember that a trip to Moscow or to any other part of Russia from Harbin would involve much less expense than from the States and that I should be only too pleased to visit Russia in any such capacity on behalf of the Library. I do not think there would be any difficulties as to my admittance to Russia especially if the purpose of any such trip would be clearly defined. I understand, of course, that this is a very remote possibility. Anyhow as I have had this on my mind for some time I thought it advisable to let you know that I should be greatly interested in carrying out any research work in Russia on behalf of the Library.152

In addition, almost ten years later there is another follow-up on the claim for compensation regarding Alexander’s death. Smith’s London lawyer, Philip R. Christie, wrote to the Under Secretary of State at the Foreign Office referring to his letter of September 16, 1920:

There would seem now to be some hope that this stage is approaching, in view of the recent announcement in Parliament of the appointment of a Joint Committee to negotiate with Soviet representatives on the subject of claims. . . . my client . . . is at present
In Tientsin, but I hold his Power of Attorney. Yours faithfully, 
Philip R. Christie\textsuperscript{153}

In the fall of 1934 Smith was no longer being paid by the Hoover. He wrote to Fisher:

Irrespective of the termination of my appointment with the Library as from September 1st\textsuperscript{154} I shall continue my work as usual and shall send along to you anything I complete. After these two years of work I have acquired the habit of collecting materials, making notes, etc. and I hope I shall be able to continue this work in one form or another. Also I feel I am under an obligation to you to do so, as I have been rather slack these last months.

With reference to the winding up of my work of collecting materials etc. for the Library I should like to have as soon as possible your general instructions. I think the best policy would be to ask all the people with whom I have been connected in Harbin to communicate with you directly.

After September 1st I shall have to look out for a new position. . . . I should very much like to get in touch with newspaper work in the United States. . . . Your Library has a splendid collection of materials on the Russian Revolution. I have a great wish to return back to academic life. My knowledge of the Russian language and my ability to write Russian is far greater than English. If you ever hear of any opening as Lecturer in Russian Literature or of any permanent position as librarian or custodian of Russian archives I should be extremely happy to take up any such position. I shall be 45 in September I may reasonably hope to have another ten years in store for devoting myself entirely to this work. I have no prospects of getting fixed up locally or in Harbin. Conditions in China are steadily getting worse.\textsuperscript{155}

We know nothing about the end of Smith’s life. There are two items indicating Smith was still in Tientsin in 1936. The first is a deed, dated November 2, that was issued to him for the renting of a plot of land.\textsuperscript{156} The second item is a notice in the Russian newspaper on November 24, that Smith’s wife Aleksandra Grigor’evna, the well-known philanthropist and Honorary President of the “Iasli” Society,\textsuperscript{157} was in the hospital
and very sick with a heart problem. The Society had held a prayer service for her on the 19th. The question of Smith’s health is a recurring theme in his life, even in Tsarist Russia. In one letter to Fisher he explained that his lack of work was due to “my usual poor health during the Spring months. Before the hot weather set in I had lost about 15 pounds and have not yet properly recovered . . . I have to wait for the Autumn months to put on weight.” Perhaps the Smiths did not live through the war. The British community in China was large and many left as a result of the war, but many stayed. A certificate of naturalization was found for Anna Emma Otzko, who was re-admitted to British citizenship on June 22, 1939. By then, she was a widow and living in Brussels, Belgium. It is unknown if Robert and Anna ever made contact again.

CONCLUSION

Now, at the end of the story of the Fab Four, many questions still remain. One of Harold Fisher’s most difficult tasks must have been directing the library during the depression years. Having so little money and constantly receiving letters begging for help, as well as not being able to purchase materials for which very high prices had been set, must have been heartbreaking. He wrote: “We naturally want to make our money go as far as possible . . . we shall be less disposed to pay high prices for single items.” While this essay concentrates on collection efforts in China, the Hoover was more deeply and broadly involved with the Russians who emigrated to Europe. The relationship of Fisher to Serebrennikov and Smith bothered me at times. The limited funds Fisher always brought up might have been better used if they had gone to Serebrennikov. Was it the Sir Bernard Pares connection that swayed Fisher to support Smith with quite a handsome salary? Fisher was primarily concerned with manuscript and primary source materials, and perhaps Smith was the right choice, with the limited funds. My feeling is that Serebrennikov could have done just as well. Fisher does seem distressed over money matters in his last letter to Smith. What happened to materials that Fisher was not able to purchase? One example, mentioned by Serebrennikov, was Tel’berg’s documents. Many disappeared over the years.

Elena Varneck’s assistance to Fisher and the Hoover collection is now better known. There was no record left that shows what Fisher and
Varneck thought about each other, but I suspect it was one of mutual re-
spect. Did they keep in touch with each other?

Ivan Serebrennikov was a prominent figure of the Russian commu-
nity in China. The entries in his diaries about Smith are interesting. If
only he had noted what happened to Smith after 1939! Even though
Fisher could not regularly send him money, even when he was very
sick, Serebrennikov left his archives to Hoover. Fisher does acknowl-
edge, “It is not pleasant to have to attempt to squeeze down the price of-
fered to men who, I well realize, are in a difficult situation.”163 There
must have been some feelings of rivalry (jealousy?) on the part of Smith
and/or Serebrennikov when they were both working for Fisher. From
the latter’s diary entries, there doesn’t seem any hostility; it was more
like disappointment.

Robert Smith was forced to leave Russia due to the revolution. Hav-
ing worked for British intelligence, taught at King’s College, and traded
in Mongolia, he ended up in Tientsin, where he set up an import-export
business. His letters are full of references to his poor health. Fisher may
have felt he was dealing with a fellow historian, but Smith actually was
trained and taught in the field of Russian literature. His observations in
the long reports were interesting, and he did work to help Hoover ac-
quire many valuable materials. I wondered if Smith’s “illness” was seri-
ous—or a cover to enlist sympathy and detract from the debts he owed.
The pursuit of compensation for his brother’s death may also have been
encouraged by his poor finances. In addition, why does it seem as if
Varneck and Fisher never met Smith? Why did he stay only two days in
Palo Alto? With whom did he meet? He does not explain why he tried to
help only his half-sister, and not his other two sisters. It is probably for-
tunate that Smith never returned to the Soviet Union. By the mid-1930s
the full force of the purges was only a few years away. He would no
doubt have perished, as perhaps his two sisters did.

After World War II, the West coast–San Francisco, in particular–was
a major center of the Russian emigration from the Far East. Over the
years, many of the collections that Smith and Fisher discussed in their
letters eventually were sold or donated to the Hoover Institution, the
Museum of Russian Culture, or to the University of California, Berke-
ley. Important collections are still coming to light. In 2002, in response
to a question Amir Khisamutdinov had asked in an article in Russkaia
zhizn’, concerning the whereabouts of any archives of Vladimir
Nikolaevich Zhernakov (1909-1977, a naturalist, ethnographer, and ge-
ographer), one of the staff at the paper contacted him. Mrs. Muskhi-
na said that when she purchased her house many years ago, she discovered
that Zhernakov’s large collection of materials was in the garage. For over a decade they resided in the basement. As fate would have it, Musikhina decided to move the boxes to the upstairs part of her house shortly before a flood occurred in the basement. This very rich archive is now at the Hoover.\footnote{\textit{164}}

The completion of a two-year federal grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to microfilm the archives of the Museum of Russian Culture has also made available heretofore difficult-to-access materials concerning the Russian émigrés from the Far East. To search for finding aids, check this website: <http://www.hoover.org/hila/ruscollection/home>.

Thanks to Varneck, Fisher, Serebrennikov, and Smith we know a little more about how the Hoover Institution Library and Archives collected and preserved both books and primary source materials on the major historical events of the twentieth century. Present-day and future scholars are deeply indebted to these past collectors.
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This is the second article in the series Pacific Rim Russian Librarianship. The first is P. Polansky, “Bibliotekovodienie na poberezh’ë Tikhogo okeana: sobrateli russkikh materialov o Dal’nom Vostoke,” 	extit{Vlast’ knigi: al’manakh} 3 (2002), 60-72. It will appear in English as “Pacific Rim Librarianship: Collectors of Russian Materials on the Far East,” in a festschrift for Murlin Croucher due for publication in the summer of 2006.
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After receiving a law degree from the University of Washington, he went on to com-
plete by 1910 a doctorate in history from the university in Heidelberg. He worked be-
tween Seattle and Stanford in the next years. By 1918, he was in the army stationed in
Paris. (Charles B. Burdick, Ralph H. Lutz and the Hoover Institution, Hoover Institu-
tion Publications 131 [Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1974]).


7. “Railway Service Corps Papers,” in Nina Almond and H. H. Fisher, Special Col-
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109. Grigori Mikhailovich Semenov (1890-1946), a Cossack Ataman and participant in the civil war.
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