

# **CONSTRUCTIONS OF JUDEO-COMMUNISM: THE UNRAVELLING OF THE MELBOURNE JEWISH COUNCIL TO COMBAT FASCISM AND ANTISEMITISM, 1949–50**

*Philip Mendes*

At the end of 1948, the Melbourne Jewish Council to Combat Fascism and Anti-semitism was at the peak of its influence. The Council acted as the official public relations representative of the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies (VJBD), and was also responsible for the public relations activities of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry whenever that body was based in Victoria. Its proactive campaigns against antisemitism were widely regarded as sophisticated and effective.<sup>1</sup> However, by July 1952, the Council had been expelled from the VJBD and largely marginalised by mainstream Jewry.

This paper analyses the Council's involvement in a series of public disputes and controversies during 1949 and 1950 which progressively undermined its previously strong support in the Jewish community. Previous commentators on the Council have attributed its decline either to its links with communist and pro-Soviet groups and views, or alternatively to the impact of Cold War McCarthyism. However, this paper argues that the fall of the Council can best be explained by specific reference to Jewish political culture, including particularly the European Jewish experience of the nexus between antisemitism and anti-communism.

On the one hand, the Council viewed the political Left as key allies in the struggle against antisemitism. This emphasis accurately reflected the Jewish political experience in much of Central and Eastern Europe whereby the Left was generally sympathetic to Jewish concerns, and the Right (including even mainstream conservative groups) was generally viewed as the enemy and hostile to Jewish interests. Anti-communism and antisemitism were correctly identified as often emanating from the same right-wing sources. This explains why from the very beginning the Council sought to combat fascism as well as antisemitism. In practice, this meant both cooperating closely with left-wing groups, and opposing any broader attacks on the political Left.

I have argued elsewhere that the local application of this strategy was always going to be problematic given that the Left-Right split in Australian politics did not neatly fit the European model. There was little tradition of conservative antisemitism in Australia. There was also a significant history of Australian philo-semitism emanating from non-Left sources including particularly the churches.

Conversely the Australian Left had only a limited tradition of defending Jews. This meant that the Council had adopted a model that unnecessarily narrowed its options towards securing support from only one side of the spectrum, and implicitly excluded the possibility of finding allies on the political Right.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, many critics of the Council were influenced by the tragic historical consequences of the Judeo-communist conspiracy theory and its powerful manipulation by fascist groups in Europe.<sup>3</sup> They feared that the Council's association with communist groups would fuel allegations from the extreme Right that Jews either controlled or played a prominent role in Australian communism, and potentially contribute to a sharp increase in antisemitism. Some Jews (e.g. the former Polish Bundists)<sup>4</sup> were also driven by their direct experience of the malevolence of post-war communist rule in Europe.

These concerns about an identification of Jews with communism were not without substance. From the early 1930s until the 1960s, Australian security agencies displayed an obsessive and enduring interest in Jewish communal organisations. Files were held by the Commonwealth Investigation Branch and subsequently ASIO not only on overtly left-wing groups such as the Jewish Council and the CPA-linked Gezerd, but also on mainstream (and often strongly anti-communist) Jewish groups and individuals including the future Governor-General Sir Zelman Cowen. This investigation of Jews seems to have reflected a belief in an intrinsic connection between Jews and communism, and was motivated by considerable hostility towards Jews in official government circles.<sup>5</sup>

For example, as early as October 1943, a Security Service document on the Jewish Council drew attention to:

the numbers of Jewish persons who have been attracted to communism. Reference has been made frequently to the circulation of Russian newspapers through little cliques of Jewish people, principally in racial or national groups.<sup>6</sup>

Later reports made similar reference to the numbers of Jews holding communist or pro-communist sympathies, and to the potential security risk posed by the Jewish Council.<sup>7</sup> The subsequent policy interrogations of young Jewish people in May 1950 (to be discussed later) were clearly influenced by such beliefs.

It is highly likely that at least some mainstream Jewish leaders were aware of the security interest in the Jewish community, and of the possible negative ramifications for Jewry. Some almost certainly provided information to or liaised with the security agencies. At the very least, they were determined – particularly in the context of the growing Cold War – to expunge any public perceptions of a link between Jews and communism.

The clash between these two competing – benign and malign – interpretations of the Council's alliances with left-wing groups sharpened with the beginning of

the Cold War. Further tensions were stoked by the Council's anomalous position within the structure of the Jewish community – acting as an official representative of the elected Jewish roof bodies – yet still retaining its organisational independence and right to advocate the views of its own membership. This situation could only continue so long as the Council continued to broadly represent the plurality of views within the Jewish community.<sup>8</sup> However, the advent of the Cold War and disagreements about Jewish relations with left-wing groups brought this issue of structural accountability to the fore via a series of public incidents.

The initial public controversy involved the Council's conflict with Paul Morawetz, a member of the Council's Executive Committee almost since its inception, and Honorary Secretary of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ). Morawetz had attended a Joint Distribution Committee conference in Paris on behalf of the ECAJ in late 1948, and on his return to Australia in early 1949 made a number of controversial statements which incensed many Jews, including the Council. It is worth noting that whilst Morawetz was quickly stereotyped as an ultra-conservative, most of the views he expressed were pragmatic and arguably based on fact, rather than ideology.

Firstly, he argued that there was no future for Australian Jewry anywhere except in Israel. He was quoted as saying that 'he did not care two hoots for the survival of the Melbourne Jewish community', and argued that Jewish refugees should be encouraged to migrate to Israel rather than to Australia.<sup>9</sup> These provocative statements did not endear Morawetz to the Jewish community, and he was asked to resign from both the Executive Council of Australian Jewry and the Jewish Council. However, it is likely that what Morawetz was accurately identifying (via admittedly blunt and non-diplomatic language) was the reality that the centre of Jewish life had shifted to the new State of Israel, and the Jewish diaspora would now frame its identity primarily around its relationship with the Jewish state.

Secondly, he expressed concern about a possible revival of antisemitism in the Soviet Bloc countries, stating that:

Jews behind the iron curtain do not feel secure. They are afraid that should the present regimes fall, the Jews will once again become the scapegoats for the vengeance of those opposed to the leftist regimes.<sup>10</sup>

Thirdly, he attacked the Council for aligning Jews too closely with left-wing politics. He argued that the Council should be equally critical of communism, which undermined democracy and individual freedom as shown by the persecution of Zionist leaders in Eastern Europe.<sup>11</sup>

The Council responded by defending the political diversity of its membership. Norman Rothfield stated that:

we have refused to reject some Jews because they are too blue or too red or too pink ... We want the whole Jewish people to fight for their rights as Jews and as human beings. The Council fought only Fascism

and not communism as well, because Fascism, not Communism, had resulted in the death of six million Jews. One might be opposed to the philosophy of Communism, but the fact remains that life in Soviet Russia involves no discrimination against Jews as such.

Another Council representative, Aaron Mushin, specifically attacked criticisms of the involvement of Communist Party member Isaac Gust in the Council.<sup>12</sup>

Rothfield's response was inadequate on two counts. Morawetz did not support the ultra-conservative argument that communists should be actively excluded from the Council. Rather, he contended that the Council should proportionately represent all viewpoints in the community instead of being heavily aligned to the Left. He did not deny that those on the political Left tended to be particularly sympathetic to Jewish concerns.<sup>13</sup> In addition, Morawetz correctly identified that antisemitism remained a major threat in Eastern Europe, although even he did not realise the extent to which it had already become a key component of Soviet government policy.<sup>14</sup> The great irony is that if the Council had listened to and followed the advice of Morawetz, they may well have retained their strong support in the Jewish community.

The next incident in May 1949 involved the participation of the Council's Youth Section in a deputation pressing for anti-fascist and group libel legislation, which Arthur Calwell, then Minister for Immigration, said was communist controlled. The delegation expressed support for independence struggles in Indonesia and Malaya, and for international disarmament. They also requested that the

White Australia policy be replaced by an immigration system, which, by means of quota, allowed a limited percentage of coloured people into Australia as immigrants annually.

The delegation included over 120 young men and women from 63 organisations with a total membership of 200,000 in all States. It appears to have been organised by the communist youth group, the Eureka Youth League (EYL), but also included representatives of a number of Christian youth groups such as the Christian Social Order Committee of the Presbyterian Young Men's Fellowship, and the Methodist Young People's Department.<sup>15</sup>

It seems that Calwell may have exaggerated the importance of the EYL's role in this delegation as a convenient means of discrediting the views expressed. Nevertheless, the apparent association between the EYL and the Council's Youth Section was neither surprising nor uncontentious. According to David Rechter, many young Carlton Jews were actively recruited into the EYL. In addition, the Council Youth Section functioned as a virtual Jewish communist youth group, and probably had many members in common with the EYL.<sup>16</sup> These links between the Council and the EYL – as revealed publicly via this incident – would have set off obvious alarm bells within key sections of the Jewish community.

The Council defended its involvement in the deputation, claiming that its Youth

Section had participated as part of a non-party deputation with other religious youth groups. They emphasised that the deputation had also specifically requested the government to introduce legislation against antisemitism.<sup>17</sup> However, the VJBD President Maurice Ashkanasy was highly critical, stating that

Neither the ECAJ nor your Board were consulted in this matter, and accepted practices as to channels of communication were disregarded'. He added that the VJBD Executive was concerned not to 'involve Jewish interests with any political party or group, and in particular with any group that can properly be regarded as subversive or disruptive, or which might be injurious to Jewish interests'.<sup>18</sup>

Ashkanasy was bluntly expressing the view that an association of Jews with communism could lead to the creation of antisemitism.

The question of the Council's relationship with communism was directly raised in an internal VJBD debate held 'in camera' in July 1949, which the attending Jewish press were requested not to report. A VJBD delegate Trevor Rapke proposed a motion calling for the expulsion of 'any present or past communist or communist sympathiser or supporter' from the Jewish Council. A number of VJBD deputies then aggressively questioned Council representative Norman Rothfield concerning the involvement of known communists such as Judah Waten in the Council. Concern was expressed that the employment of Waten as Secretary of the Council (and the rumour that he would be named at the forthcoming Victorian Royal Commission into communism) was feeding public perceptions of an association of the whole Jewish community with communism.

Rothfield responded that membership of the Council was open to Jews of all political backgrounds, and that their political affiliations were their own private affairs. But this response failed to address the fact that the association of some leading Council members with communism had become an issue of political controversy. In addition, Judah Waten himself claimed (almost certainly disingenuously) that he was 'not a Communist organiser nor have I ever been one in the sense Mr Rapke meant'.<sup>19</sup>

The VJBD Executive ultimately rejected Rapke's motion on procedural grounds but this was almost certainly a convenient means of avoiding a public debate on the potentially embarrassing matter of Jewish links with communism. As one delegate, Walter Lippmann, commented: 'If this gets outside the community, I am sure Eric Butler (leader of the anti-Semitic League of Rights) will utilise it for another attack on the Jews'.<sup>20</sup>

The next public incident involved the Council's opposition to the Police Offences Bill (or 'Bigotry Bill' as it was colloquially known), and the participation of the Council and its Youth Section – via Salomea (Loni) Genin, who was an active member of the Communist Party – in a protest deputation to the Victorian Attorney General, Mr Oldham. The deputation was lead by Brian Fitzpatrick

of the Council for Civil Liberties, and consisted of 40 churchmen and laymen from 25 affiliations including representatives of five Protestant groupings, three University societies, the Rationalist Society, the Council for Civil Liberties, and the Communist Party. Oldham described the delegation as 'Communist inspired' in an attempt to discredit their arguments. He accused the Communist Party of attempting to promote conflict between religious groups in order to further its own agenda, and specifically criticised the alleged communist links of a number of deputation members, including Loni Genin.<sup>21</sup>

The Council opposed the legislation on the grounds that the outlawing of attacks on religion did not provide any adequate protection for Jews since most antisemitic attacks were based on political and racial, rather than religious arguments. In addition, concern was expressed that the Bill would unfairly limit freedom of speech, prevent the introduction of further effective legislation against antisemitism, and was designed primarily to protect the political activities of the Catholic Church from criticism.<sup>22</sup>

The Council's argument enjoyed some logic given that many of the most common antisemitic arguments of the day, such as assertions that Jews control international finance or that a Zionist-communist plot exists for the purpose of enslaving the world, would not have been affected by the Bill. This limitation was evident in the libel action undertaken by the Zionist group Youth Aliyah (with significant Council support) against Smith's Weekly, which had accused Australian Jews via Youth Aliyah of subsidising anti-British terrorist groups in Palestine. The trial, held in 1949, appears to have been a de-facto victory for the Jewish community although the judge dismissed the suit on the technical grounds that the plaintiff had no right of action at law since an organisation rather than an individual had been allegedly defamed.<sup>23</sup> Regardless, it is unlikely that this anti-Jewish attack would have been actionable under the proposed legislation.

The VJBD took a different perspective, supporting in principle the Bill's commitment to protection of Jews from attack, whilst recommending amendments pertaining to freedom of speech, and antisemitic attacks of a non-religious nature.<sup>24</sup> These amendments were rejected by the Attorney-General, and the Bill was subsequently shelved.

The VJBD was highly critical of both the manner and content of the Council's opposition to the Bill, and informed the Attorney-General that the VJBD did not support the Council's views on the matter. According to Maurice Ashkanasy,

As it stood the bill would have been a valuable legislative protection to Jews...with moderate amendment, it might have become a model piece of legislation ... The introduction of the bill, it is true, was mainly due to a desire to protect the Roman Catholic church from attacks mainly by communists, but this should not have affected our own approach to the matter...it was a loss of a rare opportunity to further an important objective of Australian Jewry.

Ashkanasy added:

Although we were in almost constant and ready touch with the Chairman of the Public Relations and Antisemitism Committees, no member of the Executive other than the Chairman of these committees, was aware of the intended deputation, the policy expressed at which by the Council's representative was contrary to the settled policy of Australian and Victorian Jewry, and participation in the deputation was contrary to recognised practices as to communications with the Government on matters of policy.

In addition, Ashkanasy directly criticised Norman Rothfield, the joint VJBD Public Relations Chairman and Council President, who

without any prior consultation ... admitted when questioned that he proposed at a public meeting ... to make a direct attack upon the Roman Catholic Church ... the consequences of which could be most injurious to Jewry in Victoria and indeed Australia, if not the world.<sup>25</sup>

Ashkanasy's concerns were mirrored by other critics within and outside the VJBD who specifically targeted the Council's links with communists. For example, Ben Green questioned the Council's participation in the deputation, stating:

I agree we must have allies, but we have to be careful that that our allies are worthy of us. Any doctor will tell you that to combat a disease you must take a drug, but if you are not careful the drug will destroy you. I refer specifically to the communists. We do not want to give any political party our alliance.

Similarly, leading Zionist Shlomo Wynn warned: 'Any deputation these days is now tinted at once pink or red. We are not cowards, but we should not stick our necks out and we should not join with groups that are under suspicion'.<sup>26</sup> Another prominent Zionist Aaron Patkin questioned whether the Council had too rigidly aligned the specific interests of the Jewish community in combating antisemitism *per se*, with broader agendas around protecting free speech.<sup>27</sup>

As a result of this incident, the VJBD introduced a new set of formal procedures for political approaches to state and federal authorities. These procedures were intended to ensure that the Council did not act on behalf of the VJBD without specific authorisation.<sup>28</sup>

A further incident involved the Council's invitation to the 'Red' Dean of Canterbury, Dr Hewlett Johnson, who was known for his pro-Soviet views, to speak at a Human Rights Rally in April 1950. The rally was organised in association with the founding congress of the Australian Peace Council (APC) which was widely viewed as a 'Communist front' group.<sup>29</sup> The Council defended the invitation on the basis that Dr Johnson was a long-standing friend of the Jewish people, and critic of fascism and antisemitism. Johnson's speech included a moving reminiscence

of his visit to Auschwitz shortly after the death camp was occupied by the Russian army in April 1945.<sup>30</sup> Johnson had also opened the APC Congress two days earlier as the main speaker and guest of honour. In addition, the opening session of the APC was addressed by Norman Rothfield, whose address was reportedly welcomed with particular enthusiasm. Rothfield said that antisemitism and fascism should be banned, not communism.<sup>31</sup>

Critics of the Council argued that its actions had associated the Jewish community per se with Dr Johnson's pro-Soviet sympathies. They included Rabbi Herman Sanger, the leader of Liberal Jewry in Australia and the Senior Rabbi of Temple Beth Israel in Melbourne, who had previously been active in the Council. Sanger was also a former refugee from Nazi Germany who had experienced first hand the lethal political impact of the alleged Jewish link with communism. He argued that the Council's hosting of Dr Johnson had 'succeeded in linking the name of the Jewish community with communism. As a result, antisemitism, far from being combated, was being created'.<sup>32</sup>

Sanger chose to resign from the Council as a result of this incident.<sup>33</sup> Other prominent non-leftists such as Alec Masel, Jacob Jona and Nathan Jacobson also resigned around this time. The Council attempted without success to persuade all these persons to change their minds. It is likely that the Council tarred these gentlemen as simply bowing to the prejudices of the Cold War, without acknowledging the specific Jewish fears that were aroused by the Council's apparent association with communism.

The next incident concerned the Council's public exposure of the police interrogations of Jewish youth in Carlton and the St Kilda-Elwood areas. According to media reports initiated by the Council, 20 young people belonging to the pro-Soviet Kadimah Youth Organization<sup>34</sup> and the Zionist youth group Hatikvah, were questioned about their alleged involvement in anti-British and communist activities. Some parents were also approached and apparently intimidated, and overseas-born activists were threatened with deportation.<sup>35</sup> The Jewish Council spokesperson Sam Goldbloom denounced the interrogations as allegedly antisemitic given that only Jews seemed to have been investigated, and concerns were raised by Labor Senator Sandford in the Federal Parliament.<sup>36</sup> In addition, the Kadimah held a large protest meeting against the interrogations at which one speaker drew analogies with Nazi Germany.<sup>37</sup>

Discussions on this matter were held by the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies with the Chief Commissioner of Police Mr Duncan, but the Board were not satisfied with his statement that he could 'find no evidence of any member of the police force having exceeded his duty'. However, further discussions between the Board and the Premier of Victoria, Jack McDonald, led to assurances that the Jewish community had not been singled out, and that no such actions would reoccur in the future.<sup>38</sup> The VJBD did not hesitate to bend the truth in their correspondence with the police commissioner and the Premier, claiming incorrectly

that the Kadimah Youth Organization was a 'non-political organisation' when in fact it was an active left-wing group.<sup>39</sup>

The public discussion of alleged Jewish involvement in communist activities struck at the heart of Jewish fears regarding the Judeo-communist thesis. This concern intensified when Country Party Senator Reid defended the interrogations in the Federal Parliament, claiming that the young people were investigated not because they were communists, but because they had allegedly made unpatriotic statements. However, Prime Minister Menzies specifically denied that the interrogations had been authorised or organised by the Commonwealth Security Service.<sup>40</sup> Paul Morawetz denounced the Council's actions, arguing that their impulsive approach had served to 'establish in the minds of our fellow Australians some mysterious link between Jews and Communism'.<sup>41</sup> Strong criticism was also expressed by the VJBD that the Council had released the information regarding the police interrogations to the media without the Board's consent. Subsequently, the Council gave assurances to consult with the Board before taking action on any matter likely to affect the Jewish community.<sup>42</sup>

The debate over the relationship between Jews and communism was crystallised by the Communist Party Dissolution Bill presented to Parliament in April 1950. The Bill would eventually be defeated in the national referendum of September 1951.<sup>43</sup> The earlier 1949 Victorian Lowe Royal Commission into Communism had already raised concerns about the potential identification of Jews with communism. The media had publicly named two Jewish businessmen, Isaac Gust (who was labelled a 'Polish Jew') and Sam Brilliant, as prominent donors to the Communist Party. The Commission's report also referred in passing to about a dozen other alleged Jewish members of the CPA, including Council Secretary Judah Waten.<sup>44</sup>

The Council strongly opposed the CPA Dissolution Bill, claiming that it posed a serious danger to free speech generally and Jews specifically. They argued

that the Bill represented a grave threat to democracy in this country and was a step in the direction of fascism with all the dangerous consequences that it held for the Jewish people... We take the stand that any laws that limit free assembly and other traditional rights cannot but assist those fascists and antisemites in our midst who would deal with the Jews here as fascists have done in other countries.<sup>45</sup>

The Council was highly active in the public campaign against the Bill's introduction, holding public forums, addressing workers in factories, and participating in many meetings.<sup>46</sup>

The Council's concerns were shared by a diverse range of Jews (and non-Jews). All sections of the Jewish press and even anti-communist individuals and groups such as Maurice Ashkanasy, Sir Zelman Cowen, Rabbi Goldman, Paul Morawetz and the Jewish Labor Bund also opposed the Bill.<sup>47</sup> However, the Victorian Jewish

Board of Deputies (VJBD) and the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ) were concerned to avoid any public discussion of specific Jewish concerns about the Bill. The VJBD initially expressed strong opposition to the Bill in its internal discussions and conveyed this opinion to the ECAJ. However, neither organisation made any official comment, other than suggesting privately a series of amendments pertaining to the protection of minority racial and religious rights.<sup>48</sup> Whilst the majority of the Jewish community probably favoured the Council's opposition to the Bill, the Council's public outspokenness angered the Board which no doubt feared the association of Jews per se with the defence of the Communist Party.

## Conclusion

The emergence of Cold War anti-communism forced Australian Jewry to confront the politically sensitive question of Jewish links with communism. The series of public incidents described above reflected this tense debate about whether Jewish interests were effectively served by alliances with left-wing groups. The Council lost support during this period because most Jews concluded that their activities were publicly associating the Jewish community with communist activities, and therefore potentially threatening to create – rather than to combat – antisemitism. This concern would ferment further during the highly polarised debates around the anti-German migration campaign and the question of Soviet antisemitism.<sup>49</sup> But it was already clear by mid-1950 that unless the Council seriously broadened its political strategies and alliances, it would not retain serious support in the Jewish community.

## Notes

- 1 W. D. Rubinstein, *The Jews in Australia* (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1991), p. 409. See, for example, Ernest Platz, *New Australians* (Melbourne: Jewish Council to Combat Fascism and Anti-Semitism, 1949). This booklet publicised the progress made by Jewish immigrants, and their economic and cultural contributions to Australian life.
- 2 Philip Mendes, 'The enemy is on the Right: Re-evaluating the Formative Ideology and Political Strategy of the Melbourne Jewish Council to Combat Fascism and Anti-Semitism, 1942–1947,' *Australian Jewish Historical Society Journal*, vol. 14, 2 (2008), pp. 285–86.
- 3 For discussion of the political impact of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and other conspiracy theories linking Jews with international communism, see Philip Mendes, 'Jews, Antisemitism and Communism: A self-fulfilling Prophecy,' *Australian Journal of Jewish Studies*. Vol. 18 (2004), pp. 79–96.
- 4 David Rechter, 'Beyond the Pale: Jewish Communism in Melbourne', *Master of Arts Thesis* (Melbourne: University of Melbourne, 1986), pp. 129–30.
- 5 See discussion in Philip Mendes, 'The Cold War, McCarthyism, the Melbourne Jewish Council to Combat Fascism and Anti-Semitism, and Australian Jewry 1948–1953', *Journal of Australian Studies*, No.64 (2000), pp. 196–206.

- 6 · “Communist Party Interests in Jewish Council to Combat Fascism and Anti-Semitism”, Security Service file dated 21 October 1943.
- 7 *Ibid*, 26 January 1945 & 15 October 1946.
- 8 Rubinstein, *op. cit.*, p. 404.
- 9 ‘Mr Paul Morawetz hits out’, *Australian Jewish News*, 8 July 1949; Gloria Frydman, *What a Life: a biography of Paul Morawetz* (Adelaide, Wakefield Press, 1995), p. 94.
- 10 ‘The insecurity of European Jewry: Mr Morawetz’ observations’, *Australian Jewish News*, 14 January 1949.
- 11 ‘Mr Morawetz hits out’.
- 12 ‘Jewish Council reaffirms its policy’, *Australian Jewish News*, 5 August 1949.
- 13 *Ibid*.
- 14 Frydman, *op. cit.*, p. 97.
- 15 ‘Probe into University: Communism Suggested’, *The Age*, 28 May 1949.
- 16 Rechter, *op. cit.*, pp. 87–88 & 97–99.
- 17 Norman Rothfield, ‘To be or not to be’, *Australian Jewish News*, 15 July 1949; ‘The Jewish Council replies’, *Australian Jewish Herald*, 5 August 1949; ‘Jewish Youth in Canberra petition’, *Australian Jewish Herald*, 27 May 1949.
- 18 Maurice Ashkanasy, ‘Public Relations and Anti-Semitism’, *Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies Annual Report 1949*, p. 6.
- 19 Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies question time, 4 July 1949. On Waten’s communist affiliations, see Rubinstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 328–29.
- 20 VJBD question time.
- 21 Allan Leibler, ‘The Jewish Council to Combat Fascism and Anti-Semitism: A study in the Structure and Function of a Communist Front Organisation’, *Bachelor of Arts Honours Thesis* (Melbourne: University of Melbourne, 1967), p. 88; Don Watson, *Brian Fitzpatrick* (Sydney: Hale & Iremonger, 1979), p. 216; ‘Uproar at Deputation in Minister’s Office’, *The Age*, 24 September 1949, ‘Minister attacks Reds at wild anti-bigot bill deputation’, *The Argus*, 24 September 1949.
- 22 · JCCFAS Newsletter, November 1949, pp. 12–13; Norman Rothfield, ‘Report by Chairman Public Relations Committee to the VJBD’, 17 October 1949; Sarah McNaughton, ‘Liberalism and Anticommunism in the Melbourne Jewish Community in the 1940s and 1950s’, *Bachelor of Arts Honours Thesis* (Sydney: University of Sydney, 1984), pp. 65–6; Norman Rothfield, ‘Why did the Jewish Council oppose the Anti-Bigotry Bill?’, *Unity*, March–April 1950, pp. 8–9; Norman Rothfield, *Many Paths to Peace* (Melbourne: Yarraford Publications, 1997), pp. 27–8; Judah Waten, ‘Jewish Council and the Police Offences Bill’, *Australian Jewish News*, 30 September 1949; ‘Board accepts report’, *Australian Jewish News*, 4 November 1949. See also Brian Fitzpatrick, ‘Anti-Bigotry Bill’, *The Age*, 27 September 1949.
- 23 Rubinstein, pp. 400–01.
- 24 Maurice Ashkanasy, ‘Board of Deputies and the Police Offences Bill’, *Australian Jewish News*, 30 September 1949.
- 25 Ashkanasy, ‘Public Relations’, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
- 26 Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies Meeting Minutes, 17 October 1949.
- 27 Aaron Patkin, ‘The Anti-Bigotry Bill and our community’, *The Zionist*, November 1949, pp. 5–6.
- 28 McNaughton, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

- 29 Barbara Carter, 'The peace movement in the 1950s' in Ann Curthoys and John Merritt eds. *Better Dead Than Red: Australia's First Cold War 1945–1959 Volume 2*, (Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1986), p. 61.
- 30 *Council News*, June 1950; JCCFAS Annual Report 1950–51, p. 5; Rothfield, *Many Paths to Peace*, pp. 28–9; Sam Cohen, VJBD Public Relations Committee Chairman's Report, December 1950, p. 3; 'Dean at Human Rights Rally', *Australian Jewish News*, 21 April 1950.
- 31 'Tremendous enthusiasm at Peace Congress', *Australian Jewish News*, 21 April 1950.
- 32 McNaughton, op. cit., pp. 73–4.
- 33 JCCFAS Executive Committee Minutes, 26 April 1950.
- 34 On the KYO, see Rechter, op. cit., pp. 88–92.
- 35 'No comment by Victorian Police Chief on interrogations', *AJH*, 26 May 1950; 'Police interrogating Jewish youth, say reports', *AJN*, 26 May 1950; 'Jews meetings on alleged questioning', *Melbourne Herald*, 31 May 1950; 'Questions to Jews for inquiry', *Argus*, 1 June 1950; 'Hollway must answer for anti-Jewish intimidation by police', *Guardian*, 2 June 1950; 'Police get report from Jews', *Argus*, 9 June 1950; 'A preview of what can happen under the anti-red Bill', *JCCFAS Newsletter*, August 1950.
- 36 JCCFAS Annual Report 1950–51, p. 4; *Senate Hansard*, 7 June 1950, p. 3791.
- 37 '300 at Kadimah's Meeting on Interrogations', *Australian Jewish Herald*, 30 June 1950.
- 38 Sam Cohen, *VJBD Public Relations Committee Chairman's Report*, December 1950, p. 5; Sam Cohen, *Report of the Standing Committee on Public Relations to the ECAJ Annual Conference* (Melbourne: June 1951), pp. 7–8.
- 39 Executive Council of Australian Jewry, *Monthly Gazette*, August 1950, pp. 34–41.
- 40 *Senate Hansard*, 7 June 1950, p. 3797. See also *JCCFAS Newsletter*, August 1950.
- 41 Paul Morawetz, 'Press disclosures criticised', *Australian Jewish Herald*, 2 June 1950.
- 42 Sam Cohen, *VJBD Public Relations*, pp. 3–4.
- 43 On the broader debate regarding the Bill, see Watson, op. cit., pp. 229–31; Frank Cain and Frank Farrell, 'Menzies' war on the Communist Party, 1949–1951' in Ann Curthoys and John Merritt eds. *Australia's First Cold War 1945–1953 vol. 1* (Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1984), pp. 109–34.
- 44 Itzhak Gust, *Such Was Life* (Melbourne: Makor Jewish Community Library, 2004), pp. 199–200; Charles Lowe, *Report of Royal Commission inquiring into the origins, aims, objects and funds of the Communist Party in Victoria and other related matters* (Melbourne: Victorian Government, 1950), pp. 41–2.
- 45 *JCCFAS Annual Report 1950–51*, p. 4.
- 46 Ernest Platz, 'Some after thoughts of the referendum', *Australian Jewish News*, 5 October 1951; Leibler, op. cit., p. 10.
- 47 · McNaughton, op. cit., pp. 85–7; Rothfield, op. cit., pp. 29–30; 'Press Review: Anti-Communist Bill', *Unity*, May–June 1950, p. 5; 'Melbourne youth protest on Anti-Communist Bill', *Australian Jewish Herald*, 19 May 1950; 'Further protests planned on Anti-Communist Bill', *AJH*, 26 May 1950.
- 48 · Cohen, *Report of the Standing Committee*, op. cit., p. 1; Cohen, *VJBD Public Relations Committee*, op. cit., p. 4; Suzanne Rutland, *With One Voice: A History of the New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies* (Sydney: Australian Jewish Historical Society, 1998), p. 59.

- 49 Philip Mendes, 'Jews, Nazis and Communists Down Under: The Jewish Council's Controversial Campaign Against German Immigration', *Australian Historical Studies*, 119 (April 2002), pp. 73–92; Philip Mendes, 'The Melbourne Jewish Left, Communism and the Cold War: Responses to Stalinist Anti-Semitism and the Rosenberg Spy Trial', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 49, 4 (December 2003), pp. 501–16.