

‘You Have to be Pleasing  
& Co-operative’:  
**Australia’s**  
Vision Splendid  
Post-World War II<sup>for</sup>  
**Migrants**

---

This article examines the ‘vision splendid’ that existed for Australian migration following World War II. That vision (championed by the then Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell) was myopic, but is still pertinent to current debates on Australian Migration, particularly in the way that migrants were placed in categories of the desirable. This paper uses a particular migrant group, the Temple Society, to illustrate the concerns of 1940s immigration policy. This group was interned in Australia during World War II and underwent postwar investigations by the then newly formed Department of Immigration.

There has been much argument over current Australian migration policy. The points that are of particular interest to my own postgraduate studies are the ways in which Australia, as a migration nation, constructs migrant identities, placing people into categories of the desirable. At times, the Australian vision of migration has not been particularly inspiring. In fact, following World War II it was myopic. As a result, it impacted on people's lives to an extraordinary extent, not least on the lives of an ethno-religious group, the *Tempelgesellschaft* (or Temple Society), who form the main focus of my current studies.<sup>1</sup> The quote I have taken as the title of this article, although from 1946, seems to apply as much today as it did at the beginning of Australia's modern migration policy.<sup>2</sup> There still appears to be an attempt to fit migrants into categories which emphasise three things: that migrants will be safe, that they will have money or be in some way of utility to Australia, and that they will be 'pleasing' or willing to work within governmental ideas of what it means to be Australian. In this paper, I will examine what the Australian government's vision of 'the good migrant' was in postwar Australia through looking at the migration experience of the Temple Society members.

### THE TEMPLE SOCIETY

The Temple Society is a religious group that has been in existence since 1861.<sup>3</sup> Its chief centres in Australia today are Boronia and Bayswater.<sup>4</sup> Founded in Southern Germany by Christoph Hoffmann, the 'German Temple' (as it was then known) was based on the idea of living every day according to Christian teachings within a community of like-minded people. The three mainstays of the group when it began were community, piety and prophecy. It was, in some ways, a form of 'millennial Christian socialism', and the object of the Templers was to settle in the Holy Land.<sup>5</sup> This was achieved in 1868, and from 1869 to 1908 the Templers established nine colonies in Palestine: Haifa (1869), Jaffa (1869), Saronia (1871), Rephaim-Jerusalem (1873), Walhalla-Jaffa (1892), Neuhardt-Haifa (1897), Wilhelma (1902), Bethlehem (1906), and Waldheim (1908).<sup>6</sup> While the group maintained an exclusivity, neither selling land to people outside the community nor marrying outside of the Temple Society, a strong connection to Germany was maintained. Templers not only kept German citizenship, but also their dialect, *Schwäbisch*. This last has been maintained to the present day.<sup>7</sup> Within Palestine, they were notable not only as a religious group but as an ethnic group. They had strong connections to the post-1871 German

nation and, as a result, the Templers were interned by the British in Palestine during World War I.

Following World War I Palestine became a British Mandate, and the Templers rebuilt their lives under British rule. During the Nazi era they were courted (as an exclusive ethnic German group) by the Nazi *Auslandsorganisation* (Overseas Organisation), which aimed at joining all Germans into a world-wide 'Germany'.<sup>8</sup> Templers did join the Nazi Party, and the commonly accepted figure is that approximately seventeen per cent of the adults were Party members, although all Templer children were involved in the Hitler Youth.<sup>9</sup> When World War II began, the group was interned again and most were deported to Australia in 1941.<sup>10</sup> They were interned in Australia for the duration of the war in the 'family camp', Camp 3 Tatura. On reaching eighteen, single men had to leave this camp for Camp 1 Tatura or Camp 14 Loveday, both of which appear to have been primarily prisoner-of-war camps.<sup>11</sup> While the agreement that had been made between Australia and Britain provided that internees should be repatriated to Palestine after the war, the British were unwilling to allow them re-entry to the country, and proposed repatriating them to Germany instead.<sup>12</sup>

That might well have been the end of the Temple Society in Australia, but in 1945 Australia had launched a new program of migration, establishing a Department of Immigration for the first time. The program was based on the idea of 'populate or perish'. Believing that Australia's population was too small, the Labor Government proposed that the population needed to increase by roughly two per cent a year. One per cent growth was to be achieved through an increased birth rate, and one per cent through immigration.<sup>13</sup> This was a huge shift in migration policy but, while the Government wanted things to change, they also wanted everything to remain the same. The 'vision splendid' of Australia was still that of a monocultural country, one that was (and was to be kept) quintessentially British, and the newly formed department sought to maintain this monoculture in two ways. First, Arthur Calwell, the Minister for Immigration, continued the White Australia Policy, which had been in existence since the 1901 Migration Act.<sup>14</sup> Secondly, there was a policy of assimilation, which required immigrants to accept the 'British way of life'.<sup>15</sup> As the Secretary of the Department of Immigration put it, immigrants to Australia should be 'grateful and assimilate'.<sup>16</sup> It was in the context of this major change to Australian migration policy that the Overseas Internees Investigation Board was established.<sup>17</sup>

### THE TEMPLERS & THE WHITE AUSTRALIA POLICY

The question of migrant identity was crucial to the Department of Immigration. Internees were considered to be migrants, but discovering whether they were appropriate as candidates for Australian citizenship necessitated investigation. With regard to the Templers, it was noted that there was ‘a terrible lot of confused thinking (and talk) about these people’.<sup>18</sup> There was also considerable vacillation on the part of both the Department of the Army and the Department of Immigration regarding their ultimate fate. The Department of the Army was responsible for the Templers while they were interned, and it had been agreed in 1944 ‘that overseas internees (other than Japanese) remaining in custody may be released at the discretion of the Minister for the Army’.<sup>19</sup> Templers, however, were only allowed to leave the camps from 1946, despite the fact that in October 1945 Calwell had proposed that they be investigated and systematically released.<sup>20</sup> The Minister for the Army agreed that they could be released, but was concerned that they might gain ‘preference in employment, housing, etc. over our own returning ex-servicemen and Australian workers’.<sup>21</sup> From his perspective it was better that they remain interned. In the absence of an Army decision, Calwell had one of his officers, Lamidey, report on the internees.<sup>22</sup> Lamidey proposed three courses of action regarding overseas internees:

1. Appoint a judge to investigate, then release those recommended, repatriating the rest.
2. Obtain all of the internees’ dossiers and decide who should stay from within the Department of Immigration.
3. Inform the British Government that the Australian ‘custodianship’ was at an end, and request a date line for repatriation of all internees.<sup>23</sup>

The report recommended that the third option be taken, based on an entirely new and unexpected view of Templer identity:

*We know little of these people beyond the fact that many of the Palestinians are ‘near coloured’ and more—Arabians, etc. many [sic] of them (some whole families) cannot speak English and may soon become a charge upon the State. To grant them permanent residence would be an undesirable start for our immigration plans even if they are ‘clean skins’ from a security point of view.*<sup>24</sup>

This report shows the confusion that existed at this point about who the Templers were, as it implies that the internees from Palestine (most of whom were Templers) were not white migrants, but were ‘near coloured’ or coloured (‘Arabians, etc.’).

Not wishing to allow non-white migrants into Australia, Calwell unsurprisingly accepted Lamidey’s third option and advised the Prime Minister of this decision on 15 January 1946, although he did also mention the first option as a possibility.<sup>25</sup> The Prime Minister accepted the decision, and the Templers were to be deported to Germany.<sup>26</sup> While the High Commissioner’s Office began to arrange transport for the Templers with the Department of the Army, there were humanitarian concerns about the wholesale shipping of Palestinian Germans to Germany, which was already flooded with displaced persons following the war, and a telegram was sent to the Department of the Army to ascertain:

*what [sic] (if any) Palestinians have been resident in Palestine for lengthy periods of time stop Suggestion is that those who are bona fide residents of long standing should not be forced back to Germany.*<sup>27</sup>

Despite the fact that the Templers were about to be deported as Germans, Calwell still seemed cautious about accepting them (on the grounds that they might be Arabs), and wrote to Forde advising that the internees could possibly stay, although Cabinet had decided ‘that “only white internees from the UK or other British territory” are eligible to remain’.<sup>28</sup> Migration policy was so firmly based on the idea of a ‘white’ Australia that the Templers were very nearly deported. It appears that once it was finally discovered by the Department of Immigration that the internees were both white and from a British territory, there was no objection raised to their remaining in Australia, provided they were investigated by a commission.<sup>29</sup> The Minister for the Army was solely concerned by the security aspect, and also agreed to the investigation.<sup>30</sup>

### THE ‘GOOD MIGRANT’

The Overseas Internees’ Investigation Board (the OIIB) established in 1946 was actually the second such commission. A previous investigation of overseas internees had occurred in 1944, and one of the heads of that Commission, Justice Hutchins, was appointed as head of the 1946 OIIB. Hutchins was a Justice of the Supreme Court of Tasmania, and following

his involvement in the 1944 OIIB, had consistently requested a commission to separate out ‘anti-British elements’ from among the internees.<sup>31</sup> On 21 May 1946 he was given the brief he desired, as his duty was:

*in pursuance of the National Security (Inquiries) Regulations to inquire into and report upon certain matters in relation to the public safety and defence of the Commonwealth, including the question whether it was necessary or desirable to deport from Australia certain persons [namely, internees] referred to in the instrument of appointment.*<sup>32</sup>

Ostensibly the interrogations were to separate what Hutchins termed the ‘good’ from the ‘bad’ Germans, and deport those who had been involved with the Nazi Party.<sup>33</sup> However, of the fifty-seven Templers repatriated to Germany by the OIIB, only four were actually deported.<sup>34</sup> The remainder refused to stay, and returned to Germany voluntarily. Throughout Hutchins’ interrogations the main objective becomes clear—the interviews were aimed at ensuring the Templers would be good migrants and good citizens of Australia. The question then arises—what did being a ‘good migrant’ mean in Australia?

Ideas of desirable migrant qualities come out through Hutchins’ interrogations. The Templers were ‘white’, so they met the main requirement for Australian migrants, but the two other main concerns, not unlike current migration policy, were to ensure that migrants were ‘safe’ and solvent, so that they would neither threaten nor burden the state. Hence, Hutchins consistently asked internees whether they were members of the Nazi Party or Hitler Youth; whether they still adhered to the principles of these groups; whether they had been involved in any anti-British activity in Palestine; and whether they would be willing to take an oath of allegiance to the British Crown if they stayed in Australia.<sup>35</sup> Other questions related to their occupations, how much money they had, and what their properties in Palestine were worth.<sup>36</sup> Hutchins admitted in an interrogation that his purpose was to look at the Templers as potential migrants:

*The Australian Government informs me that such of you people [Templers] as I recommend as being proper persons to become future citizens of Australia that assistance will be given as far as possible to get your assets to Australia. You will have to make application in*

*writing to be permitted to remain in Australia and in twelve months you could apply for naturalisation. Could you expect them to go further than that?*<sup>37</sup>

Although he did not admit it, the OIIB also sought to encourage internees to stay.

The historian Christine Winter has argued that some of the de-Nazification processes carried out within Australian internment camps, such as the screening of a documentary shot at Bergen-Belsen, were, at Calwell’s request, combined with other newsreel footage to make internees ‘aware of the plight of German civilians, and the lack of food available in Germany’.<sup>38</sup> The idea was that the internees would be encouraged to stay in Australia. Winter points out that Justice Simpson (investigating local internees) was bent on ‘finding new Australians’.<sup>39</sup> Hutchins certainly encouraged internees to view Australia as a better alternative to Germany and did so through scare-mongering:

*At present, any person, German or not, who comes before me and I recommend they will not be a public danger, the Australian authorities will allow them to remain in Australia, and to get their assets, which are frozen in Palestine, but we don’t want to persuade anyone to stay in Australia, and once you leave Australian shores, you are finished.*<sup>40</sup>

*You are not in my power, but if you want to go back to Germany, you can go back and stop there and see what it [National Socialism] has brought Germany.*<sup>41</sup>

*It is only a concession by the Australian Government that you can remain here at all and the point is we could get rid of you if we wanted to and it means perhaps, that if you were sent back to Germany, you would starve and probably worse, because you cannot go back to Palestine.*<sup>42</sup>

Within the role he had been allocated to separate out those who were not ‘proper persons’, Hutchins seems to have had contradictory ideas. On the one hand, there were ‘good’ and ‘bad’ Germans.<sup>43</sup> On the other hand, he stated: ‘I have certified [the Templers] as being decent industrious people, only German in name.’<sup>44</sup> This indicates that he

approved of the Templers *despite* their being German, implying that Germans had only negative characteristics, which in turn implies a conflation between being German and being a Nazi. The confusion exists because there was little differentiation made by Hutchins between nationality (whether defined by citizenship or culture) and politics. While a person could be German and not belong to the Nazi Party, in Australia it appears that they were assumed to have been loyal to the Nazis (if they were German) unless proven otherwise.<sup>45</sup> Hence, Germans could be seen as ‘good’ only if their German nationality was a veneer, purely a name, which could be stripped back to reveal the ‘decent industrious people’ underneath, the ones who would make excellent Australian citizens.

In this construct, where ideas of nation were facile and interconnected with loyalty to political ideologies, what Hutchins sought to dig out was whether internees were anti-British and hence, presumably, anti-Australian. While never stated, the assumption appears to have been that loyalty to Australia implied commitment to a British way of life, and loyalty to a particular political ideology symbolised by Britain. He wanted to ensure that Templers would be loyal to the British system whatever they currently believed, although his views here were also contradictory. Whilst he made the claim ‘once a German, always a German’, implying a continuity of national identity which was incongruent with change, he also stated that what was required of the Templers was that they would be ‘as good an Australian as you were a German’.<sup>46</sup>

Ultimately, he does appear to have equated being German with being loyal to the Nazi Party (which was exactly what the Nazi leadership had sought to do) and equated being Australian with being loyal to Britain. As a consequence, internees were allowed into Australia if they were willing to answer Hutchins’ questions adequately around the idea of a changed nationality—instead of being German (Nazi), they would be Australian (British). Peeling away one national veneer, they could apply another, but what they could not be was a combined nationality, such as German-Australian. A pertinent example of this is Hutchins’ exchange with an internee, Gottlieb Ruff:

*Gottlieb: I wish to stay German and I think it would be possible to stay in Australia even whilst remaining a German.*

*Hutchins: You would be required to apply for letter [sic] of Naturalisation twelve months after you are released.*

*We cannot have anyone who might be a public danger, we cannot afford to have anyone who is disloyal? [sic]*

*Gottlieb: If Your Honour thinks I would be a danger to this country I ask you to send me back to Germany.*

*Hutchins: I am not expressing any opinion at all. So you think in time you could become a loyal British citizen whilst desiring to remain in Australia a Nazi and a German. [sic] We cannot have any possible public danger here. If you feel you cannot do that the only thing is to wait your turn and be sent back to Germany.*

*Gottlieb: I am sorry Your Honour but I cannot do that.<sup>47</sup>*

Eventually, Ruff did stay in Australia, after stating he would take the Oath of Allegiance to Britain if he had to, which met Hutchins’ requirements.

In fact, Hutchins does not seem to have met his brief. In the interviews, questions regarding belief in National Socialist ideas were neatly sidestepped by saying that the Nazi Party no longer existed.<sup>48</sup> This was quite true, but did not answer the question of whether the internee had believed in its ideology. Some internees who remained in Australia even pointed out that they were still Nazis.<sup>49</sup> One internee, Peter Decker, pointed out this fallacy: when asked ‘When you know there is no longer a Nazi Party are you still one [sic]?’ he stated that he still held the same political beliefs until he could ‘make up [his] mind as to a new political idea’, even though the Nazi Party no longer existed.<sup>50</sup> Another internee, Gudrun Heider, could not see why she would not be allowed to remain, since Hutchins was releasing others who were just as attached to the National Socialist ideology:

*Hutchins: Do you sympathise with Nazism now?*

*Gudrun: Yes.*

*Hutchins: Do you think you are fit to remain in Australia?*

*Gudrun: I think I am allowed to stay here because others who sympathise with it also get free here.<sup>51</sup>*

Hutchins allowed her release, under supervision, although he noted: ‘If she were a man I would recommend her repatriation’, illustrating

another bias that existed.<sup>52</sup> Similarly, young men who were interviewed often stated a continued adherence to the National Socialists, but were convinced by their families to change their attitudes. On the files of two of these there are identical pencilled notes, 'Use No.3 Report', that is, the interview in which they no longer stated they were Nazis.<sup>53</sup> These reports had to be the ones presented to the Department of Immigration, as the first interviews concluded with Hutchins' decision to deport the youths.<sup>54</sup> Obviously, it has to be taken into account that the young men were only in their early twenties, had participated in the Hitler Youth and then been interned with German soldiers, so that their beliefs were hardly their own. However, the underlying assumption that these young men should not be separated from their families overrode the brief given to Hutchins by the Australian government to deport those who stated that they were Nazis. A Templer I interviewed mentioned his surprise that some of the most 'dyed-in-the-wool' Nazis were allowed to stay.<sup>55</sup>

Hutchins acknowledged that he was breaching his commitment in the case of Friedrich Wagner, whom he allowed to stay in Australia after twice recommending his deportation. Wagner had admitted that he was a member of the Nazi Party as well as a leader of the NSDAP in Haifa, and Hutchins believed that he had sponsored 'a series of German propaganda films'.<sup>56</sup> The Templers requested that Wagner's case be reviewed, and at this last interrogation Hutchins recommended Wagner to stay in Australia, while pointing out that this was against his understanding of what he was required to do:

*I want you clearly to understand this. That if it became known that a man who was an active propagandist was let loose all together [sic] in Australia and some politician got news of this, that the Minister [for Immigration] would be compelled to repatriate him, and quite a lot depends upon the guarantees that he would behave himself. I would like to help you and your wife and daughter, but I have to see my way out to do it. I have had to recommend twice that you be repatriated.<sup>57</sup>*

Hutchins was also interested in the Templer group as it presented itself as a ready-made community, and often asked whether internees were willing to be ruled by what the Temple Society, as a group, decided to do.<sup>58</sup> His ideas regarding the Temple Society were based on ideas of loyalty to Australia, and of the Templers' utility as migrants, but also on the idea that migrants should be grateful to come to Australia. In an interview

with Liselotte and Gretel Steller, he summarised his views on migrants: 'You see, your happiness or otherwise in Australia depends upon your own attitude. You have to be pleasing and co-operative.'<sup>59</sup> He believed that the entire group of Templers should come into Australia as migrants and based this belief on the perception that they were honest, hard-working and pious people.<sup>60</sup> They were what he believed migrants should be.

### FITTING THE VISION

The Department of Immigration agreed with this assessment. The question of how the Minister for Immigration viewed the Templers was answered retrospectively in 1949, when Calwell brought a Bill before Federal Parliament to establish a trust fund for the Temple Society.<sup>61</sup> For information on the Templers, Calwell relied on Justice Hutchins and, more especially, on Henry Temby (who had been Hutchins' secretary on the OIIB).<sup>62</sup> Calwell regarded the Templers as white, hard-working and pious migrants with money. At the second reading of the Bill he emphasised that they were a 'religio-economic society', aiming at the 'spiritual and economic development of the Holy Land', who had built 'flourishing and *lucrative* communities'.<sup>63</sup> Moreover, they fitted into the White Australia Policy and were 'accustomed to the British way of life', so that they would assimilate easily into Australian culture.<sup>64</sup> Unlike Japanese internees who were deported posthaste, the Templers can be seen to have been more privileged than other internees by reason of being 'white'.<sup>65</sup> They were given a choice whether to stay in Australia or not. Calwell also wished Parliament to know that the Templers were '*non-Jewish* migrants from Palestine'.<sup>66</sup> This was no doubt partly due to the outraged response Calwell had received to his 1946 proposal to allow two thousand Jewish refugees into Australia.<sup>67</sup> He saw the Templers as mostly primary producers who would be able to work 'in the national interests', but what particularly pleased both Calwell and the Opposition was that they were low-cost migrants:

*Not one penny of Commonwealth funds has been expended in bringing them to this country, and, under this measure [the Trust Fund Bill], no Commonwealth funds will be expended in administering their assets or in settling them in Australia.<sup>68</sup>*

Calwell's one concern was that the Templers should not form 'alien colonies' in Australia.<sup>69</sup> He had been emphatic about this when he met

with Templer leaders on 8 July 1946, and he reiterated it in Parliament.<sup>70</sup> Hutchins, too, had queried whether it was absolutely necessary for the Templers to gather into colonies, as the Australian Government was ‘frightened of the thing becoming a cell’.<sup>71</sup> Outside this one concern there was general agreement at the government level that the Templers were ‘splendid immigrants’.<sup>72</sup>

At the same time, in Israel they were viewed as colonists who had ‘embraced, from the very beginning, the Nazi doctrines and had openly boasted of their loyalty to Hitler’.<sup>73</sup> Now, while not all Templers were Nazis, there had been connections between the group and the National Socialist state. In Australia this was no impediment for the Templers because they met Australian migration requirements: they were white, ‘safe’, were not going to become a burden on the state, and they were ‘pleasing and co-operative.’ They fitted the vision.

#### ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> The major history of the Temple Society is by Professor Paul Sauer, Gunhild Henley (trans.), *The Holy Land Called: The Story of the Temple Society*, Temple Society Australia, Melbourne, 1991. I will refer to the Tempelgesellschaft throughout this paper as the Temple Society or the Templers. A connection is often assumed to exist between the Templers and the Knights Templar, the mediaeval sect—see for example, Johann Weiss, *It Wasn't Really Necessary: Internment in Australia with Emphasis on the Second World War*, JP Weiss, South Australia, 2003, 173. This is an erroneous belief.
- <sup>2</sup> The first Department of Immigration was only established in 1945, with Arthur Calwell as Minister.
- <sup>3</sup> Although the group itself has been in existence since 24 August 1854, the Temple Society (as such) was founded in 1861.
- <sup>4</sup> There is also a German branch to the society, the *Tempelgesellschaft Deutschland*.
- <sup>5</sup> The phrase is Sauer’s: Professor Paul Sauer, Helga Uhlherr (trans.), *The Temple Society: a Brief Historical Introduction*, Temple Society Australia, Melbourne, 1987, 3.
- <sup>6</sup> Of these, Walhalla and Neuhardtshof were branch settlements of existing communities. Waldheim was a Protestant group related to the Templers, which formed when a religious split occurred. There were also Templer families at Nazareth and Tiberias. See *The Temple Society: An Overview*, Temple Society Australia, Melbourne, 1986,

Appendix 2, 1–6; *Templer Handbook*, Temple Society Australia, Melbourne, 1992, 119–22; Christa Margarite Christa, ‘The German Templers in Australia’, in Manfred Jurgensen (ed.) *German–Australian Cultural Relations Since 1945: Proceedings of the Conference held at the University of Queensland, Brisbane, from September 20–23, 1994*, Peter Lang AG, Berne, 1995, 139.

- <sup>7</sup> On Templers’ use of dialect, see Michael Clyne, *Perspectives on Language Contact: Based on a Study of German in Australia*, Hawthorn Press, Melbourne, 1972, 68–9.
- <sup>8</sup> On the operations of the *Auslandsorganisation* in Palestine with regard to the Templers see Ralf Balke, *Hakenkreuz im Heiligen Land: die NSDAP-Landesgruppe Palästina*, Sutton, Erfurt 2001; Francis Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, USA, 2000; Helmut Schmidt, ‘The Nazi Party in Palestine and the Levant 1932–9’, *International Affairs*, vol.28, no.4, 1952, 460–9; Marianne Wagner, *The Templers in Palestine and the Rise of Nazism in Germany*, Honours thesis, University of Melbourne, 1976; Sauer, *Holy Land*, Chapters 8 and 9.
- <sup>9</sup> Balke, 69, 190–11.6 (the latter contains Balke’s calculations); Wagner, Introduction, ii. On the Hitler Youth, see Schmidt, 464.
- <sup>10</sup> The majority of the group (536 Templers) came to Australia, although some Templers were interned in Palestine until 1948 when they were moved to Cyprus and then Australia.
- <sup>11</sup> Intelligence Report Tatura, 10.02.1943, series MP70/1, file 37/101/185, National Archive of Australia (hereafter NAA), Melbourne Reading Room. This move was protested by the Templers.
- <sup>12</sup> The agreement was made in 1940: Supplement 7, 02.10.1940, War Cabinet Agendum 157/1940, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room. On repatriation, see Secret Cablegram, 28.07.1945, Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, London, to Minister and Department of the Army, External Affairs and Security Services, series MP742/1, file 255/14/232, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room.
- <sup>13</sup> Jock Collins, *Migrant Hands in a Distant Land: Australia’s Post-War Immigration*, Pluto Press, Australia, 1988, 10.
- <sup>14</sup> Janis Wilton and Richard Bosworth, *Old Worlds and New Australia: The Post-war Migration Experience*, Penguin Books, Australia, 1984, 2–14.
- <sup>15</sup> Wilton & Bosworth, 13. Brigadier White, part of a delegation sent to

investigate the Templers in Palestine, noted the Templers 'are no strangers to the British way of life', as they had lived in Palestine under the British Mandate: Letter, 17.05.1948, series B1321, file TSTF 6p, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room.

<sup>16</sup> Wilton & Bosworth, 18.

<sup>17</sup> Actually the second such board. The first had been convened in 1944, and delivered its report on 26 July 1944: Report, series MP742/1, file 255/19/261, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room, although Sauer (*Holy Land*, 245) lists it as running from 13 to 19 May. No Templers were released as a result of the first investigation.

<sup>18</sup> Letter, 21.01.1946, Lamidey to Justice Simpson, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Canberra Reading Room.

<sup>19</sup> War Cabinet Agendum 131/1044, 20.03.1944, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Canberra Reading Room.

<sup>20</sup> As was to occur with 'local internees', see Letter, 25.10.1945, Calwell to Forde, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Canberra Reading Room. Justice Simpson carried out an investigation of local internees on very similar lines to those of Hutchins, although his commission ran from November 1945 to March 1946, ending before the second OIIB began. On Simpson's investigations, see Christine Winter, 'The long arm of the Third Reich: Internment of New Guinea Germans in Tatura', *Journal of Pacific History*, vol.38, no.1, June 2003, 85–108. Part of the reason for the Templers' continued internment was their own aversion (at least in 1944) to being released, due to a belief that they would be ostracised in Australia and unable to continue their German 'cultural life'—Protest Letter, 12.05.1944, Internees to Camp Commandant, Camp 3, series MP 70/1, file 37/101/185, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room. A paper I delivered at the National Museum's 'War and Citizenship' Symposium (July 2004) dealt with the re-creation of German cultural life in Camp 3, and the connections maintained with Nazi Germany in camp life. The Protest Letter is attached in full as an appendix to this paper, which will be published as part of the conference proceedings in October 2004: see SP Koehne, 'Refusing to Leave: Perceptions of German Identity during Internment in Australia'.

<sup>21</sup> Letter, Forde to Calwell, 07.12.1945, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Canberra Reading Room.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, Memorandum 'Overseas Internees', 10.01.1946, Lamidey to Calwell. Lamidey played an integral part in the classification of aliens

for internment within Australia prior to World War II, and collated his reports on local internees into a book: Noel Lamidey, *Aliens Control in Australia, 1939–46*, Noel Lamidey, Sydney, 1974.

<sup>23</sup> My summary of Memorandum 'Overseas Internees', 10.01.1946, Lamidey to Calwell, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Canberra Reading Room.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. Lamidey included camp statistics in his report, which divided internees from Palestine into Italians (56) and Germans (635). Obviously most Palestine internees were German citizens, and while 'many' is an imprecise term it would seem to include the Templers, who formed the majority of the 'Palestinians'.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, Letter, 15.01.1946, Calwell to Prime Minister.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, Letter, 05.02.1946, Prime Minister to Calwell. By this stage, it was certain that Britain would only repatriate them to Germany: see Secret Cablegram, 28.07.1945, Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, London, to Minister and Department of the Army, External Affairs and Security Services, series MP742/1, file 255/14/232, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room. See also Minutes, 17.01.1946, Dominions Office Meeting, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Canberra Reading Room.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, Telegram, 12.02.1946, Department of Immigration to Department of the Army.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, Letter, 13.03.1946, Calwell to Forde.

<sup>29</sup> Letters, 11.04.1946 and 20.05.1946, Calwell to Forde, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Canberra Reading Room.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, Letter, 05.04.1946, Forde to Calwell.

<sup>31</sup> Report, 21.07.1944, Hutchins to Forde and Minute Paper, 01.02.1945, series MP742/1, file 255/19/367, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room. The second OIIB ran from 21 May 1946 to 4 August 1946—Memorandum, 20.09.1946, Secretary, Department of the Army to Secretary, Attorney-General's Office, series A472, file W20366, NAA, Canberra Reading Room. These interrogations are the ones recorded in NAA series B1356, boxes 9–12. On the second OIIB see Sauer, *Holy Land*, 286; Christine Winter, 105–6.

<sup>32</sup> This quote is taken from a Bill, Deportation of Certain Aliens, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Canberra Reading Room. Hutchins' Instrument of Appointment outlines this same objective, but in more detail, requiring that those released be 'of good character' and 'fitted' to becoming an Australian citizen ('and in due course a

British subject'). See Instrument of Appointment, 21.05.1946, series A472, file W20366, NAA, Canberra Reading Room.

- <sup>33</sup> See ABERLE, Friedrich, series B1356, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room. Series B1356 boxes 9–12 contain Internment Camp 3 Interrogation Records from the OIIB. The records are organised alphabetically, and searchable by surname. Unless otherwise stated, references to series B1356 are to these files.
- <sup>34</sup> There are only forty-nine Templers listed in 'Templers deported or transported from Australia to Germany', series B1321, file TSTF 2f (2), NAA, Melbourne Reading Room. The families are listed by those 'Repatriated' and 'Deported'. The four members of the family Reinhardt were deported. The Australian government file does not include either Wilhelm Baumert or Hermann Tietz (and their families), both of whom were Templers who opted to return to Germany—see BAUMERT, Wilhelm; TIETZ, Hermann, series B1356. With the inclusion of the two families, the total number of Templers is fifty-seven, which correlates with information given to Sauer by the later President of the Temple Society, Richard Hoffmann, although Hoffmann stated that the repatriated Templers were 'exclusively volunteers'. Sauer, *Holy Land*, 289.
- <sup>35</sup> Summarised from interrogations, series B1356.
- <sup>36</sup> Summarised from interrogations, series B1356. Hutchins believed that their funds were crucial to them staying in Australia: 'Their ultimate fate depends, of course, entirely upon the release of Palestinian assets.' Letter, 02.08.1946, Hutchins to Calwell, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Canberra Reading Room. On interrogation questions see also Barbara Winter, *Stalag Australia: German Prisoners of War in Australia*, Angus & Robertson, North Ryde, NSW, 1986, 351; Sauer, *Holy Land*, 286.
- <sup>37</sup> ABERLE, Friedrich, series B1356.
- <sup>38</sup> Christine Winter, 105. In this, Winter relies on Margaret Bevege, *Behind Barbed Wire: Internment in Australia during World War II*, University of Queensland Press, Queensland, 1993, 220. Bevege, in turn, relies on NAA box 42, item 298, series MP1444.
- <sup>39</sup> Christine Winter, 105.
- <sup>40</sup> BITZER, Reinhold, series B1356.
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid, DECKER, Peter.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid, FRANK, Max. Hutchins tried to push Max into making a decision straightaway, saying 'people cannot hover around in midair'.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid, ABERLE, Friedrich.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> This confusion over German identity existed in the Department of Immigration as well, as indicated by the later statement that Hutchins' investigations had revealed that 'in general neither the Templar [sic] nor the *German Jew group* [interned in Australia] was Nazi': Letter, 31.01.1950, Temby to Department of Immigration, series B1321, file TSTF 1b, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room, my emphasis.

<sup>46</sup> Respectively RUBITSCHUNG, Dr Otto; STREKER, Daniel, series B1356.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid, RUFF, Gottlieb.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid, see for example HOFFMANN, Theodor; SCHNERRING, August; STELLER, Johannes; WAGNER, Friedrich. Some attempted to do this unsuccessfully—PFÄNDER, Paul said 'There are no more Nazis', but agreed that he was indeed a Nazi sympathiser.

<sup>49</sup> Series B1356: RUFF, Gottlieb; WAGNER, Friedrich; DECKER, Peter; HEIDER, Gudrun; STELLER, Johannes.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid, DECKER, Peter.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid, HEIDER, Gudrun.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid. Throughout the interviews only the Templer men speak, with women being interrogated only rarely. Most men obtained permission from their wives to speak for them, although one internee stated 'I thought it would be taken for granted.' See WAGNER, Walter, series B1356.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid, MINZENMAY, Erich; HERRMANN, Friedrich.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid. See also HERRMANN, Manfred and Hutchins' interviews with KROCKENBERGER, Oskar. At first, Hutchins recommended Krockenberger's deportation, as Oskar stated ('on his oath') that he was anti-British. After Karl Krockenberger had talked to his son, Hutchins was pleased to note: '[Oskar's] attitude is now what it should be.'

<sup>55</sup> Templer Interviewee, 2003.

<sup>56</sup> WAGNER, Friedrich, series B1356. Wagner argued that they were 'weekly news reels'.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> Many volunteered this, whether asked or not. They consistently requested that they stay together as a community. See, as a sample

from the first two boxes of series B1356: BACHER, Helmut; BECK, Urban; BEILHARZ, Reinhardt; DECKER, Gerhard ; DECKER, Peter; DREHER, Ludwig; DYCK, Abraham; EDELMAIER, Alfred; EHNIS, Ludwig; FRANK, Hedwig; GLENK, Ewald; GLENK, Gottlieb; GRAZE, Richard; GRÖZINGER, Willy; HAAR, Johannes; HÄRING, Friedrich; HERRMANN, Mina; HERRMANN, Wilhelm; HÖFER, Rudolph.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid, STELLER, Liselotte and Gretel.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid, ABERLE, Friedrich. A later report also noted ‘His Honour appears to be convinced that they are desirable immigrants and that their claim to their Palestinian assets should receive government support.’—Letter, 04.06.1947, Minister for the Army to Attorney-General, series A472, file W20366, NAA, Canberra Reading Room.

<sup>61</sup> This became the Temple Society Trust Fund Act of 1949. While it is true that all of these points were made three years after the OIIB investigations, I do not believe it is ahistorical to attribute these as the views of the Department of Immigration in 1946, particularly considering the questions that Hutchins asked (which were essentially on behalf of the Minister for Immigration).

<sup>62</sup> Temby later became an officer in the Department of Immigration, as that department grew under Heyes (from seventy-four officers in 1946 to 5,725 in 1950—Wilton and Bosworth, 18). See Memorandum, 01.09.1946, series A445, file 258/1/5, NAA, Canberra Reading Room, for Temby’s appointment.

<sup>63</sup> Calwell, House of Representatives, 23 September 1949, *Hansard*, vol.204, 550. My emphasis.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid, 553, although the first mention of Templers being ‘no strangers to the British way of life’ appears to have been made by Brigadier White: Letter, 17.05.1948, series B1321, file TSTF 6p, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room.

<sup>65</sup> An in-depth study of this situation is Yuriko Nagata’s *Unwanted Aliens: Japanese Internment in Australia*, University of Queensland Press, Queensland, 1996. The only exceptions made were for Japanese who were Australian-born or had an Australian-born spouse: Yuriko Nagata, ‘A Little Colony On Our Own’, in Saunders and Daniels (eds), *Alien Justice: Wartime Internment in Australia and North America*, University of Queensland Press, Queensland, 2000, 203; Bevege, 223ff.

<sup>66</sup> House of Representatives, 23 September 1949, *Hansard*, vol.204, 550.

<sup>67</sup> Wilton and Bosworth, 12. In the end these refugees were refused entry.

<sup>68</sup> House of Representatives, 23 September 1949, *Hansard*, vol.204, 553. Senator Cooper, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate noted ‘[t]hey are paying their own fares’—Senate, 27 October 1949, *Hansard*, vol.205, 2118. Calwell mentioned that they were farmers three times in his speech, and requested that in distributing the funds from the proposed Temple Society Trust Fund, preference be given to Templers who worked in primary industry and the ‘national interests’. Senator Cooper also approved of their ‘agricultural pursuits’—Senate, 27 October 1949, *Hansard*, vol.205, 2118.

<sup>69</sup> House of Representatives, 23 September 1949, *Hansard*, vol.204, 552. Part of Calwell’s fear may have been due to Charles Price’s book of 1945, which argued that German migrants in South Australia had not assimilated into Australian society, but had instead maintained threatening German colonies. See C A Price, *German Settlers in Australia*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1945. See also RUBITSCHUNG, Dr Otto, series B1356, where Hutchins expressed this fear of disloyal Germans: ‘I am told by officials that already in South Australia in some quarters there is a movement afoot to build up German Anti-British sentiments. And further, that German children in some quarters are now being told that the last war was just a trial and that the real war will come in 15 to 20 years time.’

<sup>70</sup> Sauer, *Holy Land*, 287. Calwell met with Max Frank and Friedrich Aberle, as the representatives of the Templers in Australia.

<sup>71</sup> ABERLE, Friedrich, series B1356.

<sup>72</sup> Senator Cooper, Senate, 27 October 1949, *Hansard* vol.205, 2118.

<sup>73</sup> Report on conversation with Moshe Sharret, 03.02.1950, Fuhrmann to Department of External Affairs, series B1321, file TSTF 1b, NAA, Melbourne Reading Room.