Children Australia
Advancing Child, Youth & Family Services

PUBLISHED BY The Centre

OPEN ACCESS

Children Australia
childrenaustralia.org.au
The Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare

doi.org/10.61605/cha_3058

Article type: Original Research

PUBLISHED 2 September 2025

Volume 47 Issue 2

HISTORY

RECEIVED: 19 March 2025

REVISED: 18 June 2025

ACCEPTED: 16 July 2025

Responses of Jewish leadership to manifestations of institutional child sexual abuse: An analysis of two Australian public inquiries

Marcia Pinskier[1] *

Philip Mendes[1]

Susan Baidawi[1]

Affiliations

[1] Department Social Work, Monash University, Melbourne, Vic., Australia

Correspondence

*Ms Marcia Pinskier marcia.pinskier1@monash.edu

CITATION: Pinskier, M., Mendes, P., & Baidawi, S. (2025). Responses of Jewish leadership to manifestations of institutional child sexual abuse: An analysis of two Australian public inquiries. *Children Australia*, *47*(2), 3058. doi.org/10.61605/cha_3058

Abstract

Prior to the 2011 public revelations by Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (ICSA) survivor Manny Waks regarding his experiences of abuse at the Yeshivah Centre, Melbourne, as far back as the 1980s, there was little acknowledgement of the existence, much less the extent, of ICSA within the Jewish community of Australia. To date, there remains limited scholarly analysis of the nation's Jewish leadership responses to ICSA. However, two Australian Government inquiries, one conducted in the state of Victoria, (2013 Betrayal of Trust Inquiry), the other conducted by the national government (2017 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse), reviewed the actions of Jewish community leaders. This study drew on a deductive content analysis of documentation and associated materials from these inquiries and aimed to identify the strengths and limitations of Jewish leadership responses to ICSA. Concerns were identified regarding Jewish leadership practices, including limited accountability to survivors and the wider Jewish community, the influence of religious and cultural factors in discouraging disclosures of abuse and inadequate survivor support. Conclusions have been drawn about peak body leadership and the need for reformed practices. These address improved accountabilities, barriers to disclosure and support for survivors of ICSA, both across Jewish communities and additional faith or ethnic communities, particularly those with like cultural practices.

Keywords:

Australian Jewish leadership, Betrayal of Trust Inquiry, institutional child sexual abuse, Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

Introduction

In the past decade, two Australian jurisdictions have held major inquiries into the crisis of Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (ICSA). One was the Victorian State Government's Betrayal of Trust Inquiry into the Handling of Child Abuse by Religious and other Organisations (BI) (FCDC, 2013a). The other, conducted by the national government, was the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (RCIRCSA) (RCIRCSA, 2017a). The Victorian Government established the Seven Child Safe Standards in response to the BI. The first was that organisations were to comply with 'Strategies to embed a culture of child safety through effective leadership arrangements' (Department of Health and Human Services, 2019). The RCIRCSA identified 10 Child Safe Standards, the first stipulating that 'Child safety is embedded in institutional leadership, governance and culture' (RCIRCSA, 2017b). Both inquiries highlighted leadership as a key factor to ensure child-safety. To date, however, minimal research has examined leadership and governance responses to manifestations of ICSA across Australian Jewish communities. Thus, these communities lack a basic understanding and response framework to deal effectively with allegations of ICSA, with an attendant incapacity to address prevention and effective redress.

The present paper presents a review of the findings of these inquiries and asks 'what are the strengths and limitations of Jewish leadership responses to ICSA?' The key contribution of this analysis is its synthesis of these findings that relate to leadership and governance across the broader Jewish community, with a view to informing future policies and practices of Jewish peak bodies and community organisations. It considers the expectations of community and institutional leadership and includes an appraisal of the major Australian national and state Jewish peak bodies. Peak bodies reviewed within this paper include the Australian national Jewish peak body, the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ), and the state bodies of Victoria, the Jewish Community Council of Victoria (JCCV) and New South Wales, the New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies (NSW JBD).

Factors reported by the RCIRCSA as enhancing the risk of ICSA and its negative impacts on victim–survivors in respect of leadership and governance, including Jewish cultural factors (RCIRCSA, 2017c), are commented upon. Recommendations specific to the Jewish community, along with those common to promote child safety in religious organisations but applicable to Jewish organisations and communities, are also highlighted. We note that Jewish leadership responses are examined at a specific moment in time (i.e. linked to the two government inquiries), rather than as an evaluation of their overall contributions to the issue of ICSA within the Jewish community since the period of these reviews. Findings have applicability to mitigate and prevent ICSA, and to enhance survivor support, across the Australian Jewish community as well as a range of wider communal bodies and not-for-profit organisations. These will be relevant, in particular, to international Jewish communities, and those with like cultural characteristics, such as the Catholic church, or other ethnic or faith minorities.

ICSA in global Jewish communities

Religious influence, communities, practices and beliefs constitute a most understudied cultural issue in child sexual abuse (CSA) (Tishelman & Fontes, 2016), with victims from religious and ethnic minority groups facing additional barriers to disclosure and reporting (Sawrikar & Katz, 2018). Worldwide, limited research exists into ICSA within Jewish communities (Pinskier et al., 2021; Sawrikar & Katz, 2017). The small amount available has emerged, in large, out of Israel and America, with further findings, of late, available from the British Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) (Hurcombe et al., 2020). The bulk of studies have been conducted in Israel, where Jews form the majority ethno-religious group compared with their minority status elsewhere (Mendes et al., 2024) and have predominantly examined the ultra-Orthodox (see, for example, Lusky-Weisrose (2021) and Zalcberg (2017)). Common findings include the importance of religious and cultural context for understanding the impact of CSA on survivors and their willingness (or disinclination) to report abuse to secular authorities (Hurcombe et al., 2020).

Leading studies have noted extended delays in disclosure (Zalcberg, 2017), with failure to disclose or report for a range of religious or cultural reasons. These include *Halachic* (Jewish law) mandates to prevent reputational damage and shame, to both God and community (Blau, 2017; Neustein & Lesher, 2008) and avoid gossip or slander (Katzenstein & Aronson Fontes, 2017). In addition, Lusky-Weisrose et al. (2021) noted the fear of communal ostracism following disclosure. Rabbinic leaders serve largely as the authorities within these communities as seen by Alfandari et al. (2021), which contributes to allegations (when made) being disclosed firstly to religious leaders, and then commonly dealt with by internal, often inadequate, processes (Tishelman & Fontes, 2016). Were a rabbi to forbid further discussion of the complaint, the victim would usually obey. Sizeable numbers of such incidents were related by the IICSA. Victims reporting abuse at religious camps, synagogues or rabbis' homes, who brought complaints to their rabbi or *Beth Din* (Jewish Rabbinic court) were frequently left with inadequate support by leadership within their community (IICSA, 2020).

Ultra-Orthodox Jewish groups are highly insular. Children in these communities find it difficult to find an adult to whom they feel safe to disclose because all adults may seem to have a relationship with the offender (Tishelman & Fontes, 2016). This often pairs with alienation from secular authorities due to fear that connection could result in antisemitism (Katzenstein & Aronson Fontes, 2017). Research has also found that CSA is closely linked to male dominance or patriarchal religious communities (Tishelman & Fontes, 2016), as has been noted in comparable systems across a range of cultures (Mathews, 2019). Jewish Rabbinic courts are exclusively male (Neustein & Lesher, 2008) and few leadership roles are open to women, obstructing them from decision-making opportunities that advance effective child safeguarding processes (Mendes et al., 2024).

Jay et al. (2021) reported escalation in ICSA among the ultra-Orthodox, seen in the IICSA, with incidents increasing in complexity and gravity. Notwithstanding, improved stances are being seen within these communities. Materials in child and adult education promote greater awareness of ICSA, address barriers to

disclosure and convey that secular care may align with Jewish values (Neustein & Lesher, 2009). Communal responsibility calls for allegations to not be dismissed or minimised, that police be called if suspicions exist, that perpetrators or institutions are not protected above victims, and Rabbis on rabbinic courts be trained in the nuances of CSA (Dratch, 2009).

Recommendations for best practice reform within Jewish communities commonly suggest mitigation of ICSA through improved screening methods for staff and volunteers working with children and training in child safety. Sex education in faith-based community institutions, development of core child safety standards and child protection policies are also seen as beneficial (Mendes et al., 2024).

Notwithstanding the above, minimal research has been sourced on the contributions of lay, communal Jewish leadership in the domain of ICSA. Arguably, peak bodies have both a responsibility and capacity to influence and guide improved child safety practices, address cultural barriers to disclosure and increase survivor support among affiliate organisations and the wider community. Indeed, it has been noted that victims often choose to depart their communities due, in part, to lack of support from these peak bodies (Sztokman, 2022).

The two inquiries

Terms of reference

The BI's terms of reference included examination of organisational responses to the criminal abuse of children and consideration of the existence of systemic practices that discouraged reporting of abuse. The inquiry ran for approximately 18 months, from April 2012 to November 2013 (FCDC, 2013a). Letters Patent of the RCIRCSA reflected similar purposes, including exploration of institutional systemic failures in relation to allegations and incidents of CSA, provision of victim justice and survivor support, and future best practice (RCIRCSA, 2014). The 5-year length of the RCIRCSA (2013–2017) enabled additional detail regarding extensive and nuanced research and reports.

Demographics of engagement of inquiries and subsequent limitations

The Jewish community in Australia involves a diverse spectrum of culture, lifestyle and religious observance and it has been noted that there is no 'typical Australian Jew' (Graham & Markus, 2018). As such, while frequently recognised as an ethnicity (Zuckerman, 2003), it is not uncommon for Jews to be commonly categorised by their religious practices, as detailed in Table 1.

Table 1. Practices of disparate faith and practice Jewish sub-groups
After Markus (2011).

Religious identification	Lifestyle practices
Ultra-Orthodox (Haredi)	Adhere to Halacha (Jewish law) and lifestyle guided by theological principles, with emphasis on religious texts and traditions. Includes Chabad, some 400 families in Australia (RCIRCSA, 2016a).
Modern Orthodox	Adhere to Halacha; lifestyle guided by traditional teachings and practices; engaged with the modern world.
Traditional	Traditional values are upheld, to uphold Jewish life.
Conservative	More open to change than Orthodoxy, but more connected to tradition than other liberal forms of Judaism.
Progressive	Most progressive of religious streams, observing Jewish laws and practices through a liberal lens, maintaining that Judaism should be modernised and compatible with surrounding culture. Progressive streams include: • Masorti, who follow a form of Jewish law, with less severe theological beliefs; and • Reform, who largely do not believe that Jewish law is binding, but value ritual and custom.
Secular	Focused on secular or cultural Judaism, rather than the spiritual, regarding Judaism as an evolving, cultural civilisation.

The BI consulted with Jewry only as part of wider investigations and received testimony from only the JCCV President (Nina Bassat) and CEO (David Marlow) (FCDC, 2013b); and ICSA survivor Manny Waks and his father (FCDC, 2012). Manny Waks is well known as the first (and one of the few to date) survivors of ICSA within the ultra-Orthodox community of Australia to 'go public'. In July 2011, his experiences of ICSA in the Chabad community were reported in mainstream media (Topsfield, 2011). The BI received a small number of additional submissions, one of which was provided by the ECAJ (Lamm & Wertheim, 2012), in response to statements made to the Inquiry by Manny Waks.

The RCIRCSA selected case studies utilising criteria including allegations received about an institution or group of institutions, availability of witnesses (survivors and staff) and systemic issues (RCIRCSA, 2017a). Regarding the Australian Jewish community, this led to review of the Chabad institutions Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshivah Melbourne (Case Study No. 22, CS22), from the two largest Australian cities of Sydney (Bondi) and Melbourne. Yeshiva and Yeshivah have related communities and cultures yet are separate entities (RCIRCSA, 2016a). CS22 included a witness list of 11 Rabbinic and institutional leaders and representatives and four survivors of ICSA and three of their family members. Yeshiva Bondi did not seek leave to appear; however, a number of their Rabbinic leaders were summoned by the RCIRCSA (RCIRCSA, 2016a).

CS22 was followed 2 years later by the Institutional review of Yeshiva/h (CS53) (RCIRCSA, 2017d). The purpose of CS53, most significantly, was to assess the responses of these institutions to relevant Royal Commission reports since CS22 (RCIRCSA, 2017e). CS53 involved two panels; the former comprising seven community leaders (including peak body leaders) unrelated to Yeshiva Bondi or Yeshivah Melbourne; the latter comprising one representative of Yeshiva Centre, Chabad NSW, two from Yeshiva College Bondi and two from Yeshivah Melbourne (RCIRCSA, 2017f).

Both inquiries engaged with the Jewish community through a limited prism of institutions or community sectors. The BI lacked an explicit engagement with Jewry and, hence, their findings contained no recommendations particular to the community. The RCIRCSA addressed matters pertaining to ICSA, cognisant of Jewish leadership, culture and systemic issues, and thus yielded

attendant recommendations (RCIRCSA, 2017g). These, however, were largely developed in the context of, and consequentially predominantly relevant to, the ultra-Orthodox sector (RCIRCSA, 2017c), who form only some 6% of the Jewish population of Australia (Staetsky, 2022).

Key terms

To examine what the BI and the RCIRCSA tell us about the strengths and limitations of Australian Jewish leadership responses to ICSA, data have been examined against recognised concepts in the fields of leadership and governance. Limitations exist, in that definitions of neither leadership nor governance can be sourced within the glossaries of either of the inquiries.

Leadership

Northouse (2018) provided an interpretation of leadership as a power relationship in which the leader inspires, influences or guides followers to promote movement or change. Addressing the culture of Judaism, Friedman et al. (2016) highlighted values implying compassion for the needy and communal concern for justice, which align with the ethical and servant leadership models (Ben-Hur & Jonson, 2012). Kalshoven et al. (2011) addressed how these models operate with a focus on morality, justice and caring values, aiming for the advantage of followers and society, and to ensure that the least privileged people will benefit (Ben-Hur & Jonson, 2012). Person-oriented in nature, servant leadership is distinctive in serving individuals, as opposed to organisations (Greenleaf, 2002; Spears, 2010).

More specific to communal organisations, such as peak bodies, and many welfare and non-for-profit organisations, Israel et al. (2018) characterised communal leadership as emerging through a plurality of individuals acting with common concerns, rather than a power elite. Central to this are the ideas of involvement of local people in decision making, transparency and accountability. Further, communal leadership promotes a shared commitment to wellbeing in a locality and encourages the community to take responsibility to improve community wellbeing (Brookes, 2010).

Community peak bodies

Peak bodies (or roof bodies) in Australia act as representative organisations, incorporating membership of additional organisations with a shared purpose or allied interests (Quixley, 2006). Jewish peak bodies include diverse Jewish communal affiliate or member organisations within a state, such as schools, sporting clubs, synagogues and welfare and further groups.

Australian Jewish community peak body leaders include members of Jewish community peak body Boards or committees, and individuals in lead operational roles, such as chief executive directors.

Table 2 outlines the major Australian Jewish peak bodies and their constituencies who participated in the BI and/or the RCIRCSA.

Table 2. Major Australian Jewish peak bodies and characteristics
After ECAJ (2024), JCCV (2023a, 2023b) and NSW JBD (2024).

Name	Characteristics	Affiliate no. and types	Exclusion type
Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ)	National representative body of the Australian Jewish community	CONSTITUENTS: State peak bodies (7) AFFILIATES: Major national Jewish organisations (9)	
Jewish Community Council of Victoria (JCCV)	State representative body of the Victorian Jewish organisations	TOTAL: approx. 55 communal (e.g. schools, sports clubs and cultural, religious and welfare groups)	Ultra-Orthodox, Chabad entities
New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies (NSW JBD)	State representative body of the New South Wales Jewish organisations	TOTAL: approx. 55 communal (e.g. schools, sports clubs and cultural, religious and welfare groups)	Ultra-Orthodox, Chabad entities

Governance

The RCIRCSA referred to governance encompassing '… systems, structures, and policies that control the way an institution operates, and the mechanism by which the institution, and its people can be held to account' (RCIRCSA, 2017h: p. 147). By extension, it is critical to any analysis of responses to ICSA. *Governance elements*, listed below, are well established within the literature.

Accountability

The governing body is liable for decisions and fulfilment of responsibilities. Leaders must be able to articulate a constituency, whether members or a wider community (Miller, 2002) (in this instance, both affiliate organisations and the wider Jewish community). They are legally required to act in the organisation's best interests, fulfilling the stated purposes on behalf of stakeholders and the organisation. Leaders must identify and report to constituencies to whom the organisation owes compliance. These stakeholders should, in some way, be able to hold leaders to account (Cornforth, 2001) and be provided with means to raise concerns (Holland, 2002; Pomeranz & Stedman, 2020).

Conflicts of interest

The governing body works to an established code to ensure duties to the organisation and members are prioritised above actual or potential personal interests, such as other financial, personal or organisational interests (Ryan, 2019).

Organisational culture

Leaders are responsible to establish, monitor and evaluate norms and values to directly impact decision making. This provides effective cultural stewardship and influences the overall ethics and culture of the organisation. Mechanisms should exist to ensure that values are clear and communicated to stakeholders (MacCormick, 2019; Ryan, 2019).

Compliance

Decisions are taken to meet legal and regulatory obligations and internal policies (Byrne, 2025).

Stakeholder (victim–survivors of ICSA in this instance) engagement

Stakeholders are people involved in an organisation, whether internal or external, such as staff, clients, donors or those on whom policy impacts. Leadership understands who their stakeholders are and ensures their interests are considered in decision making. Meaningful engagement exists, including a framework for protection of vulnerable people. A process for gathering and responding to complaints and feedback is provided (Ryan, 2019).

Theoretical lens – systems theory

Systems theory provides a framework 'that integrates the systems that impact on people's lives and focuses on the interactions among those systems, especially in social and cultural domains' (Connolly & Healy, 2017: p. 21). Societies are characterised by various diversities of class and culture; as such, one cannot assume that all agents have comparable interpretations or understandings, whether in definition or solutions of social problems (Schirmer & Michailakis, 2019). Thus, systems theory provides a language for interactions between people and their environments. Additionally, it assists in identification of risks and protective factors, a key leadership responsibility and, as noted by Connolly and Harms (2015), may provide understanding and show causation of these matters.

A number of core concepts of systemic theory, as outlined by Connolly and Harms (2015), address factors in people's systemic interaction with each other and their environments. These concepts, detailed below, are relevant to Australian Jewish closed communities reviewed by the RCIRCSA, such as the Haredi. While the remainder of the community would not be considered 'closed' in the typical sense, certain cultural habits, such as preference for communal education, welfare organisations and sports clubs, would reflect the practice of internal boundaries.

General system theory – core concepts

Open and closed systems

Closed systems are recognised as being isolated from their environment and may place their individuals or communities at greater situations of risk due to limited capacity to healthy adaptability.

Boundaries

Social systems maintain their own boundaries and rules, cognisant of the need for some interaction across a social system to access resources and development; the importance of input across boundaries is of considerable importance.

Entropy

Entropy indicates that closed systems inevitably run down, become disorganised and unable to transform information.

Steady state

This refers to the identity of a system remaining unchanged, commonly leading to stability, regardless of inputs and outputs. Related to the concept of maintenance of this status quo, it is acknowledged that a system may be oppressive and require challenge (Connolly & Harms, 2015).

Parkinson and Cashmore provided a series of references in their RCIRCSA report that detailed how 'closed systems (total institutions)' (Parkinson & Cashmore, 2017: p. 89) or communities may facilitate ICSA. Such closed systems, comparable with those within elements of the Jewish community, have likewise been detailed within the Catholic Church, where political and social systems function in a way to marginalise some voices, such as vulnerable survivors bringing allegations, and prioritise others (Death, 2015; Parkinson & Cashmore, 2017), such as the more powerful religious. Systems theory enables an exploration of ICSA by addressing leadership and governance practices and associated systemic practices and concerns that leave children at escalated risk of ICSA within the Jewish community of Australia.

Methods

Secondary data – sampling

Materials sourced for analysis as part of this review met the following criterion:

- Documentation forming inputs (e.g. submissions) or products (e.g. reports) of one of the BI or the RCIRCSA.

RCIRCSA materials were located within the RCIRCSA website. BI materials were located within the Parliament of the Government of Victoria domain. Additional documentation and reference materials considered relevant were cited directly from organisational sources. These included peak body constitutions, policy platforms and affiliate lists. Commentary, in consideration of the survivor experience or leadership capacity considered relevant to the Inquiries, was sourced in public media. All information utilised in the analysis was located in the public domain. This assisted research accessibility and addressed ethical issues in regard to confidentiality.

Analysis

To examine what the BI and the RCIRCSA tell us about the strengths and limitations of Australian Jewish leadership responses to ICSA, this review utilises a deductive, content analysis method. Secondary data have been examined against recognised concepts in the fields of leadership and governance (see Key terms).

These concepts formed a framework for the content analysis – acting as a blueprint to assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of Jewish leadership by their comprehension, presence or absence in relationship to manifestations of ICSA, as documented by the BI and the RCIRCSA. Several additional concepts are analysed, selected by key word or concept association as developed by the investigators. Terms utilised reference survivor support or the survivor experience within the Jewish community; for example, barriers to disclosure and additional concepts particular to Jewish cultural mores. This method of analysis enabled consideration of comprehension, communications and responses across a range of documentation relevant to the inquiries under review.

Rigour

Internal checking was utilised during this study to augment credibility and validity of research throughout. Author one conceptualised and determined initial materials for examination

from the Inquiries, and associated concept criteria requiring deeper investigation (see Secondary data). These were reviewed further by co-investigators, as were analysis and findings.

Ethics

Identifiability of data and information has been considered to minimise potential for harm or risk (NHMRC, 2018). All individuals referenced from the BI identified themselves by name. Acronyms or pseudonyms as identifiers, or survivor names, when utilised, are those allocated by the RCIRCSA. Other than Mr Manny Waks (self-identified), no known survivors are identifiable in this article.

Ethics approval

Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee (MUHREC Project I.D. 29342).

Results

Both the RCIRCSA and BI highlighted the critical role of leadership in maintaining an institutional culture to ensure child safety, with concerns treated seriously, acted upon and reporting of abuse neither obstructed nor prevented (FCDC, 2013a; RCIRCSA, 2017h). This would entail cognisance and acknowledgement by leadership of the degree of ICSA within the community, commitment to act and prioritisation of resources toward dealing with manifestations and outcomes of ICSA.

Leadership repudiation of ICSA within the Jewish community

The JCCV's first submission to the BI seemed to suggest minimal acknowledgement of ICSA, stating 'Child abuse has only recently emerged as endemic' (JCCV, 2012). Testifying, Mrs Bassat remarked that both in the submission and her own words, she felt that this implied the 'general' rather than the Jewish community, though she reflected that the Jewish community is '… a microcosm of the wider community' (FCDC, 2013b: p. 2). She did not believe CSA was 'endemic' in the Jewish community, and regarding JCCV affiliates, that she was 'not actually aware of any incidence of child abuse …' (FCDC, 2013b: p. 2). However, she acknowledged cases outside JCCV affiliates, presumably alluding to incidents such as the abuse of Manny Waks at Yeshivah Melbourne, which had received widespread publicity.

Despite the JCCV submission and testimony, only 4 months prior, Manny Waks had testified, '… the level of child sexual abuse within the Jewish community … may be described as being nothing short of endemic,' and that abuse was '… not restricted to a particular (e.g. ultra-Orthodox) segment of the Jewish community' (FCDC, 2012). The testimony of the JCCV President, following so shortly after that of survivor and community advocate Manny Waks, would suggest a disinclination on the part of leadership to treat publicly voiced concerns of those with lived experience of ICSA with credibility, and respond in a suitable manner, as would have been appropriate.

Manny Waks also addressed what he considered to be the deficient response of Jewish communal leadership, declaring that, in the 18 months since allegations had been in the community spotlight '… the ECAJ has done very little' (FCDC, 2012). He reflected critically on the ECAJ priorities, '… it is quite clear that they do not regard this as a pressing issue' (FCDC, 2012).

Within days of Manny Waks's testimony, the ECAJ provided a submission to the Betrayal Inquiry, parts of which vigorously opposed his remarks germane to the endemic nature of CSA in the community. They specified that until works of the courts and the RCIRCSA were undertaken '… there does not appear to be any basis for concluding that these problems are endemic throughout the Jewish community …' (Lamm & Wertheim, 2012). Aligned with the JCCV, their views appeared to convey minimal alarm. Perhaps even more remarkable, the suggestion that any consideration that ICSA may be an issue of considerable concern need not be the case – unless so declared by an official body. Notwithstanding, over a year earlier (June 2011), survivor AVB wrote to ECAJ President, Danny Lamm, regarding the Victoria Police investigation into CSA at Yeshivah College. AVB understood from Danny Lamm's response that he knew that CSA and non-reporting were far more widespread than the investigation being undertaken (RCIRCSA, 2015a). This testimony was particularly significant because it suggested the ECAJ was aware of cases of ICSA beyond Yeshivah. Even so, the ECAJ Annual Report referred to only one media statement, urging reporting to police and survivor support (RCIRCSA, 2015b). Other than that, the ECAJ seemed not to have undertaken any visible further activity to address ICSA in the 18 months between the initial correspondence with AVB and their own BI submission.

The testimony of JCCV leadership at the BI, along with limited ECAJ activity regarding ICSA or survivor support as outlined above, apparently indicate minimal acknowledgement of the emerging ICSA crisis, much less associated responsibility they may have felt to act. Indeed, the ECAJ BI submission, including their oppositional remarks to survivor Manny Waks, seemed to justify his own critical reflections upon leadership's lack of intent regarding the need to address ICSA in the community. Together, this highlights critical leadership absences to acknowledgement, act and prioritise resources in dealing with manifestations and outcomes of ICSA.

The apparent disbelief as to the extent of ICSA in the community voiced by secular leadership, was later echoed by religious leader Rabbi Moshe Gutnick, Senior *Dayan* (judge) of the Sydney Beth Din. At CS22, he recalled taking a call in 1987 from an unknown boy, complaining of being sexually abused at a Yeshiva Bondi camp, by Daniel Hayman, a volunteer at the Yeshiva Rabbinical College and the camp. The Rabbi contacted Yeshiva at the time but considered the call a prank. It was not until he was contacted in 2011 (by survivor AVB), who revealed it was he who had phoned about the abuse that Rabbi Gutnick came to realise 'that [Hayman] was indeed a perpetrator' (RCIRCSA, 2016a). He stated, 'I didn't hear, as a rabbi, of any case of actual child abuse until 2011. I thought it was not something that happened within our community' (RCIRCSA, 2017e). Despite these remarks, the RCIRCSA was notified of multiple cases of CSA against Hayman in the 1980s, having occurred at Yeshiva Bondi and within the community and reported at the time to various Rabbinic leaders (RCIRCSA, 2016a).

This episode, related by religious leadership, replicated outcomes among secular leadership, as seen at the BI. A disinclination existed to acknowledge ICSA within the community. Leadership failures to treat concerns or reports seriously and act appropriately in light of emerging episodes of ICSA, ultimately, were to leave additional children risk of abuse over an extended period.

Lack of familiarity with organisational purposes, powers and associated responsibilities

Peak body leadership holds authority and capacity to guide and influence the community through a relationship agreement with members. To fulfil their governance duties, leaders are required to have a comprehensive familiarity with organisational documents (Ryan, 2019). Constitutions contain organisational purposes, leadership responsibilities, powers, processes and membership obligations. Policies communicate internal values and behavioural expectations. Together, they empower and regulate leadership, articulating obligations that leadership should meet and under which they are contracted to provide. Failure to meet standards is in effect a breach of agreement between leadership and members, which may result in loss of public trust (Holland, 2002) and reduced influence, features that form the basis of leadership capacity (Tracy, 2023). Purposes within constitutions of both the JCCV and the NSW JBD address the welfare of Jews in their state (JCCV, 2019; NSW JBD, 2022). In the instance of the JCCV, a clause binds members to duly passed resolutions thus compelling affiliates to align with ratified policies or other endorsed actions, while suspension processes exist in both constitutions. NSW JBD Directors are further empowered to act as they see fit. Together, these clauses provide a potent capacity for leaders to compel their affiliates to certain actions or outcomes. Despite the Constitution of the ECAJ being without a number of these clauses, it includes within its Objects (Purposes) a clause to act '… as it considers necessary on behalf of Australian Jewry in matters that concern Australian Jewry …' (ECAJ, 2014), providing a 'top-down' influence on state affiliates.

Both inquiries heard leaders of Jewish peak bodies insist that they lacked compulsive powers, despite constitutional clauses listed above clearly suggesting otherwise. At the BI, JCCV President Nina Bassat testified, '… we have no compulsive powers …' (FCDC, 2013b). Similar remarks apropos incapacity to compel members were made, by JCCV President Jennifer Huppert, at CS53, advising the JCCV held authority to influence, but not bind affiliates (RCIRCSA, 2017e). Despite their initial submission to the BI further advising that the organisation '… is not in a position to formulate policy …' (JCCV, 2012) the JCCV had a Child protection policy itself, as early as 2010 (JCCV, 2022), 2 years prior to this submission date. By binding members to all resolutions (JCCV, 2019: p. 22, Clause 69) and (and policies), the JCCV clearly exemplified compulsive powers. Emeritus Professor Cass, Chair of the Social Justice Committee of the NSW JBD (RCIRCSA, 2017d), also remarked that the NSW JBD '… does not have the authority to make people follow policies and procedures' (RCIRCSA, 2017e).

Repeated denials by peak bodies regarding their compulsive powers, over many years, appear contentious. They suggest an accompanying failure of leadership familiarity with their constitutional powers, understanding of which would enable them to fulfil their purposes, a pivotal matter for leadership. Such familiarity would, in this instance, facilitate leadership to meet their purposes of community welfare, compelling their well-over 100 Jewish affiliate organisations across Australia to embed child safety standards, improve CSA policies and survivor support practices. This apparent, longstanding lack of familiarity or comprehension of powers on the part of all peak bodies, has long gone entirely unremarked. Appropriate knowledge would enable consequent proactivity across the community, improving outcomes for both children at risk and ICSA survivors.

Accountability at Yeshivah Melbourne

As late as CS22, Yeshivah Melbourne's structure was such that no opportunity for community membership existed within the Yeshivah Melbourne overarching legal entities. Individuals had no ability to elect community leaders or hold them to account for complaints or concerns. By CS53, the governance structure was reformed (RCIRCSA, 2017e) and the community were able to achieve membership and participate in elections, thus providing a forum for leadership accountability. While there was some communal concern as to the structure of the new entities; the facilitation of membership and forms of accountability were a major transformation within this community (Levi, 2016). Notwithstanding any faults that may have been inherent in the new arrangements, systemic changes were to serve the community at large.

Mismanagement of conflicts of interests impeding response to incidents of ICSA

RCIRCSA reports are rife with reference to the dangers to good governance caused by conflicts of interest across a range of not for profits and communal organisations. As previously noted, the ultra-Orthodox, are a commonly insular Jewish group, and as with other closed, religious communities (RCIRCSA, 2017c), conflicts of interests were seen to occur within Yeshivah Melbourne. Reviews detailed an absence of leadership of Yeshivah Melbourne to '… deal transparently with, perceived or actual familial and personal conflicts of interest' (RCIRCSA, 2016a). Religious leaders showed poor understanding or disregard for such conflicts. Responding to allegations, where relationships to alleged perpetrators existed, leaders failed to prioritise or protect victims, or make reports to police (RCIRCSA, 2017c), potentially being perceived as prioritising institutional or familial loyalties. Incidents occurred in both Yeshivah Melbourne and Yeshiva Bondi (RCIRCSA, 2016a, 2017c).

AVB gave evidence of family bonds leading to conflicts of interest and misuse of authority, within the Yeshivah Melbourne community, involving Chabad Rabbi, Meir Shlomo Kluwgant, also a Victoria Police chaplain (RCIRCSA, 2016a). Victoria Police had requested student contacts from Yeshivah, to be contacted regarding ICSA investigations. Aware of many who had not received the police communications, AVB sent an email to his own contacts, urging them to assist the police. Shortly after, speaking with AVB, Rabbi Kluwgant referred to being a police chaplain involved for some months and told AVB he should not have sent his email (RCIRCSA, 2015a). AVB responded, stating that by mentioning his involvement in the investigation and status as a police chaplain, AVB felt he was claiming the authority of Victoria Police, rather than of a Rabbi or communal leader. Also, he wrote, the Rabbi was not objective due to his relationships. Financial and familial conflicts existed as the Rabbi, and several of his family members were employees of the Yeshivah Centre, and trustees of the Yeshivah entities (RCIRCSA, 2015a). Victoria Police submissions declared Rabbi Kluwgant had no contact with Victoria Police, regarding investigations into CSA within the Melbourne Jewish community.

At Yeshiva Bondi, where Rabbinic student AVL allegedly sexually abused a student at a Jewish youth camp in July 2002, further organisational deficits to conflicts of interest were noted. AVL was a member of the wider family of Rabbi P Feldman (Head Rabbi of Chabad-Lubavitch, NSW) and his son, Rabbi Y Feldman, (Director of Yeshiva Centre) (RCIRCSA, 2016a). The day following receipt of the allegation, AVL met with both Rabbis; familial conflicts were thus added to response concerns. Neither Rabbi took notes. Rabbi Y Feldman then met alone with AVL, at which time AVL admitted he had lain with and massaged a child. Both Rabbis suspected that AVL intended to leave Australia, (which he did), yet neither communicated with police. Rabbi P Feldman testified that he believed he had no duty to report the possible departure. Rabbi Y Feldman stated that at the time, he was unaware whether AVL's actions constituted a crime, what had to be reported to police or mandatory reporting provisions (introduced in NSW in 1988) (RCIRCSA, 2015c).

The RCIRCSA recommended detailed policy relating to management of conflicts of interest, covering all individuals with a role in response to complaints of child sexual abuse (RCIRCSA, 2017i). These cases clarify the importance of leadership being trained in relevant concepts and nuances and applying codes with integrity both within the boardroom and across the community they serve.

Prioritisation of institutional reputations above protection of children and survivor support

Culturally, Jewry is loath to exposing its flaws. In 2008, JCCV President, Anton Block, stated, 'There is not enough openness in dealing with sexual abuse because of the fear of fostering anti-Semitism' (RCIRCSA, 2015a: p. C6201). Apropos ICSA, measures were taken to avoid public scandal or conceal information that would tarnish the image of institutions, personnel or communal standing. To this end, when allegations were received at Yeshivah, on numerous occasions perpetrators were quietly moved to avoid prosecution, resulting in ongoing access to children (Smith & Freyd, 2014; RCIRCSA, 2017c). Victim narratives consistently alluded to prioritisation of institution and community, above victim care. ICSA survivor AVA remarked, '… the first thought of the leaders … was to protect Yeshivah and its reputation, not me or the other children' (RCIRCSA, 2015d).

As detailed in the cases of AVL and Daniel Hayman, (who was ultimately charged in 2013 relating to child sexual assaults against underage boys from Yeshiva Bondi) (Baker & McKenzie, 2013), both highlighted deficits in organisational culture. These included inadequate or absent child protection policies, lack of compliance, including mandatory reporting practices, poor leadership education and processes (RCIRCSA, 2016a). These systemic breaches suggested reputational prioritisation of institutions and alleged perpetrators. This enabled the latter to leave the jurisdiction even when such actions were anticipated; ultimately with ongoing access to children, placing them at further risk.

Policy and process deficits regarding ICSA incident complaints and procedures

Both inquiries focused on common deficits identified across numerous institutions whose policy and process deficits, akin to Yeshivah Melbourne and Yeshiva Bondi, placed children at heightened risk of ICSA. These included: absent or inadequate child protection policies, lack of compliance; lack of education about CSA; ineffective reporting mechanisms; allowing known offenders to have ongoing access to children; failing to prioritise children's welfare; patriarchal structures and the limited role of women in leadership (RCIRCSA, 2016a, 2017c, 2017i).

Institutional policies and processes were noted as problematic at both inquiries. The BI was informed that Victorian Jewish schools advised the JCCV that child safeguarding policies existed. In fact, the peak body neither monitored nor audited the policies of these institutions and knew little about synagogues or the Jewish sports clubs (FCDC, 2013b). While they had, since 2013 conducted a series of workshops as part of a child protection program, as had the NSW JBD, since 2015 (Block, 2017), reviews of their own education programs and forums also did not occur, though it was conceded that this was needed.

In CS22, Yeshivah College Melbourne was reported as without adequate policies and practices for responding to CSA complaints between 1984 and 2007 (RCIRCSA, 2016a). By CS53, Yeshivah Melbourne had undertaken a re-structure and developed new policies, Nevertheless, victims criticised the appointment of Rabbi Chaim Tzvi Groner, a former trustee, to all the newly created boards of the Yeshivah Melbourne Centre (RCIRCSA, 2016b). Policies may have changed, they claimed, but not the culture (Levi, 2017). Representing Yeshiva Bondi, Rabbi P. Feldman doubted formal policies for recording complaints existed at Yeshiva Gedola when allegations were received regarding child sex abuser Daniel Hayman (1986–1987). Papers could not be supplied recording allegations, nor did the Sydney colleges have formal manuals or procedures for responding to CSA (RCIRCSA, 2017c).

Failure to acknowledge and support survivor communities: apologies and redress

As previously noted in international literature, the RCIRCSA identified Jewish law and cultural beliefs in leadership practices in ultra-Orthodox communities as contributing to barriers to disclosure and lack of support for survivors of ICSA. Manny Waks and AVB identified separate sermons given by Rabbi Telsner, Head Rabbi of the Melbourne Yeshivah Centre, as contributing to their shunning, and shunning of their families, or at least the condoning of such action. AVB and Manny Wak's father, Zephaniah, spoke of being denied religious honours, such as being called to the Torah in the synagogue. In an ultra-Orthodox community, refusal of religious honours was a rare and public expression of disapproval and could not have escaped attention (RCIRCSA, 2016a).

BI transcripts reflected minimal action from peak body leaders in provision of survivor support, much less affiliate guidance. The first Jewish CSA victim advocacy group in Australia, Tzedek, was established in December 2012 by Manny Waks (RCIRCSA, 2015d). Though JCCV CEO Mr Marlow had met with Manny Waks, and JCCV President Nina Bassat declared that ICSA survivors and their voices were of most concern, at the BI she stated that their input was as yet 'going to be important …' (FCDC, 2013a, 2013b). By CS53, however, JCCV President Jennifer Huppert testified that the JCCV was '… working with Tzedek to see if … as a roof body, [we] can offer to assist victims' (RCIRCSA, 2017e). These remarks by President Huppert provide one of the rare and important occasions to note the transition in attitude between JCCV

leadership toward the survivor advocacy organisation, in context of leadership engagement and support for survivors in the period of some 5 years, between the BI and CS53.

Australian Jewish peak body leadership, in testimony at CS53, expressed strong criticism of the practices of Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshivah Melbourne, including adverse views about various Jewish religious laws and customs which they generally do not remark upon. In tandem, nothing was stated, as to their own practices (RCIRCSA, 2017e). For example, the RCIRCSA reported the Yeshivah [Melbourne] Committee and senior Rabbis on multiple occasions forcefully criticised and failed to create an environment in support of survivors, noting an 'absence of supportive leadership for survivors of CSA and their families …' (RCIRCSA, 2016a: p. 52). However, no evidence was offered by leaders from state or national peak bodies to suggest they were markedly active in seeking to modify such behaviour. As noted, it had not been a practice of Yeshivah Melbourne to directly apologise to survivors, yet communal leadership did not appear to encourage the Yeshivah leaders to do so. Nor did they implement substantive actions of their own to support survivors. ECAJ President, Anton Block, testified at CS53, 2 years after the revelations of CS22, that a 'Night of Healing' was about to take place. However, it became clear that the event was arranged by Tzedek, and only 'supported' by the ECAJ (and others, including the Rabbinical Council of Victoria and JCCV) (RCIRCSA, 2017e), rather than initiated by any of these leadership groups.

Jewish peak body leadership were absent throughout CS22, with no representatives present to support the survivors. Australian political and community leaders attended the RCIRCSA Final Sitting; again, no Jewish leadership attended (RCIRCSA, 2017j). This was despite the passage of only 6 months, since ECAJ President Anton Block apologised to ICSA victims on behalf of Jewish leadership, acknowledging past failures (Pinskier, 2017). The presence of peak body leaders at only CS53, where they had been summoned as witnesses, but at no other RCIRCSA sessions, to acknowledge the import of the work being undertaken, recalls survivor words condemning a lack of prioritisation regarding the ICSA crisis and improved future outcomes. A key leadership aspect is to influence change and drive improvements, whether for affiliates or the wider community. By their absence, the potential for Jewish leadership to share a message with the community regarding the significance of best practice concerning child safety practices and standards, and survivor support, was missed (Pinskier, 2017).

The RCIRCSA found no evidence to suggest that leaders of Yeshivah Melbourne or Yeshiva Bondi provided direct, personal apologies to any survivors who did come forward, either for abuse suffered, or the manner in which complaints were handled (RCIRCSA, 2017c). It was not until August 2012 that Yeshivah Melbourne wrote to their community and apologised for 'historical wrongs that may have occurred'; terms so qualified that Manny Waks found it insulting (RCIRCSA, 2016a). However, Mrs Nechama Bendet, the former General Manager of Yeshivah Centre (RCIRCSA, 2015e), did make a personal apology to Manny Waks during a session break at CS22 (RCIRCSA, 2015f).

Neither Yeshiva Bondi nor Yeshivah Melbourne were found to have considered establishing a redress policy at CS22 (RCIRCSA, 2017c), though Rabbi P Feldman suggested victims could approach Yeshiva Bondi for apology or redress (RCIRCSA, 2015g). He advised CS53 that Yeshiva had not created a redress scheme, nor was one envisaged. He opined that Yeshiva bore no legal or financial liability for CSA prior to 2003 (RCIRCSA, 2017e), was without means to provide redress, and (anyway) had no victims (RCIRCSA, 2017c, 2017e). It was posited by a survivor that without a redress scheme, Yeshiva could not acknowledge past mistakes to CSA survivors that had occurred under their remit (Levi, 2017). In contrast, Yeshivah Melbourne formed a scheme in 2015. About ten victims came forward and were provided with redress. The scheme closed after 12 months, in the mistaken belief that this was a RCIRSA recommendation. Yeshivah agreed at CS53 to review this matter (RCIRCSA, 2017e). Rabbi Gutnick stipulated at CS53 that, 'Any time someone is harmed there must be redress and in Jewish law there's no statute of limitations for that redress' (RCIRCSA, 2017e). As the Head Judge of the Sydney Beth Din, and thus, reputationally the lead Rabbinic authority in Australia, these remarks were particularly significant, both in regard to Yeshiva Bondi's approach that no redress was necessary, and Yeshivah Melbourne's closure of their scheme, limiting offering of redress. It was concluded that at least till CS53, efforts to provide redress by either institution, remained limited (RCIRCSA, 2017c).

Disclosures and in-house responses

The RCIRCSA reported that contemporaneous disclosures or allegations made to both Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshivah Melbourne generally encountered disbelief, or disregard. Allegations were met with leadership assurances that action would be taken; mostly, this did not occur (RCIRCSA, 2017c). 'Adon' related events after reporting abuse by his teacher to his school, '… the abuser was removed from his former position … he reappeared a few weeks later in another position' (RCIRCSA, 2017k).

Some religious institutions received multiple complaints about the same individual, implying a pattern of inaction in responding to alleged perpetrators (Mathews, 2017). This was seen at Yeshivah Melbourne in the cases of child sex abusers David Cyprys and David Kramer. Despite multiple allegations being received, and over a prolonged period in the case of Cyprys, both individuals had ongoing access to children and were not reported to police. Yeshivah College assisted Kramer to leave Australia for Israel, with no reports of his departure being made. Yeshivah also paid for a ticket for Kramer to the United States, where he continued to teach, offend against children, and was eventually convicted of serious child sexual offences. Following imprisonment in the U.S., Kramer was charged by Victoria Police in 2011 and extradited to Australia (RCIRCSA, 2017c). Both Cyprys and Kramer were ultimately charged with CSA offences, sentenced and placed on the Sex Offenders Register with life-long reporting obligations (RCIRCSA, 2016a). Their cases highlight the reluctance of Jewish leadership to implement suitable disciplinary and reporting processes. Disclosure practices were noted to be deficient, if not absent, along with reputational prioritisation of both institution and perpetrator, above ongoing consideration for child safety.

The practice of 'in-house' management through assisting individuals to depart the jurisdiction following disclosures, was still seen as late as 2008, in one of the most insular Jewish community groups in Melbourne, in the much-publicised case of Malka Leifer; Principal of Adass Israel School (Donelly, 2016). Within hours of confronting Mrs Leifer with multiple allegations of inappropriate behaviours, members of the school Board assisted her to leave the country for Israel; no report was made to Victoria Police (Rush, 2015).

Analysis revealed a widespread practice among religious institutions to manage disclosures through in-house responses, which typically did not include reporting of allegations to the police (RCIRCSA, 2017c). Indeed, Rabbi Y Feldman, then President of the Rabbinical Council of NSW, argued that complaints should first be tested by a Rabbi and if it was believed the perpetrator would not reoffend, police need not be contacted. (Levi, 2011; RCIRCSA, 2011).

Jewish cultural mores

Patriarchy

Features of patriarchal cultures and organisations, place children at escalated risk, with patriarchal structures in religious institutions impacting adversely on quality of responses to ICSA, due to the limited role of women in decision-making and leadership (Kaufman & Erooga, 2016; RCIRCSA, 2017c). Exemplifying this, was the sole apology received by Manny Waks, (as previously noted) from the only woman in a leadership position at the Yeshivah Centre, Mrs Bendet. This patriarchy applies to ultra-Orthodox, Jewish communities - where only men may access the rabbinic role of spiritual leadership. Indeed, Mrs Bendet was the only woman among the 11 leaders who testified at CS22 (RCIRCSA, 2015e). This representation emphasised how as late as 2015, little had progressed in the nature of gender leadership at either of the institutions or communities reviewed. Conversely, women held the JCCV Presidential positions through the BI and RCIRCSA, and as such was not visibly impacted by the patriarchal history and nature of Jewish leadership culture.

Jewish religious strictures

Religious mores, upheld by leadership, acted as barriers to disclosure. The RCIRCSA specified a number of Jewish, religious concepts placing children at escalated risk for ICSA, serving as barriers to disclosure, or hindering survivor support:

Loshon Horah, prohibits critical speech about a fellow Jew or Jewish institution and was noted as undermining disclosures and effective responses to allegations. (RCIRCSA, 2016a). *Mesirah*, bans informing on a fellow Jew to non-rabbinic authorities. Ultra-Orthodox Jewish victims, who report (or are even suspected of reporting) to authorities such as the police, are often designated a *Moser* (informer), and consequently harassed and shunned within their communities (RCIRCSA, 2016a). Despite *Mesirah* having been censured, in regard to CSA, by Rabbinic and mainstream Australian Jewish leadership (RCIRCSA, 2017e; RCV, 2017), the RCIRCSA received many submissions from the ultra-Orthodox, having been labelled a *Moser*; shunned, ostracised, subject to harassment and withdrawal of religious privileges (RCIRCSA, 2015d, 2015h).

The *Beth Din* part of a requirement to settle disputes among Jews utilising Jewish law forms another challenging response to ICSA (RCIRCSA, 2016a). Rabbinic leaders often direct Haredi victims to the *Beth Din*, a form of 'in-house' response, which shields both institutions and communities from scrutiny or reputational damage (RCIRCSA, 2017c). Rabbi Moshe Gutnick of the Sydney Beth Din (RCIRCSA, 2017d) described a *Dayan*'s knowledge as applicable regarding, Jewish marriage, divorce, civil disputes and the like (RCIRCSA, 2017e). This lack of relevant education further informs the problem of the *Beth Din* involvement with ICSA, placing victims in an inappropriate justice forum.

Discussion

This study set out to review the findings of the BI and the RCIRCSA concerning Australian Jewish community leadership, and ask, what are the strengths and limitations of Jewish leadership responses to ICSA? As noted, both inquiries contained their investigations to limited sections of Australian Jewry. Neither produced detailed outcomes regarding ICSA across the larger mainstream Jewish community, nor comprehensively assessed the performance of state and national peak bodies, leaving related knowledge deficits concerning leadership and governance in the Jewish community regarding manifestations of ICSA. Findings support the works of Sawrikar and Katz (2017, 2018), and their conclusions regarding limitations on research into ICSA within religious and ethnic minority groups and comparable, additional barriers faced by victims to disclosure and reporting within Jewish communities.

RCIRCSA outputs and additional literature reveal that faith-based communities with like characteristics display similar outcomes in their leadership practices. As with ultra-Orthodox Jewry, communities with a strong patriarchal character, such as the Catholic church were also seen to display an absence of women in decision-making positions around CSA (Kaufman & Erooga, 2016). Both of these communities displayed strong institutional and communal reputational prioritisation, which acted as barriers to disclosure and survivor support (Mendes et al., 2019). Leadership choices to move alleged perpetrators between aligned organisations was another similarity of these institutional cultures, as were efforts made to dissuade victims from approaching police with complaints (Death, 2015; Smith & Freyd, 2014).

BI materials were of value primarily to record contemporary views, in contrast to evidence collected at the RCIRCSA. To this end, analysis validity was confirmed through exploration of comparative issues in sampled materials across both inquiries. For example, the BI heard that the JCCV had not engaged meaningfully with survivor group Tzedek (FCDC, 2013b); at CS53, the JCCV advised it was engaged with Tzedek to explore how the peak body might assist victims (RCIRCSA, 2017e). This supports the notion that the BI offered a sound counterpoint to analysis and commentary laid out in the RCIRCSA because it was able to indicate and signpost changes on focus and influence over time.

Leadership serves the community with clear expectations of function and guidance, operating ineffectually without acknowledgement and prioritisation of substantive matters. JCCV and ECAJ submissions and remarks at the BI indicated a lack of insight to the prevalence of ICSA and an associated failure to address the situation. This included a choice by the ECAJ to dispute the evidence of survivor Manny Waks. It also remained

unrecognised that policies of the JCCV affiliates required further oversight and review, as did the results of the JCCV's own programming (FCDC, 2013b). Poor commitment was displayed to survivor support, and there did not appear to be substantive actions taken to intervene to improve the practices of affiliates or influence the wider community.

For a number of Jewish peak bodies, whether by lack of comprehension or practice, there appeared to be a lack of facility with organisational powers. At the BI, the JCCV declared it was unable to compel member organisations, formulate policy or services; however, their constitution and policy platform all suggest these remarks are worth further deliberation. The JCCV has an extensive body of policies, including a Child Protection Policy. Curiously, or perhaps not, even this policy currently makes no compulsive demands upon members, and only 'CALLS UPON' anyone to report to authorities where concerns or suspicions about child safety exist (JCCV, 2022). In totality, these actions, or omissions, left children within the community at escalated risk of ICSA, and survivors lacking in support. At the BI, the JCCV noted the need for their own leadership to monitor communal organisation policies, yet no mention of such activity is found within its Child Protection Policy (JCCV, 2022). Nor has material identified to date suggested this has occurred. The RCIRCSA and IICSA issued extensive recommendations to the importance of child protection policies and procedures within institutions, including regular training for those in leadership positions (IICSA, 2022; RCIRCSA, 2017i).

In conclusion, a number of leadership behaviours across the inquiries may have left peak bodies in breach of core obligations, those being to fulfil the constitutional purposes of their organisations, in this instance, as addressed community welfare. Notably, and relevant to all the peak bodies reviewed, there were instances of refutation of survivor testimony, failures to acknowledge and prioritise action regarding ICSA and survivor support across the community and provide oversight of child safety policies of affiliate bodies. Further, in expectation of leadership positive guidance and influence, failure to attend, most particularly at CS22, and the Final Sitting of the RCIRCSA are particularly significant. There appears to have been minimal consequence for any of these matters. As these bodies were not reviewed by the RCIRCSA, there was no commentary produced specific to their leadership. Indeed, remarks that were made came only from the far less powerful voices of the public and survivors.

Jewish cultural mores and Halachic strictures reviewed by the inquiries, acting as barriers to disclosure, produced comparable conclusions to earlier literature. These included: avoidance of slander (Katzenstein & Aronson Fontes, 2017); prevention of reputational damage to the community (Blau, 2017); and communal ostracism following disclosure (Zalcberg, 2017). Mesirah, or any other practices to dissuade victims in religious communities from reporting to police, were vigorously opposed by all peak body leaders at CS53.

Limitations

- In analysing the strengths and limitations of the Australian Jewish leadership responses to ICSA, the BI primarily offered a baseline voice of Victorian Jewish state secular leadership against which to measure later opinions and activity.
- As noted previously, this review examined Jewish leadership responses at a specific point in time, rather than as an appraisal of their overall contributions to the issue of ICSA within the Jewish community. Further research would ideally interrogate the wider breadth of policy and practice statements on ICSA by a number of these Jewish leadership groups, such as ECAJ, JCCV, etc. (Mendes & Pinskier, 2021).

Knowledge translation and impact

The closed nature of the Haredi, with their highly insular lifestyle, as well as the general internal boundaries practised through the more mainstream branches of the community, identify elements of closed systems across the Australian Jewish community. Common to both groups, expressed in a different fashion and to different degrees, is a disinclination to put the reputation of the community at risk. These factors suggest that within the systemic foundations of these communities, elements exist that provide risk factors, as suggested by Connolly and Harms (2015) and highlighted within the results of this study.

Peak body leadership groups have a vital role in increasing awareness, education and child safety maintenance regarding ICSA, and advocating for survivor support across their communities. Many of these bodies are well positioned to assist their members to promote child-safe practices and become child-safe organisations.

Policy and practice implications

Organisational documentation provides various peak bodies powers to ensure their affiliates support purposes, which include attention to communal care and welfare. Powers would enable: maintenance of child safety standards and regulations; attention to recording, reporting and maintaining reports of allegations of ICSA received; and development, review and maintenance of internal best-practice child-safety policies and practices to encourage survivor support.

Analysis has clarified the importance of leadership visibility and the capacity it provides to influence the entire community, whether affiliates or otherwise, regarding commitment to important outcomes. This highlights the consequence that leadership must allocate to ICSA and survivor support across the community.

Familiarity with the recommendations, as outlined in Table 3 below, would be of benefit to a number of wider agencies working with children at risk of ICSA and survivors. They include:

- Jewish community agencies that support these groups;
- Additional faith/ethnic/community agencies that support these groups; and
- Commissioners for Children and Young People, to familiarise, address communities or further facilitate works within their remit.

Our findings, and those of earlier studies within and beyond Australia, suggest that Jewish communal leadership bodies would benefit from recommendations found within Table 3.

Table 3. Policy and practice recommendations

Governance practice, leadership and structures to ensure: • Establishment and education regarding familiarity and usage of codes (e.g. conflicts of interest) both inside and outside boardrooms; and • Feminist lens to inform gender inclusion in governance structures.
Ongoing community prioritisation of ICSA through promotion of: • Public awareness, institutional engagement, survivor advocacy and support; and • Ongoing research to contribute to risk mitigation, child safety and survivor support.
Mandate affiliates through policy and/or audits or other organisational powers to ensure: • Quality of ICSA policies, processes and practices.
Mandate affiliates through policy or other organisational powers to ensure: • Maintenance of records of ICSA incidents and complaints received; • Establishment and operation of registers to assist in the detection of individuals against whom allegations are received; • Prevention of potential perpetrators moving between institutions and jurisdictions; and • Register design and operation function in light of privacy and security considerations.
Ongoing education regarding ICSA and survivor support by scheduling: • Regular sessions on *Peak body board or committee* agendas; and • Communal forums providing education and awareness.
Inter-communal and/or faith engagement to: • Establish and maintain committees with like ethnic/faith/patriarchal groups (e.g. Catholic Church) to consult and share development of improved processes regarding ICSA, survivor support and redress.

References

Alfandari, R., Enosh, G., & Rechnitzer, H. (2021). To split or include? Child sexual abuse mandate reporting in the ultra-orthodox Jewish community in Israel. *Children and Youth Services Review, 120,* 105759. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105759

Baker, R., & McKenzie, N. (2013, 5 November). Daniel Hayman charged over child sex at Bondi's Jewish Yeshiva centre. *The Sydney Morning Herald.* https://www.smh.com.au/national/daniel-hayman-charged-over-child-sex-at-bondis-jewish-yeshiva-centre-20131105-2wyl6.html

Ben-Hur, S., & Jonson, K. (2012). Ethical leadership: Lessons from Moses. *Journal of Management Development, 31*(9), 962–973. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621711211259901

Blau, Y. (2017). Sexual abuse in the orthodox Jewish community: An analysis of the roots of the failure to effectively respond to the crisis. *Tradition, 50*(2), 50–59. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26879502

Block, A. (2017, 23 March). *Statement by ECAJ President Anton Block to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse – Case 53. Sydney 23 March 2017.* Sydney, Australia: Executive Council of Australian Jewry. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/IND.0729.001.0001.pdf

Brookes, S. (2010). Telling the story of place: The role of community leadership. In S. Brookes & K. Grint (Eds). *The new public leadership challenge.* (pp. 150–168). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230277953_10

Byrne, D. (2025). *What is compliance?* Dublin, Ireland: Corporate Governance Institute. https://www.thecorporategovernanceinstitute.com/insights/lexicon/what-is-compliance/?srsltid=AfmBOooAvFWfDI3PsWTz3INo7BNL6-VF90P6zOS_UINp-4VEYfnAVDsW

Connolly, M., & Harms, L. (2015). Systems theories. In *Social work: From theory to practice.* (pp. 60–84). Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316104644.006

Connolly, M., & Healy, K. (2017). Social work practice theories and frameworks. In M. Connolly, L. Harms & J. Maidment (Eds). *Social work, contexts and practice.* 4th edn. (pp. 19–33). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.

Cornforth, C. (2001). *Understanding the governance of non-profit organizations: Multiple perspectives and paradoxes.* 30th Annual ARNOVA Conference, 29 November–1 December 2001, Miami, FL, USA. https://oro.open.ac.uk/15392/1/ARNOVA_paper_2001.pdf

Death, J. (2015). Bad apples, bad barrel: Exploring institutional responses to child sexual abuse by Catholic clergy in Australia. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy, 4*(2), 94–110. https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.v4i2.229

Department of Health and Human Services. (2019). *Review of the Victorian Child Safe Standards.* Melbourne, Australia: Victorian Government. https://www.dffh.vic.gov.au/publications/review-victorian-child-safe-standards

Donelly, B. (2016, 22 April). Melbourne's most reclusive Jewish sect lets cameras in. *The Age*. https://www.theage.com.au/national/victoria/melbournes-most-reclusive-jewish-sect-lets-cameras-in-20160412-go42bu.html

Dratch, M. (2009). A community of co-enablers: Why are Jews ignoring traditional Jewish law by protecting the abuser. In A. Neustein (Ed). *Tempest in the temple: Jewish communities and child sex scandals*. (pp. 105–125). Waltham, MA, USA: Brandeis University Press.

Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ). (2014). *Constitution*. Sydney, Australia: Executive Council of Australian Jewry. https://www.ecaj.org.au/about/constitution

ECAJ. (2024). *About*. Sydney, Australia: Executive Council of Australian Jewry. https://www.ecaj.org.au/about

Family and Community Development Committee (FCDC). (2012). *Transcript – 10 December 2012 – Inquiry into the handling of child abuse by religious and other organisations*. https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/491544/globalassets/sections-shared/get-involved/historical-inquiries/betrayal-of-trust/hearings/manny__zephaniah_waks_10-dec-12.pdf

FCDC. (2013a). *Document Library – Family and Community Development Committee inquiry into the handling of child abuse by religious and other non-government organisations – Volumes 1 & 2*. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/document-library?type=66&keys=Family+And+Community+Development+Inquiry+into+the+Handling+of+Child+Abuse+by+

FCDC. (2013b). *Transcript – 22 April 2013 – Inquiry into the handling of child abuse by religious and other organisations*. https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/491544/globalassets/sections-shared/get-involved/historical-inquiries/betrayal-of-trust/hearings/jewish_community_council_of_victoria_22-april-13.pdf

Friedman, H., Warter, J., & Warter, L. (2016). What are the essential core values for individuals and organizations? Lessons from Judaism. *Journal of Applied Ethics and Biolaw, 1*(4), 49–69. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Iulian-Warter/publication/319331547_What_are_the_Essential_Core_Values_for_Individuals_and_Organizations_Lessons_from_Judaism/links/59a5795caca272cf43d9d7be/What-are-the-Essential-Core-Values-for-Individuals-and-Organizations-Lessons-from-Judaism.pdf

Graham, D., & Markus, A. (2018). *Gen17 Australian Jewish community survey: Preliminary findings*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Centre for Jewish Civilisation and JCA. https://www.monash.edu/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/1531791/gen17-initial-findings-report-online-version-final-22_3.pdf

Greenleaf, R. K. In 2002 (Ed). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. New York, USA: Paulist Press. https://www.urbanleaders.org/620Leadership/92Readings/articles/Greenleaf-Servant%20Leadership.pdf

Holland, J. (2002). Board accountability: Lessons from the field. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 112*(4), 409–428. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.12406

Hurcombe, R., Darling, A., Mooney, B., Ablett, G., Soares, C., King, S., & Brahler, V. 2020. *Truth Project thematic report: Child sexual abuse in the context of religious institutions*. London, UK: Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.iicsa.org.uk/document/truth-project-thematic-report-child-sexual-abuse-context-religious-institutions

Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA). (2020). *The National Archives – Public Hearing Transcript – 11 May 2020*. London, UK: Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/18751/view/public-hearing-transcript-11-may-2020.pdf

IICSA. (2022). *Child protection in religious organisations and settings investigation report. H.3: Recommendations*. https://www.iicsa.org.uk/reports-recommendations/publications/investigation/cp-religious-organisations-settings/part-h-conclusions-and-recommendations/h3-recommendations.html

Israel, G. D., Beaulieu, L. J., Luloff, A., & Swanson, L. E. (1990). Community leadership. In A. Luloff & L. E. Swanson (Eds). *American rural communities*. (pp. 181–202). London, UK: Routledge.

Jay, A., Evans, M., Frank, I., & Sharpling, D. (2021). *Child protection in religious organisations and settings. Investigation report*. London, UK: Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.iicsa.org.uk/reports-recommendations/publications/investigation/cp-religious-organisations-settings.html

Jewish Community Council of Victoria (JCCV). (2012). *Inquiry into the handling of child abuse by religious and other organisations. Jewish Community Council of Victoria Submission – 21 September 2012*. Melbourne, Australia: Jewish Community Council of Victoria. https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/491744/globalassets/sections-shared/get-involved/historical-inquiries/betrayal-of-trust/submissions/jewish-community-council-of-victoria.pdf

JCCV. (2019). *Constitution JCCV*. Melbourne, Australia: Jewish Community Council of Victoria. https://www.jccv.org.au/index-1.html [retrieved 12 October 2020]

JCCV. (2022). *JCCV today and Policy platform*. Melbourne, Australia: Jewish Community Council of Victoria. https://jccv.org.au/jccv-today

JCCV. (2023a). *JCCV affiliates*. Melbourne, Australia: Jewish Community Council of Victoria. https://jccv.org.au/jccv-affiliates

JCCV. (2023b). *Home*. Melbourne, Australia: Jewish Community Council of Victoria. https://jccv.org.au

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D., & De Hoogh, A. H. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *The Leadership*

Quarterly, 22(1), 51–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.12.007

Katzenstein, D., & Aronson Fontes, L. (2017). Twice silenced: The underreporting of child sexual abuse in Orthodox Jewish communities. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 26*(6), 752–767. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2017.1336505 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28715275

Kaufman, K., & Erooga, M. (2016). *Risk profiles for institutional child sexual abuse: A literature review.* Sydney, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/Research%20Report%20-%20Risk%20profiles%20for%20institutional%20child%20sexual%20abuse%20-%20Causes.pdf

Lamm, D., & Wertheim, P. (2012). *Submission to Victorian Government inquiry into handling of child abuse by religious and other non-government organisations.* Sydney, Australia: Executive Council of Australian Jewry. https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/491744/globalassets/sections-shared/get-involved/historical-inquiries/betrayal-of-trust/submissions/executive-council-of-australian-jewry.pdf

Levi, J. (2011, 28 July). Rabbi 'should step down'. *Australian Jewish News.* https://www.australianjewishnews.com/rabbi-should-step-down

Levi, J. (2016, 22 April). New Yeshivah structure revealed. *Australian Jewish News.* https://www.australianjewishnews.com/new-yeshivah-structure-revealed

Levi, J. (2017, 17 March). *Exhibits for Case Study 53/Australian Jewish News article, p 4.* Sydney, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/YSV.1002.001.0002.pdf

Lusky-Weisrose, E. (2021). "Maybe what happened is actually OK?" Child sexual abuse by authority figures in the ultra-orthodox community in Israel: Survivors' perceptions of their relationships with the perpetrator. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 122,* 105325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2021.105325 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34534847

Lusky-Weisrose, E., Fleishman, T., & Tener, D. (2021). Online disclosure of child sexual abuse by authority figures in the Ultraorthodox Jewish community in Israel. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37*(19–20), NP17758–NP17783. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211028370 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34184571

MacCormick, J. (2019). *Governing organisational culture.* Sydney, Australia: Australian Institute Company Directors. https://aicd.companydirectors.com.au/resources/director-tools/practical-tools-for-directors/governing-organisational-culture

Markus, A. (2011). *Jewish continuity: Overview.* Melbourne, Australia: Australian Centre for Jewish Civilisation, Monash University. https://www.monash.edu/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/1678416/gen08-report2-jewish-continuity-overview.pdf

Mathews, B. (2017). Optimising implementation of reforms to better prevent and respond to child sexual abuse in institutions: Insights from public health, regulatory theory, and Australia's Royal Commission. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 74,* 86–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.07.007 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28789816

Mathews, B. (2019). *New international frontiers in child sexual abuse: Theory, problems and progress.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99043-9

Mendes, P., & Pinskier, M. (2021). How do Jewish community leadership bodies respond to manifestations of institutional child sexual abuse? A case study of Malka Leifer. *International Journal on Child Maltreatment, 4,* 115–133. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42448-021-00071-z

Mendes, P., Pinskier, M., & Baidawi, S. (2024). How does the media represent institutional child sexual abuse within Jewish communities? A case study of the Malka Leifer court case. *Australian Journal of Social Issues, 59*(3), 783–803. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajs4.317

Mendes, P., Pinskier, M., McCurdy, S., & Averbukh, R. (2019). Ultra-Orthodox Jewish communities and child sexual abuse: A case study of the Australian Royal Commission and its implications for faith-based communities. *Children Australia, 45*(1), 14–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/cha.2019.44

Miller, J. L. (2002). The board as a monitor of organizational activity: The applicability of agency theory to nonprofit boards. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 12*(4), 429–450. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.12407

National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC). (2018). *National statement on ethical conduct in human research (2007) – Updated 2018.* Canberra, Australia: National Health and Medical Research Council. https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/about-us/publications/national-statement-ethical-conduct-human-research-2007-updated-2018

Neustein, A., & Lesher, M. (2008). A single-case study of rabbinic sexual abuse in the Orthodox Jewish community. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 17*(3–4), 270–289. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538710802329783 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19042602

Neustein, A., & Lesher, M. (2009). How Rabbis can interfere with the prosecution of sex offenders – And strategies for how to stop them. In A. Neustein (Ed). *Tempest in the temple.* (pp. 197–230). Waltham, MA, USA: Brandeis University Press.

New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies (NSW JBD). (2022). *Governance/ Governing documents.* Sydney, Australia: New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies. https://nswjbd.org.au/about-us/governance

NSW JBD. (2024). *About us.* Sydney, Australia: New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies. https://nswjbd.org.au/about-us

Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* (8th edn.). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publishing.

Parkinson, P., & Cashmore, J. (2017). *Assessing the different dimensions and degrees of risk of child sexual abuse in institutions.* Sydney, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses into Child Sexual Abuse. https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:731375

Pinskier, M. (2018, 3 January). *Where was Jewish leadership?* reprinted from *Australian Jewish News*. https://www.mpinskier.com/post/where-was-jewish-leadership

Pinskier, M., Mendes, P., & McCurdy, S. (2021). How do ultra-Orthodox Jewish leadership bodies respond to manifestations of Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (ICSA)? A critical reflection on the findings of two public inquiries in Australia and England. *Australian Journal of Jewish Studies, XXXIV,* 122–156. http://www.aajs.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Pinsker_et_al_AJJS_XXXIV_2021_122-156_Final.pdf

Pomeranz, E., & Stedman, R. (2020). Measuring good governance: Piloting an instrument for evaluating good governance principles. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning, 22*(3), 428–440. https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2020.1753181

Quixley, S. (2006). *What is a "peak body"?* Brisbane, Australia: Youth Affairs Network of Queensland. https://www.yanq.org.au/uploads/1/4/1/7/14174316/abridged_role_of_peaks.pdf

Rabbinical Council of Victoria (RCV). (2017). *Document Library/Rabbinical Council of Victoria – RCV resolution condemning and combating child abuse.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/YSV.0002.001.0008.pdf

Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (RCIRCSA). (2011). *Exhibits for Case Study 22/ 22-0023/Day 63/5 Feb 2015/The Australian Jewish News Article "Rabbi 'should step down'".* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/YSV.0009.001.0003.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2014). *Interim Report: Volume 1.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/interim_report_volume-1.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2015a). *Case Study 22: Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshivah Melbourne/Transcript/4 Feb 15/Day 3/C062.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/Case%20Study%2022%20-%20Transcript%20-%20Yeshiva%20Bondi%20and%20Yeshivah%20Melbourne%20-%20Day%20C062%20-%2004022015.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2015b). *Exhibits for Case Study 22/Extracts from Danny Lamm, President, Executive Council of Australian Jewry, Annual Reports/ID: YSV.0004.001.0039.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses into Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/YSV.0004.001.0039.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2015c). *Case Study 22: Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshiva Melbourne/Transcript/9 Feb/Day 6.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/Case%20Study%2022%20-%20Transcript%20-%20Yeshiva%20Bondi%20and%20Yeshivah%20Melbourne%20-%20Day%20C065%20-%2009022015.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2015d). *Case Study 22: Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshivah Melbourne/Transcript/2 Feb 15/Day1/C060/mw_ava.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/document-library?type=48&keys=2+february+2015

RCIRCSA. (2015e). *Case Study 22: Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshivah Melbourne/Witness list.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/Case%20Study%2022%20-%20Witness%20list%20-%20Yeshiva%20Bondi%20and%20Yeshivah%20Melbourne%20-%20Melbourne.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2015f). *Case Study 22: Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshivah Melbourne/Transcript/11 Feb 2015/Day 8/C0067.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/Case%20Study%2022%20-%20Transcript%20-%20Yeshiva%20Bondi%20and%20Yeshivah%20Melbourne%20-%20Day%20C067%20-%2011022015.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2015g). *Case Study 22: Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshivah Melbourne/Transcript/5 Feb 15/Day 4/C063.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/Case%20Study%2022%20-%20Transcript%20-%20Yeshiva%20Bondi%20and%20Yeshivah%20Melbourne%20-%20Day%20C063%20-%2005022015.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2015h). *Case Study 22: Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshivah Melbourne/Transcript/3 Feb 15/Day 2/C061/ZW_AVC_ZW.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/Case%20Study%2022%20-%20Transcript%20-%20Yeshiva%20Bondi%20and%20Yeshivah%20Melbourne%20-%20Day%20C061%20-%2003022015.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2016a). *Report of Case Study No.22: The response of Yeshiva Bondi and Yeshivah Melbourne to allegations of child sexual abuse made against people associated with those institutions.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into

Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/Case%20Study%2022%20-%20Findings%20Report%20-%20Yeshiva%20Bondi%20and%20Yeshivah%20Melbourne.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2016b). *Exhibits for Case Study 53/Constitution YBR ID: YSV.3001.001.0025_R/Chabad Institutions ID: YSV.3001.001.0081_R/Yeshivah Centre ID: YSV.3001.001.0123_R*. Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/exhibits-case-study-53

RCIRCSA. (2017a). *Document Library/Final Report Volume 1, Our inquiry.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/document-library?type=11&keys=final+report+Volume+1,+Our+inquiry

RCIRCSA. (2017b). *Document Library / Recommendations.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/final_report_-_recommendations.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2017c). *Document Library/ Final Report Volume 16, Religious Institutions Book 3*. Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/final_report_-_volume_16_religious_institutions_book_3_0.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2017d). *Case Study 53: Institutional review of Yeshiva/h*. Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/case-studies/case-study-53-institutional-review-yeshivah

RCIRCSA. (2017e). *Case Study 53: Institutional review of Yeshiva/h/Transcript/23 Mar 17*. Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/case_study_53_-_transcript_-_institutional_review_of_yeshivah_melbourne_and_yeshiva_bondi_-_day_264_-_23032017_v2.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2017f). *Case Study 53: Institutional review of Yeshiva/h/Witness List*. Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/Case%20Study%2053%20-%20Witness%20list%20-%20Institutional%20review%20of%20Yeshivah%20Melbourne%20and%20Yeshiva%20Bondi%20-%20Sydney.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2017g). *Preface and Executive Summary.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/preface-and-executive-summary

RCIRCSA. (2017h). *Document Library / Final Report Volume 6, Making institutions child safe.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/document-library?type=11&keys=Final+Report+Making+Institutions+Child+Safe+Volume+6

RCIRCSA. (2017i). *Final Report, Volume 16, Religious Institutions, Book 1*. Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/file-list/unredacted-volume-16-religious-institutions-book-1.pdf

RCIRCSA. (2017j). *Final Sitting: December 2017, Sydney.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/case-studies/final-sitting-december-2017-sydney

RCIRCSA. (2017k). *Yeshiva/h survivors' story.* Canberra, Australia: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/narrative/yeshivah-survivors-story

Rush, J. (2015). *Erlich v Leifer & Anor [2015] VSC 499 (16 September 2015).* Melbourne, Australia: Supreme Court of Victoria. http://www6.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/viewdoc/au/cases/vic/VSC/2015/499.html

Ryan, L. (2019). *Not-for-profit governance principles.* Melbourne, Australia: Australian Institute of Company Directors. https://www.aicd.com.au/tools-and-resources/not-for-profit-governance-principles.html

Sawrikar, P., & Katz, I. (2017). Barriers to disclosing child sexual abuse (CSA) in ethnic minority communities: A review of the literature and implications for practice in Australia. *Children and Youth Services Review, 83,* 302–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.11.011

Sawrikar, P., & Katz, I. (2018). Preventing child sexual abuse (CSA) in ethnic minority communities: A literature review and suggestions for practice in Australia. *Children and Youth Services Review, 85,* 174–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.12.028

Schirmer, W., & Michailakis, D. (2019). *Systems Theory for social work and the helping professions.* London, UK: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429022104

Smith, C., & Freyd, J. (2014). Institutional betrayal. *American Psychologist, 69*(6), 575–587. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037564 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25197837

Spears, L. C. (2010). Servant leadership and Robert K. Greenleaf's legacy. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds). *Servant Leadership: Developments in theory and research.* (pp. 11–24). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230299184

Staetsky, D. (2022). *Haredi Jews around the world: Population trends and estimates.* London, UK: Institute for Jewish Policy Research. https://www.jpr.org.uk/reports/haredi-jews-around-world-population-trends-and-estimates

Sztokman, E. (2022). *When Rabbis abuse: Power, gender, and status in the dynamics of sexual abuse in Jewish culture.* London, UK: Lioness Publishing.

Tishelman, A. C., & Fontes, L. A. (2016). Religion in child sexual abuse forensic interviews. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 63,* 120–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2016.11.025 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27914237

Topsfield, J. (2011, 8 July). Jewish community leader tells of sex abuse. *The Age*. https://www.theage.com.au/national/victoria/jewish-community-leader-tells-of-sex-abuse-20110707-1h4t4.html

Tracy, K. (2023, 12 September). The leadership skill of influence. *Forbes.* https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbescoachescouncil/2023/09/12/the-leadership-skill-of-influence

Zalcberg, S. (2017). The place of culture and religion in patterns of disclosure and reporting sexual abuse of males: A case study of ultra Orthodox male victims. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 26*(5), 590–607. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2017.1316335 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28696908

Zuckerman, P. (2003). *Invitation to the sociology of religion.* London, UK: Routledge.