

(1) Your submission notes a convergence of radical Islamist and far-left Zionist movements. How should NSW counter this alliance without infringing on civil liberties?

Much of the evidence the Committee has considered, including the oral submissions made during the hearing on 19 May 2025 is demonstrative of the troubling and complex interplay between political interests of domestic actors, the 'red-green' alliance between the radical left anti-zionists and islamists, and foreign interference by nation states and international organisations and the way these render policy discussions and the formulation of appropriate interventions so difficult for policy makers.

ISGAP is committed to safeguarding democratic practice, values and principles, including the right to peaceful protest and dissent, and civil liberties in a Liberal democratic society.

Notwithstanding the diversity of any protest movement in democratic societies, a tactical alliance, and in some cases, ideological overlap, is emerging between radical Islamist movements, particularly those influenced by Salafi-jihadist thought, and elements of the far-left engaged in anti-Israel and antisemitic activism. Though differing in theology and political tradition, these groups increasingly share a worldview that interprets global events through a rigid binary of oppressor and oppressed, claims moral purity, and positions its adherents as the exclusive arbiters of truth. Core to these different ideological social movements are shared notions of genocidal antisemitism. In addition, central to this convergence is a rejection of the liberal-democratic global order, seen as illegitimate and imperialist.

This binary framework draws heavily on postcolonial and Marxist-derived narratives and manifests in both religious and secular revolutionary rhetoric. Islamist groups such as Hizb ut-Tahrir and far-left organisations like Socialist Alternative advocate for the wholesale dismantling of existing political systems, while often obfuscating or downplaying the role of violence in that process. Within this worldview, Israel, Zionism, and Jews more broadly are cast as colonizer oppressors while Palestinians, Muslims, and the Global South are framed as permanent victims.

The result is a narrative that erases nuance, demonises dissent, and legitimises resistance 'by any means necessary,' thereby blurring the line between political activism and ideological extremism.

This logic is not only rhetorical but ideologically generative. It constructs a closed moral universe in which violence is justified, antisemitism is reframed as anti-imperialism, and democratic pluralism is dismissed as compromise or betrayal. Absolutist thinking, rooted in notions of identity, purity, and grievance, enables radical

Islamists and far-left ideologues to align publicly despite otherwise deep differences. These narratives are amplified in academic institutions, online spaces, religious communities, activist networks and sadly, recently, through the Australian Greens, a political party that has historically demonstrated nuance and a commitment to dialogue.

ISGAP suggests that these observations are especially important to highlight for the Committee's consideration in light of both written and oral submissions made over the course of this inquiry by many organisations, especially of smaller and newer somewhat fringe progressive left wing anti-zionist organisations. On the one hand there is undoubtedly some legitimacy to the view that the views of these groups are often overlooked by peak representative bodies of the Jewish community, and that their perspectives have been marginalised, at times inappropriately.

At the same time many of the submissions operate, in one way or another, under the same logical frameworks we identify and criticise here. There has for instance been a remarkable and erroneous conflation between the unique experience of cultural and ethnic genocide that has occurred against Indigenous Australians and First Nations peoples, and the plight of Palestinians. Even if one were to agree with the idea that both peoples have been subject to significant human rights abuses and oppression, there is a glaring complication of the undeniable fact of Jewish indigeneity to the levant, well supported by extensive population level genetic analysis, archeological findings and anthropological studies. Furthermore, as the attacks of October 7th demonstrated, there is a commitment by Islamist organisations in the form of Hamas (the Palestinian Chapter of the Muslim Brotherhood backed by the Iranian Revolutionary Regime) and Palestinian Islamic Jihad to conduct religiously motivated ethnic cleansing in the region at any opportunity (noting that the religious motivation is a core component of these organisations motivations in distinction from the decolonisation perspective that many activists might otherwise cite in an attempt to draw an ill chosen analogy with the struggle for remedying historical injustice perpetrated against indigenous Australians) - a position that is hardly condemned by the majority of Palestinians in the region. In this regard much of the anti-zionist position and rhetoric in progressive circles, in trying to platform certain acceptable Jewish perspectives that better accord with the binary 'oppressor vs oppressed' world view in the name of portraying a more accurate and nuanced perspective, still falls short and renders proponents guilty of the intellectual crime of which they accuse their zionist interlocutors.

This tactic of discourse inversion, claiming that activists perspectives are being marginalised and denied and freedom of speech infringed upon while in the same breath causing the same harm to occur is well trodden in the international realm, and

is a calculated strategy by Islamist forces to subversively advance their cause by way of the cosmetic patina of a concern for human rights abuses. Various international organisations have placed unilateral focus on human rights abuses of anti-muslim brotherhood states in the Middle East such as the UAE and Saudi Arabia, while simultaneously deplatforming any concomitant focus placed on Islamist aligned entities own egregious actions such as those facilitated by Iran, Qatar, Oman, Turkey or the Algerian governments.

This further contributes to the isolation that Jews, especially those operating in progressive spaces such as tertiary institutions as students and teachers can feel from communities they might otherwise feel aligned with politically. It contributes to a toxic climate which tacitly, and sometimes overtly, condones escalatory acts of antisemitism (reflected in the well evidenced rise of antisemitic incidents).

It has implications for how the State of NSW may be best placed to formulate an appropriate response to the rise in antisemitism that is a necessary consequence of the adoption and support that is provided for an ideology fundamentally committed to the eradication of Jewish people on theological grounds.

First and foremost, there must be a mindful approach in both enforcement and education. NSW should prioritise the disruption of extremist narratives through civic education that promotes pluralism, nuanced consideration of facts and diverse perspectives, critical thinking, and historical literacy, particularly in environments where ideological rigidity takes hold. Law enforcement must continue to investigate and prosecute hate crimes, incitement, and extremist activity under the *Crimes Act 1900 (NSW)* and related laws. But education is equally vital. Israeli perspectives are highly under-represented in tertiary Middle Eastern studies curricula, which frequently reflect ideological bias and distortions of Zionism and Jewish history. This omission not only marginalises Jewish voices but also produces graduates whose understanding of the region is shaped by simplistic binaries.

Not only universities, but secondary and primary schools, too, require better tools to address antisemitism when it arises. This includes professional development for teachers, curriculum reform, and the delivery of student programs that build resilience to hate. There must also be significant monitoring of movements to politicise classrooms through a focus on activist approaches to teaching. Government support for community initiatives, particularly those fostering Jewish-Muslim dialogue and rejecting ideological absolutism, will be essential in reducing polarisation and reinforcing democratic cohesion.

These measures must be pursued with a firm commitment to protecting civil liberties, ensuring that the line between legitimate political expression and incitement to hatred remains clearly and consistently upheld.

(2) Should the NSW Government take a stronger stance on foreign influence, especially where it is linked to antisemitic rhetoric?

Any foreign organisations or entities which seek to exert their influence in New South Wales in a manner which undermines basic liberal democratic values and social cohesion should be subjected to the highest levels of scrutiny, and affiliate organisations that receive strategic guidance, logistical support, or resourcing in the form of personnel, funding or other should be appropriately restricted or banned.

There must be a concerted effort from policy makers across multiple levels of government and multiple departments to maintain an awareness of international organisations, non-state actors and nations which seek to undermine liberal democratic values, and see antisemitism as varyingly an ideological fundamental precept or at the very least a useful tool to sow chaos in our society. Maintaining dialogues with international organisations that monitor this, and building internal mechanisms including registers and identifying lists which highlight such features of organisations, even before they are subject to sanctions or highlighted as fully warranting proscription as terrorist entities or the like under existing security mechanisms would be a useful step in addressing interference before it takes hold at a deeper level.

While some decisions remain fully in the ambit of the Federal government and national security organisations, there are practical measures that could be implemented at a NSW government level which would go a significant way to protecting the community against pernicious international, anti-democratic, anti-liberal and antisemitic influences. Removing the platform prominent activists gain through their employment in government entities, or entities or individuals that receive the bulk of their funding from governmental sources (such as universities and schools, individual researchers or creatives) by requiring that staff or individuals refrain from membership of any radical organisations that promote hate speech and undermine social cohesion could be a meaningful step forward, even where such organisations are not yet formally proscribed by Federal government authorities, but perhaps identified via a less cumbersome mechanism discussed above. For instance if a teacher or professor was found to be a member of Hizb ut-Tahri, and/or actively promoting analogous views including advocacy for the creation of a Islamist Caliphate necessarily predicated on eliminating many of the vulnerable minorities including jews, in our community on religious grounds, then this would seem grounds for removing any support and terminating employment.

Excluding radical views from public institutions on the grounds that they are exclusionary and inciting hatred against vulnerable groups in our community is in no way inconsistent with preserving civil liberties, rather the opposite.