

INQUIRY INTO ANTISEMITISM IN NEW SOUTH WALES

Organisation: Coalition of Women for Justice and Peace

Date Received: 20 March 2025



Coalition of Women for Justice and Peace

Submission to the NSW Parliament Portfolio
Committee No. 5 – Justice and Communities
Inquiry into Antisemitism in New South Wales

20 March 2025

Contents

Submission Letter	1
Executive Summary	2
Part A: Response to the Terms of Reference	4
Introduction	4
1. Causes of Rising Antisemitic Incidents	4
2. Antisemitism in Educational Institutions	4
3. Threats to Social Cohesion	5
4. Enhancing Community Safety	6
5. Security of Synagogues.....	6
6. Protection Against ‘Doxing’	7
7. Privacy of Public Information	7
8. Role of the Sydney Jewish Museum.....	7
Conclusion and Recommendations	8
Part B: Research in Support of Submission.....	9
1. Causes of Rising Antisemitic Incidents	9
2. Antisemitism in Educational Institutions	9
3. Threats to Social Cohesion	11
4. Enhancing Community Safety (Policing and Civil Liberties).....	12
5. Security of Synagogues (Protecting Worship, Not Curbing Protest)	13
6. Protection Against "Doxing"	14
7. Privacy of Public Information (Land Titles, Electoral Roll).....	15
8. Role of the Sydney Jewish Museum (Holocaust and Human Rights Education).16	
End Notes	18

Submission Letter

Dear Committee Members

The Coalition of Women for Justice and Peace welcomes the opportunity to provide our submission to you in your inquiry on antisemitism.

The Coalition is made up of women from diverse backgrounds, including Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and secular perspectives, as well as a range of ethnic and cultural identities. This rich diversity strengthens our commitment to advocating for justice, human rights, and the dignity of all people.

We are available to present to the Committee if the Committee wishes to hear our group's perspective.

We look forward to seeing the work of the Committee.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Louisa Romanous and Associate Professor Hadia Haikal-Mukhtar OAM

Joint Convenors, Coalition of Women for Justice and Peace

Email:

Mob:

Executive Summary

The Coalition of Women for Justice and Peace, a diverse group of women from Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and secular backgrounds, presents this submission to the NSW Parliament Portfolio Committee No. 5 inquiry into antisemitism in New South Wales.

While we unequivocally condemn antisemitism in all its forms, we express deep concern that this inquiry's framing risks conflating legitimate political expression with hatred, thereby suppressing free speech and public discourse, particularly regarding Palestinian human rights.

Key Concerns and Recommendations

1. Definition and Data Collection

We urge careful examination of how antisemitic incidents are defined and recorded. Evidence suggests that legitimate political expression, such as pro-Palestinian advocacy, has been misclassified as antisemitism, skewing data and delegitimising peaceful protest. A clear distinction between antisemitism and criticism of Israeli state policies is essential.

2. Educational Institutions

Universities and schools must remain spaces for free intellectual inquiry. Recent adoption of expansive antisemitism definitions by universities risks suppressing legitimate political discourse and student activism. We caution against policies that disproportionately target Palestinian, Arab, Muslim, and Jewish students who support Palestinian rights.

3. Social Cohesion

True social cohesion requires addressing all forms of racism equally. A one-sided focus on antisemitism without acknowledging rising Islamophobia and anti-Palestinian sentiment risks deepening societal divisions rather than fostering unity. Recent revelations about fabricated incidents used to justify restrictive legislation raise serious concerns about the impact on civil liberties.

4. Community Safety and Civil Liberties

While every community deserves safety, security measures must not result in the suppression of another group's rights. We oppose mandatory sentencing laws that undermine judicial independence and disproportionately impact disadvantaged

groups. Community safety policies should protect all vulnerable communities, including advocates for Palestinian rights who have faced harassment and threats.

5. Religious Spaces and Protest

While places of worship must be protected from threats, security measures should not criminalise peaceful political protests nearby. The recent NSW Places of Worship law grants police overly broad powers that infringe on legitimate demonstration rights.

6. Privacy and Accountability

Protections against doxing and privacy measures are necessary but must be balanced with the public's right to information and accountability. These protections should not shield public figures or institutions from legitimate scrutiny regarding human rights issues.

7. Holocaust Education

Holocaust education, particularly through institutions like the Sydney Jewish Museum, offers profound lessons on dehumanisation and systemic discrimination. We encourage an approach that connects these lessons to other histories of oppression, reinforcing that "never again" applies universally to all persecuted groups.

Conclusion

We call on the Committee to lead with integrity, ensuring that genuine antisemitism is addressed without undermining the rights of individuals and communities to advocate for Palestinian justice and human rights. Justice must be universal, not selective, with equal protection for all communities against hatred and discrimination.

The Coalition stands ready to present our perspective to the Committee and contribute to a nuanced, balanced approach that upholds both the safety of Jewish communities and the fundamental rights to free expression and political advocacy.

Part A: Response to the Terms of Reference

Introduction

We submit this response on behalf of the Coalition of Women for Justice and Peace. Our coalition is committed to justice, equality, and human rights for all people.

We unequivocally condemn antisemitism, as we do all forms of racism and hate. However, we are deeply concerned that this inquiry's framing and terms of reference risk conflating legitimate political expression with hatred, thereby suppressing free speech and curtailing public discourse.

We respectfully urge the Committee to approach this inquiry with nuance and care, ensuring that genuine antisemitism is addressed without undermining the rights of individuals and communities to advocate for Palestinian justice and human rights.

1. Causes of Rising Antisemitic Incidents

The Committee should rigorously examine how antisemitic incidents are defined and recorded. There is credible evidence that actions such as distributing pro-Palestinian literature or chanting "Free Palestine" at rallies have been classified as antisemitic.

This not only skews the data but delegitimises legitimate expressions of solidarity with an oppressed people.

It is essential to distinguish between antisemitism and anti-Zionism. Criticism of the State of Israel or its policies — particularly regarding the occupation of Palestinian land and the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Gaza — is not antisemitic.

Mislabelling political criticism as hatred silences those advocating for human rights and perpetuates injustice. It is also inconsistent with adherence to international and humanitarian law, which requires action in relation to genocide.

The Committee should also consider the broader context in which people are protesting: the documented atrocities against Palestinians, the systematic blockade of Gaza, and the lack of meaningful international intervention. The Australian public's increased engagement on this issue reflects a growing global consciousness about human rights — not a surge in racial hatred.

2. Antisemitism in Educational Institutions

Universities and schools are spaces where students should be free to explore complex political issues without fear of reprisal.

Labelling student activism or academic inquiry into Israeli state practices as antisemitic chills free speech and undermines intellectual freedom.

Reports of rising antisemitism in educational institutions must be scrutinised carefully. Are these genuine acts of racial hatred, or are they instances of students expressing support for Palestinian liberation?

We express deep concern over the definition of antisemitism recently adopted by universities, as its vague and expansive wording risks suppressing legitimate political discourse.

While we unequivocally condemn antisemitism, the definition's inclusion of criticism of Israel as a potential indicator of hate speech blurs the line between racism and political advocacy.

This has already had a chilling effect on academic freedom and student activism, with Palestinian, Arab, Muslim, and Jewish students who support Palestinian rights facing disproportionate disciplinary measures.

Universities should be spaces for critical thought and robust debate, not institutions that police political perspectives under the guise of combatting hate speech.

It is critical that the Committee protects the right to peaceful protest and ensures that pro-Palestinian students are not unfairly vilified or punished for advocating justice.

3. Threats to Social Cohesion

True social cohesion can only be built on a foundation of equal justice. Addressing antisemitism is necessary, but it cannot come at the expense of ignoring other forms of racism, such as the rising Islamophobia and anti-Palestinian bigotry experienced across NSW.

If the goal is to promote harmony, then the Committee must take a holistic approach, advocating for the safety and dignity of all communities.

A one-sided focus on antisemitism, without acknowledging the vilification of Palestinian, Arab, and Muslim Australians, risks deepening division rather than fostering unity.

Recent revelations that elements of reported antisemitic incidents were fabricated or influenced by foreign actors raise profound concerns about the rushed passage of legislation that severely impacts civil liberties. We note that the NSW Law Reform Commission advised against implementation of the Hate Speech laws, expressing concern that terms like “hatred” are imprecise and subjective, with this ambiguity making them “an inappropriate standard for the criminal law”.

The use of manufactured incidents to justify laws criminalising public speech and granting police broad powers to curtail protest, without proper debate or public consultation, erodes trust in the democratic process and risks deepening societal divisions.

This breakdown in communication has already exacerbated Islamophobia and contributed to a climate of fear, disproportionately harming Muslim and Palestinian communities.

Laws designed in response to manipulated events undermine social cohesion and distract from genuine efforts to combat racism in all forms.

We urge the Committee to advise the NSW government to repeal or significantly amend these laws and to commit to an inquiry into the process by which they were passed, to restore public confidence and prevent such legislative overreach in the future.

4. Enhancing Community Safety

Every community deserves safety, but it is concerning if measures to protect one group result in the suppression of another.

Community safety policies should protect all vulnerable groups, including Palestinians and their supporters, who have faced harassment, job losses, and threats for their activism.

For example, Palestinian advocates have been subject to intense surveillance, and public protests have been policed with disproportionate force.

In relation to sentencing for criminal acts affecting community safety, the Australian Human Rights Commission has consistently opposed mandatory sentencing laws because they undermine judicial independence and the ability of courts to ensure that the punishment fits the crime, as well as having an unfair impact on disadvantaged groups. The Commission maintains that courts are best placed to weigh up all the relevant circumstances and impose an appropriate penalty for criminal offences.

Any recommendations from the Committee for enhanced community safety must balance the need for security with the preservation of civil liberties and the right to dissent.

5. Security of Synagogues

Places of worship should be safe havens, and any threats to Jewish synagogues must be condemned and prevented.

However, security measures must not create an atmosphere where political protests are treated as security threats.

It is crucial to protect religious spaces while ensuring that external calls for justice are not mischaracterised as incitement or violence.

Similarly, mosques, Palestinian community centres, and other religious and cultural spaces must receive equal attention if the goal is truly to protect all communities from hate.

6. Protection Against ‘Doxing’

Protection against ‘doxing’ must not be used to shield public figures or institutions from accountability.

For instance, exposing the names of politicians or public entities complicit in human rights abuses is a legitimate part of advocacy, not harassment.

The Committee should carefully craft recommendations that avoid creating blanket protections that stifle public accountability.

7. Privacy of Public Information

Safeguarding personal information is important, but this must not be used as a pretext to obstruct political activism or shield institutions from scrutiny.

Advocacy groups often use public records to trace corporate or political connections to human rights abuses.

Any privacy recommendations from the Committee should protect the public’s right to know.

8. Role of the Sydney Jewish Museum

If the goal is to cultivate compassion, critical thinking, and a commitment to human rights, educational programs should embrace a holistic approach that amplifies diverse voices and honours the struggles of all oppressed.

The history of Jewish persecution offers profound lessons on the dangers of dehumanisation and systemic discrimination. There is a prime opportunity now for the Sydney Jewish Museum to educate people on the impact of the holocaust on Jewish people and on humanity as a whole, and to provide a clear message that “never again” applies to all persecuted groups: there is no exceptionalism in persecution and suffering. Further, to truly foster empathy and a deeper commitment to justice,

education must also acknowledge other histories of oppression — including the dispossession and ongoing struggles of First Nations peoples in Australia.

Incorporating Indigenous histories alongside Holocaust education could provide students with a broader human rights framework, illustrating the global patterns of colonisation, racism, and resistance.

This would enrich Holocaust education, helping students draw connections between historical and contemporary struggles against injustice — whether in Europe, Palestine, or on Australian soil.

Conclusion and Recommendations

We urge the Committee to:

- Adopt a clear distinction between antisemitism and political criticism of the Israeli state.
- Ensure the accuracy of incident reporting to prevent the inflation of antisemitism statistics through the misclassification of legitimate advocacy.
- Protect free speech in public and educational spaces, ensuring that pro-Palestinian voices are not silenced or criminalised.
- Address all forms of racism and discrimination to promote genuine social cohesion.
- Balance security measures with civil liberties to avoid creating an atmosphere of repression.
- Encourage inclusive human rights education that acknowledges both historical and contemporary struggles for justice.

The Australian people — including Jewish, Palestinian, Arab, Indigenous and Muslim communities — deserve a society where all forms of racism are condemned, and where political dissent is protected. Justice cannot be selective. It must be universal.

We call on the Committee to lead with integrity, to challenge narratives that silence marginalised voices, and to ensure that this inquiry does not become a tool to suppress legitimate calls for Palestinian liberation.

Part B: Research in Support of Submission

1. Causes of Rising Antisemitic Incidents

Recent research and expert analyses show that rising antisemitism must be addressed with clear definitions that distinguish it from political speech about Israel. Studies document how conflating anti-Zionism (opposition to Israeli government policies or ideology) with antisemitism (hatred of Jews) is a distorted approach that has been used to stifle legitimate advocacy for Palestinian rights. Jaffee (2024) documents:¹

“In recent years, a distorted definition of antisemitism that conflates anti-Jewish prejudice with criticism of Israel has increasingly been adopted... The intended effect of such legislation is to silence activists, students, teachers, and workers who speak out against Israeli apartheid and for Palestinian freedom.”

Likewise, a joint NGO letter led by Human Rights Watch warns that the popular IHRA definition of antisemitism, if applied uncritically, has been problematic:²

“In practice, however, the IHRA definition has often been used to wrongly label criticism of Israel as antisemitic, and thus chill and sometimes suppress non-violent protest, activism and speech critical of Israel and/or Zionism.”

These sources support the concern that some reported antisemitic incidents may in fact be instances of political protest misclassified as hate speech. The evidence emphasises the need for precise definitions: anti-Jewish bigotry should be condemned, but legitimate critique of Israel or Zionism should not be automatically equated with antisemitism.³

This distinction is crucial to identifying the true causes of antisemitic incidents and avoiding the chilling of lawful political discourse.

2. Antisemitism in Educational Institutions

Evidence indicates that in universities and schools, expansive definitions of antisemitism and aggressive accusations can create a chilling effect on academic freedom and student activism. The Jewish Council of Australia reacted strongly to Australian universities' recent adoption of a politicised antisemitism definition, noting it threatens academic freedom and would label Palestinian advocacy as antisemitic, thereby stifling critical political debate on campus:⁴

“Australia's 39 universities endorsed a dangerous and politicised definition of antisemitism which threatens academic freedom, will have a chilling effect on legitimate criticism of Israel, and risks institutionalising anti-Palestinian racism... By categorising Palestinian political expression as inherently antisemitic, it will stifle critical political debate.”

The same statement further explains:

“The definition dangerously conflates Jewish identities with support for the state of Israel... It degrades the very real fight against antisemitism for it to be weaponised to silence legitimate criticism of the Israeli state and Palestinian political expressions.”

This shows how fear of being branded antisemitic can deter students and staff from speaking openly about Israel/Palestine. Human Rights Watch further documents that misuse of antisemitism definitions has had serious consequences:⁵

“Those who use the IHRA definition in this way tend to rely on a set of... examples... Seven of those examples refer to the state of Israel... in practice, these disclaimers have failed to prevent the politically motivated instrumentalization of the IHRA definition in efforts to muzzle legitimate speech and activism by critics of Israel's human rights record and advocates for Palestinian rights.”

The targets of these accusations have specifically included academic communities:

“The targets of accusations of antisemitism based on the IHRA definition have included university students and professors, grassroots organizers... who... criticize Israeli policies and speak in favor of Palestinian human rights.”

Together, these sources substantiate the concern that accusations of antisemitism are sometimes used to intimidate or censor voices in educational settings. They highlight a chilling effect: educators and students may self-censor or avoid discussions on Middle East politics for fear of reputational damage or disciplinary action.

The research underscores the importance of protecting academic freedom and ensuring that genuine antisemitism (such as Holocaust denial or anti-Jewish slurs) is addressed without undermining universities as spaces for open inquiry and political discourse.

3. Threats to Social Cohesion

Research supports the idea that focusing on one form of hate while ignoring others can undermine social cohesion. The Australian Human Rights Commission's president explicitly warned that tackling antisemitism in isolation from other forms of racism is counter-productive:⁶

“This inquiry... should be considered within a broader framework of measures designed to address antisemitism, and racism more broadly... Universities should implement effective and principled anti-racism strategies which acknowledge the interconnectedness of all forms of racism... It will be ineffective, and counter-productive for universities to try and address antisemitism in isolation from other forms of racism.”

He urged a holistic anti-racism framework that addresses antisemitism alongside Islamophobia, anti-Palestinian racism, and prejudice against other groups, reflecting the emphasis on the interconnectedness of all forms of racism. This intersectional approach is reinforced by examples of how antisemitism and Islamophobia can be politically weaponised against each other.

Recent empirical evidence strongly supports this interconnected approach. Between January 2023 and December 2024, Australia witnessed a significant rise in Islamophobic incidents, with 309 physical and 366 online incidents reported—marking more than a twofold increase compared to previous periods.⁷ Girls and women wearing Islamic headwear were predominantly targeted, facing physical abuse and verbal threats including rape threats. Nearly half of the in-person incidents occurred in New South Wales, with a substantial increase following Hamas's attacks on Israel in October 2023 and the subsequent war in Gaza. Victims experienced trauma, anxiety, and fear of public spaces, with some quitting jobs or avoiding leaving their homes altogether.

This data on Islamophobia, alongside rising antisemitic incidents, provides concrete evidence of how Middle Eastern conflicts can trigger interconnected forms of hatred domestically. These parallel trends underscore the necessity of addressing all forms of religious and racial prejudice simultaneously rather than in isolation.

Studies describe a phenomenon termed "Judeonationalism," whereby expressions of concern about antisemitism are sometimes used cynically to discredit Muslims or pro-Palestinian advocacy:⁸

“Accusations of antisemitism are an effective strategy to discredit Muslims and their views... This mirrors other forms of instrumentalisation of vulnerable

groups... Often when political leaders choose to speak out against antisemitism, a Muslim antagonist is just around the corner. This begs the question: are politicians' concerns about antisemitism genuine? Or are they exploiting antisemitism to discredit Muslims, and the causes Muslims are more likely to support?"

Such exploitation not only harms Muslim communities but also further divides the community, as noted by civil liberties groups.⁹

In sum, the evidence shows that social cohesion is best served by solidarity across communities: addressing antisemitism in tandem with combating Islamophobia and all racism. Policies that privilege one group's safety to the exclusion of others can breed resentment or be misused to justify bigotry. Therefore, an inclusive, all-of-community strategy is supported as the most effective way to "build bridges" and avoid one form of anti-racism inadvertently fuelling another form of hatred.

4. Enhancing Community Safety (Policing and Civil Liberties)

Research sources underline the delicate balance between enhancing security for the Jewish community and upholding civil liberties for all. Analysis cautions that a raft of new anti-hate measures, while well-intentioned, on closer inspection may undermine democratic freedoms:¹⁰

"A wave of new federal and state laws have recently been introduced under the guise of protecting against hate speech and vilification. While this may seem like a step in the right direction, on closer inspection, these laws are likely to have a chilling effect on our democracy while failing to stamp out hate speech and discrimination."

Measures like broadened police powers, heavier penalties, and protest restrictions, if overly broad, can suppress lawful dissent and silence people peacefully speaking out, rather than just the intended extremists:¹¹

"Expanding police powers and restricting protest will only create more division by silencing the voices of people peacefully speaking out. We cannot arrest our way to social cohesion."

This aligns with the warning that over-policing or draconian laws could harm community relations. Civil liberties advocates similarly argue that authorities in NSW weaponised fear of antisemitism to rush through repressive laws that criminalise legitimate speech and protest:¹² For example, in early 2025 the NSW government cited

isolated antisemitic incidents to justify sweeping new offenses and powers, some of which were later revealed to be based on a fabricated terror plot:¹³

“The Minns Labor Government... used [a fabricated plot] to drive a repressive and fear-based legislative agenda that has further divided the community... pushing through repressive laws that have eroded our democratic freedoms.”

Such responses risk eroding trust if communities feel security policies are being used to curtail basic rights. In summary, the research supports the need for a measured approach to community safety – one that certainly improves security (e.g., against genuine threats of antisemitic violence) but does not cast such a wide net that it stifles free expression, peaceful protest, or disproportionately targets other groups.

This balance between safety and civil liberty is crucial to maintain social cohesion and the confidence of all communities in law enforcement.

5. Security of Synagogues (Protecting Worship, Not Curbing Protest)

The research confirms that safeguarding places of worship like synagogues must be done in a way that doesn't unnecessarily infringe on the right to protest. Human rights advocates point out that peaceful protests at or near places of worship have no inherent link to hate crimes, and in fact serve legitimate purposes such as community accountability:¹⁴

“Let's be clear: there is no connection between peaceful protest and hate crimes. Peaceful assemblies outside places of worship are an important tool for communities to hold their institutions to account. There is no evidence that new police powers... would have prevented the recent spate of antisemitic incidents in NSW or the disturbing rise of neo-Nazi and far-right extremist activity.”

For instance, demonstrations could be aimed at a church's handling of abuse cases or a synagogue's stance on an issue, without posing any security threat. Broad bans on gatherings in the vicinity of religious sites risk sweeping up such lawful assemblies. NSW's new Places of Worship law is cited as an example of overreach: civil libertarians warn it gives police overly broad discretion to clear people from near any church, mosque, or synagogue, even if those people are members of the faith protesting their own organisation or others engaged in unrelated rallies nearby:¹⁵

‘The new law banning obstruction near religious sites “grants NSW police extraordinary powers to arrest and move on people in or near a place of worship for any reason” and “could be used to charge members of the faith protesting

their own organisation, sexual abuse survivors demanding justice, and any snap rally or assembly that happens within vicinity of a place of worship".

Such measures, critics note, could be used to charge peaceful protesters and are extraordinarily broad, especially in city centres where many public venues happen to be near a place of worship:¹⁶

"Because many public squares (e.g. Sydney Town Hall) are near a church, these laws are extraordinarily broad, potentially sweeping up protests unrelated to the synagogue or church."

These findings support the argument that while synagogues do face security risks (indeed, recent attacks on synagogues demonstrate the need for protection), solutions should focus on targeted security enhancements (e.g., guards, cameras, hardening of facilities) rather than blanket restrictions on public assembly.

Over-broad laws could inadvertently criminalise legitimate protests – undermining civil liberties without demonstrably improving safety. In sum, effective protection of synagogues can be achieved without prohibiting peaceful demonstrations, preserving both security and democratic freedoms.

6. Protection Against "Doxing"

There is strong evidence that doxing – publishing someone's personal information to encourage harassment – is recognised as a serious harm in need of legal redress. Australia is moving to explicitly outlaw doxing: in late 2024 the federal Parliament passed amendments to the Privacy Act making malicious doxing a criminal offense:¹⁷

"The legislation... introduces new criminal offences to outlaw doxxing with serious criminal penalties of up to 7 years' imprisonment. Doxxing is a form of abuse that can affect all Australians but is often used against women in the context of domestic and family violence."

This legislative reform directly supports the call for better protection against doxing:

The government's online safety watchdog defines doxxing as the "intentional online exposure of an individual's identity, private information or personal details without their consent."

The context of the October 2023 "Zio600" incident – where activists leaked names and details of Jewish academics and artists – illustrates how doxing can terrorize a community. The Attorney-General noted this incident as a shocking example:¹⁸

"The recent targeting of members of the Australian Jewish community through those practices like doxxing was shocking but, sadly, this is far from being an isolated incident," said Attorney-General Mark Dreyfus.

The Jewish community's support for anti-doxing legislation shows that doxing is perceived as a genuine threat to safety and civic participation:¹⁹

Jewish community leaders "welcomed" the plan to outlaw doxxing, with the president of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry noting the need for laws to protect Australians "from this shameful and dangerous practice".

At the same time, experts emphasise balancing enforcement and free expression – laws must be tightly focused on malicious intent and will require diligent enforcement mechanisms (involving tech platforms) to avoid overreach:²⁰

"At the same time, cyber law experts cautioned that enforcement of anti-doxing laws will require cooperation from social media companies, given the challenges police face in tracking online harassment."

This aligns with the point about balancing protection with accountability: robust anti-doxing measures can deter online harassment and intimidation, provided they are implemented in a way that targets harassers while not chilling legitimate disclosure done in the public interest.

In essence, the research validates the need for anti-doxing protections as a means to ensure individuals (activists, journalists, or community members) are not exposed to harm for their views or identity, thereby safeguarding open advocacy and participation.

7. Privacy of Public Information (Land Titles, Electoral Roll)

The tension between privacy and transparency is a key consideration in this inquiry. On one hand, certain personal information (such as property ownership records or electoral roll addresses) is traditionally public in Australia for reasons of transparency and democracy. On the other hand, recent incidents show that readily available personal data can be exploited for harassment or doxing. The "Zio600" case – where activists compiled Jewish professionals' publicly available details into a list, resulting in threats – exemplifies how open data can be weaponised. In response, legal reforms are underway that implicitly acknowledge this dilemma. The new federal privacy amendments propose a cause of action for serious invasions of privacy, but critically, they build in a public-interest balancing test:²¹

Schedule 2 [of the Privacy Amendment Bill] recognises that there can often be tension between protecting an individual's privacy and the greater public

interest. If implemented... an invasion of privacy tort... must be considered on the balance of public interest. Specifically...the plaintiff must satisfy the court that the public interest in the invasion of privacy was outweighed by the public interest in protecting the plaintiff's privacy.

The bill also considers exceptions for legitimate activities:

The Bill also provides for defences and exemptions to ensure legitimate activities – such as those with legal authority or in the public interest – are not caught by the privacy tort.

As explained by legal experts, any claim of privacy invasion would require courts to weigh the individual's privacy interest against the public interest in disclosure – effectively ensuring that uses of public information for legitimate purposes (journalism, academic research, anti-corruption efforts) remain protected by law.²²

This supports the point that protecting privacy (to prevent doxing or intimidation) must be done without undermining accountability and open access to information. For instance, electoral rolls and land title registers serve public interest functions (verifying voter eligibility, transparency in property dealings); outright removal of such data from public view could hamper those functions.

A balanced approach might involve allowing individuals at risk (e.g., victims of stalking or targeted hate) to suppress their address (as "silent electors"), or limiting bulk access to data, rather than closing records entirely. The research thus underlines that context and intent matter: privacy protections should target malicious misuse of information, not the routine and beneficial use of public records.

By adopting measures like the public-interest test and specific anti-harassment laws, policymakers can better protect individuals (such as activists concerned about being doxed) while maintaining the transparency needed for advocacy and public accountability.

8. Role of the Sydney Jewish Museum (Holocaust and Human Rights Education)

The Sydney Jewish Museum (SJM) is highlighted in research as a model for using Holocaust education to promote wider human rights awareness and understanding of oppression. As a dedicated Holocaust museum founded by survivors, the SJM naturally teaches the historical specifics of antisemitism and the Shoah. At the same time, it explicitly situates those lessons in a universal context: notably, the museum

includes a permanent Human Rights section alongside its Jewish history and Holocaust exhibits.²³

Its educational programs for school groups emphasise empathy, using the Holocaust as a case study in the dangers of prejudice and authoritarianism:²⁴

SJM "runs several school tours every day... educating future generations about the horrors of the Holocaust teaches children about empathy and understanding. Additionally, students and adults... witness the testimonies of Holocaust survivors, highlighting the importance of oral history".

Yotam Weiner, SJM's education manager, advocates teaching through the Holocaust to illuminate patterns of human rights abuse and to inspire students to uphold justice:²⁵

"Educators can and should teach through the Holocaust – rather than just about the Holocaust... Weiner believes there are clear educational benefits in teaching about other human rights violations through the lens of the Holocaust. 'It has the effect of helping students become reflective rather than reactive when they encounter other people. We need to teach students about the failures of societal structures and then equip and inspire them to build structures that don't fail.'"

In practice, this might mean drawing parallels between the dehumanisation of Jews in Nazi Europe and other instances of racism or genocide, thus fostering an understanding that the slogan "Never Again" applies universally. The call for inclusive, comparative approaches is supported by such an ethos: research finds that framing Holocaust education in a broader human-rights narrative helps students become more reflective and morally engaged citizens.²⁶

At the same time, experts advise balance – ensuring that the Holocaust's unique historical context is not lost. The museum's scholar-in-residence cautions against trivialising the Holocaust by equating it with every injustice.²⁷ This nuance aligns with the intent to have the SJM promote Holocaust education as part of a broader anti-oppression curriculum, not instead of it. In conclusion, the SJM is well-positioned to provide Holocaust education that is both deeply rooted in Jewish experience and inclusive of other human rights lessons.

By linking the Holocaust with lessons about racism, genocide, and persecution of any people (including, for example, Australia's own history with Aboriginal peoples or contemporary issues of antisemitism and Islamophobia), the museum can help students draw universal ethical lessons from history. This research reinforces the idea

that Holocaust education, when done in an inclusive way, is a powerful tool to combat hatred and to teach about the importance of defending human rights for all.²⁸

End Notes

¹ Jaffee, L. J. (2024). *Anti-Zionism is not Antisemitism: The centrality of Palestinian liberation in the struggle for anti-oppressive education*. Critical Education, 15(1), 29–51.

² Human Rights Watch. (2023, April 4). *Human Rights and other civil society groups urge United Nations to respect human rights in the fight against antisemitism* (Joint NGO letter).

³ Ibid.

⁴ Jewish Council of Australia. (2025, February 26). *Jewish Council of Australia slams universities' adoption of dangerous, politicised and unworkable antisemitism definition* [Press release].

⁵ Human Rights Watch. (2023, April 4). *Human Rights and other civil society groups urge United Nations to respect human rights in the fight against antisemitism* (Joint NGO letter).

⁶ Australian Human Rights Commission. (2024, September 27). *Opening statement to the Senate Inquiry into Antisemitism at Australian Universities* (H. de Kretser, President).

⁷ Islamophobia Register Australia, Monash University, & Deakin University. (2025). *Islamophobia in Australia: Report V*. Islamophobia Register Australia.

⁸ van Oosten, S. (2023, Nov. 15). *Judeonationalism: Calling out antisemitism to discredit Muslims*. The Loop – ECPR Politics & Religion Blog.

⁹ NSW Council for Civil Liberties. (2025, March 13). *Media Statement: Calls for inquiry into the misleading of Parliament in passing repressive legislation*.

¹⁰ Feng, T. (2025, February 21). *How new hate speech laws impact your rights*. Human Rights Law Centre.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² NSW Council for Civil Liberties. (2025, March 13). *Media Statement: Calls for inquiry into the misleading of Parliament in passing repressive legislation*.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Human Rights Law Centre. (2025, February 21). *How new hate speech laws impact your rights* (Commentary on recent laws).

¹⁵ NSW Council for Civil Liberties (NSWCCL). (2025). *Comment on the NSW Crimes Amendment (Places of Worship) Bill 2025* (as cited in J. Lees, Red Flag, 2 March 2025).

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Attorney-General's Department (Australia). (2024, November 29). *Delivering stronger privacy protections for Australians* [Press release].

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Campbell, I. (2024, September 27). *Privacy reforms – From doxxing to invasion*. Holman Webb Lawyers Blog.

²² Ibid.

²³ Tullis, C. (2019, October 7). *Education and evacuations: Sydney Jewish Museum*. History Matters (University of Sydney).

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Salzburg Global Seminar. (2018). *Holocaust education – The case of Australia* (Report on international seminar; quotes from Y. Weiner, Education Manager, Sydney Jewish Museum).

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Tullis, C. (2019, October 7). *Education and evacuations: Sydney Jewish Museum*. History Matters (University of Sydney).