

Part I: The IHRA Definition - Geopolitics, Not Conscience

1. Ms Jillian Segal's 2025 Plan to Combat Antisemitism makes the working definition of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) the foundational pillar of the entire framework for erasing antisemitism. The Envoy notes that the Australian Government, several state governments and dozens of international governments have endorsed the IHRA working definition as best practice for identifying antisemitism. The pregnant implication is that this is an internationally accepted moral dogma, and Australia must adopt the IHRA definition for combatting antisemitism.

2. It is not so simple as that.

3. A working definition of a concept, born of an international forum, is no moral science. It is a negotiated text, and negotiations reflect power. The IHRA working definition, adopted in 2016 in Bucharest, was birthed by a body whose nourishing womb was unmistakably Western, led by the United States and the European states, with Israel's influence behind the platform. What such international Forums deliver is less the distilled conscience of humanity than the prevailing balance of power among its members.

4. The United Nations' own record amply demonstrates this. A concept such as 'Zionism is Racism' can be redefined by changed constituencies on the UN General Assembly floor within a single generation.

- **1975:** The General Assembly resolved that "Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination". This Resolution was carried because the Non-Aligned and Soviet bloc nations were in the majority against Western opposition.
- **1991:** The same ideology, Zionism, named as racism was un-named in 1991. The earlier Resolution 3379 was revoked by Resolution 46/86, 111 to 25. Tellingly, this was done without a single word of reasoning. This reversal was no moral reassessment. After the Soviet collapse, the United States and its Western allies had the numbers. The same ideology named as racism in 1975 was simply overturned by the changed distribution of power.
- **2026:** What would be the vote today on such a Resolution?

5. In 2022, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution, sponsored by the West, against 'Holocaust denial', which reflected IHRA's definitional language. That was par for the course under Western tutelage and arm-twisting. However, what was notable was an extraordinary admission by the German envoy, who explained her country's sponsorship in terms of its "historical responsibility". That is, the European debt to Jewry worldwide was openly acknowledged on the floor of the Assembly.

6. Such candour was refreshing. The states that persecuted Jews for centuries, and permitted the Holocaust, carry a debt they are still paying. They are discharging it, in part, by cash – Germany has paid global reparations of over \$USD 90 billion to Holocaust

survivors since 1952, or by arms, or by deferring to Israeli commandments of what may and may not be politically correct to say. Atonement is owed, and they are still atoning for it.

7. Crucially, the United Nations has never adopted the IHRA definition of *antisemitism* itself, and its own human-rights machinery is openly divided. The UN Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, Tendayi Achiume, in her 2022 report, warned against the politically motivated instrumentalisation of the fight against antisemitism through the IHRA text and urged member states to suspend its adoption. On the other hand, Israel and its Western moral debtors have commended the definition as an educational tool. The UN, in short, cannot agree whether IHRA is a humane instrument or a political one.

8. So, what are we to make of it all in Australia? Of Jillian Segal's Jewish-centric recommendation, not burdened with any nuance, that the government should adopt and apply the definition across all levels of government, public institutions and regulatory bodies? This recommendation takes no account of the broader implications of applying the IHRA in, for example, the Australian educational system [H2]. Segal also recommends that government funding be withheld from universities, programs or individuals that facilitate, enable or fail to act against antisemitism.

9. So far, these recommendations have not been enforced. Notably, ABC and SBS have refused to adopt the Definition.

10. It is within the Royal Commission's Brief to guide the Australian government on this vexatious issue:

- Atonement is owed, but the import of a European conscience into an Australian classroom dispenses no justice to anyone.
- Australians do not owe any moral debt to the Fundamentalist Zionist rulers of Israel or to their representatives in Australia.
- The IHRA definition should be read for what it is - a creature of geopolitics and historical guilt, not a neutral measure of hatred - and it should be assessed as such before it is introduced into Australian learning and public services.