

Dear Sir/Madam,

This email serves as my submission with concerns about the Censorship Bill to be considered by Parliament.

The proposed hate speech laws enable unfair political censorship through severe penalties that create a chilling effect on free expression. With one tweet risking years imprisonment, citizens will self-censor political speech. UK's milder version already arrests 30 daily for posts, demonstrating inevitable abuse for silencing dissent.

The bill disproportionately penalizes speech by increasing baseline penalties and adding "racial hatred" as an aggravating factor, creating evidentiary burdens while making it a near-essential element of offenses. Criminalizing mere expression of opinions on racial issues and migration is inappropriate, as heightened punishment for speech alone exceeds legitimate bounds of criminal sanction.

The criminal conviction standard is inappropriately low because the proposed law lacks adequate mens rea requirements. Defendants can be convicted without needing to intend the offense or intend physical harm to the community. This insufficient intention threshold means individuals may face criminal sanctions despite no culpable mental state, undermining fundamental justice principles.

The hate group provisions are inappropriate because they lack due process protections and allow the government to designate organizations as prohibited hate groups through regulatory decree alone, without requiring convictions or procedural fairness. This creates potential for arbitrary governmental power without adequate legal safeguards.

Please take into account my concerns in your report.

Regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please treat this email as my submission on the rushed censorship bill, which I hope will assist your inquiry.

My main arguments are:

- The hate group provisions are inappropriate because they grant government unchecked power to designate organizations without convictions or procedural fairness. This regulatory decree process completely bypasses due process protections, allowing arbitrary blacklisting of groups. Such authority lacks fundamental legal safeguards against potential abuse and violates basic principles of natural justice.
- Hate speech laws enable unfair political censorship by criminalizing discussion of critical issues like indigenous domestic violence rates. UK's weaker provisions resulted in 30 daily arrests for social media posts, demonstrating how such laws suppress legitimate debate rather than just preventing harm.
- Criminal punishment for expressing opinions on racial issues is inappropriate. Adding "racial hatred" as an aggravating factor compounds this by increasing penalties for speech-based offenses, creating evidentiary problems while making what should be free expression a punishable crime with disproportionately harsh sentences.
- Hate speech laws are inappropriate in democracies because their necessarily vague definitions enable abuse. Stalin's Soviet Union first proposed such laws, and they've since been weaponized to silence legitimate political dissent—undermining the free expression essential to democratic debate and accountability.

I hope the Senate Committee will make it clear that Soviet Hate Speech laws do not work.

With regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to make a submission on this rushed censorship bill, which I hope will assist the Committee.

Here are the main issues from my perspective:

1. Hate speech laws are inappropriate for democracies because their vague definitions enable abuse, as demonstrated by their Soviet origins under Stalin. History shows they've been weaponized to suppress legitimate political dissent, threatening the free expression essential to democratic governance.
2. Hate speech laws can penalize minorities because organizations exploit such legislation for propaganda purposes, undermining its protective intent. Additionally, these laws differentiate between minority groups, which paradoxically reduces social cohesion and increases division rather than fostering unity. This fragmentation can leave minorities more vulnerable and marginalized within society.
3. The proposed hate speech laws enable unfair political censorship by criminalizing legitimate debate on migration and community issues. UK's weaker provisions already result in 30 daily arrests for social media posts, demonstrating how such laws are weaponized to silence political speech rather than address genuine hatred.
4. Limited enforcement resources mean authorities will selectively target large, primarily right-wing accounts. Meanwhile, the religious carve-out protects hate preachers, revealing ordinary Australians are the real target. This virtually guarantees inconsistent, unfair enforcement based on political considerations rather than objective standards.

I look forward to the Senate's careful consideration of my concerns.

Kind regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

This email serves as my submission with concerns about the Censorship Bill to be considered by Parliament.

Hate speech laws are inappropriate in democracies because their vague definitions enable abuse, as seen when Stalin's Soviets first proposed them. They've been weaponized to silence legitimate political dissent, undermining the free debate essential to democratic society.

Hate speech laws can penalize minorities because broadly worded provisions may be used against marginalized groups, including those with disabilities. Additionally, laws distinguishing between minority groups reduce social cohesion and increase division, potentially weaponizing such legislation against the very communities they aim to protect.

The hate speech laws enable unfair political censorship by stifling legitimate debate on migration and community issues. UK's weaker provisions already result in 30 daily arrests for social media posts, demonstrating how such laws criminalize political speech rather than protecting communities.

Historical selective enforcement proves inconsistent application. The religious carve-out protecting hate preachers while targeting ordinary Australians demonstrates inherent bias. Past patterns indicate this legislation will similarly be enforced arbitrarily, discriminating against regular citizens while exempting privileged groups, ensuring unfair and selective implementation.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I hope the Committee can make it clear that Soviet Censorship is not acceptable.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir/Madam, This email represents my submission on the censorship bill with concerns for your inquiry. Hate speech laws are inappropriate for democracies because their inherently vague definitions enable abuse. They've been weaponized to silence legitimate political dissent. Notably, Stalin's Soviet regime first championed such laws—a telling origin that reveals their authoritarian nature. Democratic societies require clear, limited restrictions on speech, not broad, ambiguous powers easily turned against lawful opposition. The hate speech laws enable unfair political censorship by creating a chilling effect—one wrong tweet risks years in prison—thereby silencing legitimate political debate on migration and community concerns. Citizens self-censor vital discussions rather than face potential prosecution. The law targets majority groups disproportionately while exempting religious hate preachers, revealing its true aim: silencing ordinary Australians rather than genuinely combating hatred. This built-in imbalance guarantees inconsistent enforcement, where identical speech receives different treatment based on the speaker's group identity, creating a two-tiered system that undermines equal justice under law. Penalties are disproportionate because they criminally punish mere speech expressing opinions on racial issues and migration. Additionally, increased baseline penalties combined with "racial hatred" as an aggravating factor creates evidentiary problems, making racial hatred a de facto precondition that further intensifies punishment for expressing viewpoints. I hope your report will make it clear that Soviet hate speech laws do not work and should be stopped. Regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please treat this email as my submission on the rushed censorship bill, which I hope will assist your inquiry. Here are the main issues from my perspective:

1. Hate speech laws are inappropriate for democracies because their vague definitions enable abuse. Stalin's Soviet regime pioneered these laws, and they've since been weaponized to suppress legitimate political dissent. Democratic societies require clear legal boundaries and robust free speech protections that hate speech laws inherently undermine.

2. Hate speech laws penalise minorities because they reduce social cohesion and increase division by distinguishing between groups. Additionally, such legislation can be exploited by organisations like the NSN, which have used laws protecting Jewish communities to generate propaganda, ultimately harming the minorities these laws intend to protect.

3. Hate speech laws enable unfair political censorship by criminalizing legitimate debate on sensitive issues like indigenous domestic violence rates. UK's milder version arrests 30 daily for social media posts, demonstrating how such laws suppress free expression and silence uncomfortable but necessary discussions under censorship's guise.

4. Selective enforcement is inevitable because: (1) The law intentionally targets majority groups over minorities, building in bias from the start. (2) Past legislation shows a clear pattern of selective enforcement. Without structural changes, this new law will simply repeat previous failures and inequities.

Please take my concerns into account and make it clear that hate speech laws do not work.

Best regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

This email is my submission on the Censorship bill to be considered as part of your inquiry.

The following seem to me to be the most serious things for you to think about:

- \* I believe this law creates unfair political censorship because the chilling effect is severe - I could face years in prison for one wrong tweet, which will silence legitimate political speech.
- \* I believe enforcement will be selective and unfair because the law targets majority groups more than minorities, and limited resources mean authorities will focus on large, right-wing accounts. This creates unequal application where some voices face disproportionate scrutiny while others escape consequences.
- \* I believe criminal punishment for simply expressing opinions on racial issues and migration is inappropriate. The severe penalties—potentially several years imprisonment—create a profound chilling effect on free speech. Such disproportionate consequences for mere speech threaten fundamental democratic freedoms.
- \* I find it deeply troubling that mere tweets qualify as public acts warranting conviction, and that someone can be criminally convicted without any intention to physically harm anyone. This standard is dangerously low and threatens fundamental freedoms.

I look forward to the Senate Committee's consideration of my concerns about Soviet-style Censorship.

Regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

This email is my submission on the Censorship bill to be considered as part of your inquiry.

Hate speech laws are inappropriate in democracies because they censor discourse on controversial topics like indigenous issues and migration reform. These laws have been weaponized to silence legitimate political dissent. In a democratic society, free and open debate—even on contentious matters—is essential. Such restrictions undermine fundamental democratic principles of free expression.

Ordinary Australians who cannot freely discuss and debate issues that concern them; online, around the water cooler, and at the local barbie soon begin to fear their neighbours.

Hate speech laws attempt to distinguish and protect specific minority groups, which can reduce social cohesion and increase division. Additionally, extremist organizations exploit these laws for propaganda purposes, potentially weaponizing protections intended for minorities against them, ultimately penalizing the very communities the legislation aims to shield. We have seen this in the UK when people standing up for women's rights have been reported by activists and subsequently arrested by the police. Already in Australia, statements of truth are used by activists to harass women through the courts for not submitting to a preferred ideology.

The proposed hate speech laws enable unfair political censorship through their severe chilling effect: with one wrong tweet risking years in prison, people self-censor legitimate political speech. UK's weaker provisions already result in 30 daily arrests for social media posts, demonstrating how such laws inevitably suppress free expression beyond genuine hate speech. In Western Australia the posting of stickers that state biological truth are being investigated by police as 'acts of hatred'.

The use of police to enforce a preferred ideology is a hallmark of authoritarian regimes. Governments which inflict moral injuries upon the populace by the censorship of speech and the forced adherence to lies cannot be considered heirs to the great liberal tradition of Australia.

Historical selective enforcement proves existing laws aren't applied equally. The religious exemption protecting hate preachers while targeting ordinary Australians demonstrates inherent bias. This pattern virtually guarantees inconsistent application, making the new legislation just another tool for unfair, selective prosecution rather than equal justice.

These laws are supposedly in response to the Bondi Massacre. The biggest terrorist attack, and first mass slaughter of Jews in Australian history. To quote Noam Chomsky

"It is a poor service to the memory of the victims...to adopt a central doctrine of their murderers."

I look forward to the Committee's report making it clear that this legislation is not acceptable.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir/Madam,

This email serves as my submission with concerns about the Censorship Bill to be considered by Parliament.

I believe these hate speech laws constitute unfair political censorship because they prevent legitimate debate on migration and community issues. They may silence discussion of important matters like higher domestic violence rates in indigenous communities, shutting down necessary conversations under the guise of preventing offense.

I've seen existing laws selectively enforced for years. Why should I believe this new legislation will be any different? History shows enforcement will remain arbitrary and unfair to people like me.

I believe these provisions are inappropriate because they fail to include due process protections when listing organizations as prohibited hate groups, denying affected groups their fundamental right to fair procedures.

I believe this standard is inappropriately low because it criminalizes behavior based merely on subjective feelings of harassment, rather than objective harm. Moreover, it requires minimal proof of intent, potentially convicting people for unintentional actions they never meant as threatening.

Please make it clear in your report that censorship legislation is wholly unacceptable.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please treat this email as my submission on the rushed censorship bill, which I hope will assist your inquiry.

Here are some of the concerns I would like you to consider:

\* I believe hate speech laws are inappropriate in democracy because their vague, broad definitions enable censorship of legitimate political dissent.

Stalin's Soviet Union first proposed such laws—hardly a model for free societies. We cannot trust authorities to fairly define "hate.

\* I've seen how broadly worded hate speech laws backfire on us minorities.

Authorities weaponize vague provisions against marginalized groups like people with disabilities, turning our protection into our persecution.

\* I believe these laws unfairly censor political debate by preventing discussion of critical issues like higher domestic violence rates in indigenous communities, silencing legitimate policy conversations under the guise of preventing hate speech.

\* I've seen existing laws selectively enforced before. Why should I believe this new legislation will be any different? History shows enforcement will remain inconsistent and unfair to some groups.

Please take into account my concerns in your report.

Kind regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to make a submission on this rushed censorship bill, which I hope will assist the Committee.

The law creates unfair political censorship through its chilling effect: with one wrong tweet risking years in prison, people self-censor legitimate political speech. UK's weaker provisions already arrest 30 daily for social media posts, demonstrating how such laws suppress lawful expression beyond genuine hate speech.

The penalties—several years' imprisonment for speech—are disproportionate and risk chilling free expression. Enhanced baseline sentences for existing offences, combined with "racial hatred" as an aggravating factor, compounds this severity. This raises evidentiary concerns, as proving racial hatred becomes effectively mandatory, functioning as a de facto prerequisite that further escalates punishment beyond what mere speech warrants.

Combining these standards creates an inappropriately low threshold: if mere tweets qualify as public acts, and subjective feelings of harassment satisfy the offense criteria, then simply posting online content that makes someone feel harassed becomes criminal—criminalizing speech based solely on another's emotional response.

Hate speech laws threaten democracy because their vague definitions enable abuse—as intended by Stalin's Soviet regime. They've been weaponized to silence legitimate political dissent. In democracies requiring free debate, such ambiguous restrictions grant governments dangerous power to suppress opposing viewpoints under the guise of protection.

I look forward to the Senate Committee's consideration of my concerns about Soviet-style Censorship.

Kindest regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to make a submission with my concerns on censorship

My primary concerns that I would like you to consider are:

1. I've seen organizations like the NSN exploit hate speech laws meant to protect Jewish communities, twisting them into propaganda tools that ultimately harm the very minorities these laws were designed to shield.
2. I believe these laws enable unfair political censorship. UK's weaker provisions already result in 30 daily arrests for social media posts, showing how such laws inevitably suppress legitimate political speech under hate speech pretexts.
3. I believe enforcement will be selective and unfair because the law specifically targets majority groups for censorship more than minorities. This creates unequal treatment under the law, which violates basic fairness principles.
4. I believe imprisoning someone for years simply for expressing views on race or migration is grossly disproportionate. Such harsh penalties for mere speech aren't justified and will severely chill free expression, deterring others from voicing opinions on these important issues.

Soviet-style hate speech laws simply do not work. I hope the Committee will take my concerns into account.

Regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please consider this email as my formal submission concerning censorship to the Committee.

Please consider the following key points:

- Hate speech laws are inappropriate for democracies because their vague, broad definitions enable censorship of legitimate political dissent. Originally proposed by Stalin's Soviet regime, such laws provide dangerous tools for suppressing opposition—a fundamental threat to democratic freedoms and open debate.
- The hate speech law creates unfair political censorship by threatening years in prison for tweets, deterring legitimate discourse. It may silence critical discussions about real issues like higher domestic violence rates in indigenous communities, preventing honest debate about problems requiring solutions.
- Given limited enforcement resources, the law will target large, primarily right-wing accounts rather than applying standards equally across all violators. This creates selective enforcement based on account size and political ideology, making prosecution unfair and inconsistent regardless of actual violations.
- Criminal punishment for expressing opinions on racial issues is inappropriate. Enhanced penalties treating "racial hatred" as an aggravating factor create evidentiary problems and effectively make it a de facto element of offenses, disproportionately punishing speech rather than conduct.

I hope your report will make it clear that Soviet hate speech laws do not work and should be stopped.

Yours sincerely,

I am writing with my concerns about censorship.

In particular I am concerned about the following issues:

There is a problematic subsection in the proposed legislation - section 80.2BF paragraph 4 - exemptions for when referencing religious text or for the purpose of religious teaching/discussion. This opens the door for religious leaders to preach hate to continue to do so under the guise of “quoting” scripture to say anything that they like - a latitude that is likely not offered to ordinary Australians.

Enforcement will be selective and unfair because the law deliberately targets majority groups for censorship more than minority groups, creating unequal treatment based on group identity rather than applying standards consistently to everyone.

I believe these provisions are inappropriate because they grant the government unchecked power to label groups as hateful without fair process or conviction. Given the severe penalties for mere association, this creates dangerous potential for abuse and undermines fundamental due process rights.

I oppose hate speech laws because their definitions are inherently vague and broad. It's telling that Stalin's Soviet Union first proposed them—hardly a model for democratic freedoms we should emulate.

I oppose these hate speech laws because they unfairly censor legitimate political debate. They'll prevent me from discussing critical issues like domestic violence rates in indigenous communities, migration concerns or even identifying Islamic terrorism, language that even the Prime Minister has avoided. This silences important conversations our community needs to have about real problems.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I hope the Committee can make it clear that Soviet Censorship is not acceptable in Australia.

Sincerely,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing with my already fully expressed concerns about censorship.

Hate speech laws are inappropriate in democracies because they censor discourse on controversial topics like indigenous issues and migration reform. Historical evidence shows these laws have suppressed legitimate political dissent.

Protecting free speech, even when uncomfortable, is essential for democratic debate and preventing government overreach.

The hate speech laws enable unfair political censorship by imposing severe prison sentences that chill free speech. They may criminalize discussing legitimate issues like higher domestic violence rates in indigenous communities, effectively silencing important policy debates through fear of prosecution rather than open dialogue.

Given that existing laws have already been selectively enforced, this legislation will likely face the same problem. Additionally, since the law disproportionately targets majority groups over minorities, it creates built-in unfairness, making selective and inequitable enforcement virtually inevitable.

The penalties are disproportionate because they impose several years imprisonment merely for speech. When racial hatred becomes an aggravating factor with increased baseline penalties, individuals face severe prison time for expression alone. This creates a profound chilling effect, deterring legitimate speech through fear of disproportionately harsh punishment.

I look forward to the Committee's report making it clear that this legislation is not acceptable.

Regards,

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to make a submission on this rushed censorship bill, which I hope will assist the Committee.

Here are some of the concerns I would like you to consider:

- I believe hate speech laws are inappropriate in a democracy because they censor discourse on controversial topics like indigenous issues and migration reform. These laws have been used to silence legitimate political dissent, undermining the free exchange of ideas essential to democratic society.
- I believe hate speech laws penalise minorities because broadly worded provisions allow authorities to weaponise them against marginalised groups, including those with disabilities. Additionally, these laws distinguish between minority groups, which reduces social cohesion and increases division, ultimately harming the very communities they claim to protect.
- I believe these hate speech laws constitute unfair political censorship. The threat of years in prison for one wrong tweet creates a serious chilling effect on free expression. These laws prevent legitimate political debate on migration and other issues of community concern, silencing voices on matters that directly affect our society.
- I believe this law will unfairly target ordinary Australians like me. The religious exemption protects hate preachers while the drafting ensures majority groups face more censorship than minorities. This virtually guarantees inconsistent, selective enforcement—not equal justice, but political bias masquerading as law.

Please make it clear in your report that hate speech laws simply do not work.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to make a submission on this rushed censorship bill, which I hope will assist the Committee.

In particular I am concerned about the following issues:

\* I believe these laws enable unfair political censorship because weaker UK provisions already result in 30 daily arrests for social media posts, demonstrating how easily such regulations suppress legitimate speech and dissent.

\* I believe criminal punishment for simply expressing my opinion on racial issues and migration is inappropriate. The penalties are disproportionate when applied to mere speech.

\* I believe criminal convictions demand ironclad proof. If mere tweets qualify as public acts meeting conviction standards, the bar is dangerously low. Social media posts shouldn't carry such weight in criminal proceedings.

\* I believe hate speech laws are inappropriate because their definition is inherently vague and broad. Alarmingly, they were first proposed by Stalin's Soviet regime, which disregarded logical concerns about such imprecision.

Thank you in advance for considering my concerns.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please consider this to be my submission to the Senate, concerning the Censorship Bill Inquiry.

I believe the heightened penalties are disproportionate because they punish mere speech about racial issues and migration with criminal sanctions. Making "racial hatred" an aggravating factor compounds this by potentially requiring proof of subjective intent, effectively criminalizing opinions rather than harmful conduct.

I believe these provisions are inappropriate because they allow the government to unilaterally label groups as hateful through decree alone, bypassing courts and denying any fair process or chance to defend against such accusations.

I believe the criminal conviction standard is too low because you can be convicted without ever intending to physically harm anyone in the community, which seems fundamentally unjust.

I've seen how hate speech laws backfire. Organizations like the NSN exploit legislation meant to protect Jewish communities, twisting it into propaganda tools that ultimately harm the very minorities these laws intended to shield.

I hope that my concerns will be fully taken on board by the Senate.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please consider this to be my submission to the Senate, concerning the  
Censorship Bill Inquiry.

I oppose these hate speech laws because they enable unfair political censorship. UK's weaker provisions already result in 30 daily arrests for social media posts. These laws could silence crucial discussions about serious issues, like higher domestic violence rates in indigenous communities, preventing honest debate about problems we must address.

I believe these provisions are inappropriate because the government can designate prohibited hate groups by decree alone, without convictions or fair procedures. This arbitrary power is deeply troubling, especially given the severe penalties imposed simply for being connected to such groups. This undermines fundamental principles of due process and procedural fairness.

I believe hate speech laws harm us minorities because vague wording allows authorities to weaponize these provisions against marginalized communities like mine. Additionally, when laws categorize and separate different minority groups, they actually reduce social cohesion rather than promote it, creating more division within our communities instead of protecting us.

I believe hate speech laws are inappropriate because they censor discourse on controversial topics like indigenous issues and migration reform. History shows these laws suppress legitimate political dissent. In a democracy, free debate—even on divisive matters—must be protected, not silenced by government control.

Please stop this legislation. Thank you for considering my concerns.

With regards,