

From: Lauren Anderson [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 14 July 2025 1:20 PM
To: PRL Independent Review Secretariat
Subject: Submission in Response to the Review of Criminal Law Protections Against the Incitement of Hatred in NSW

Categories: Protections Submissions

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

To the the Honourable John Sackar AM KC and Review Panel,

I write to express serious concern about the direction, framing, and likely intent of this review into criminal law protections against the incitement of hatred.

While the stated purpose is to balance protections for vulnerable communities with fundamental freedoms and promote social cohesion, the selective scope, background context, and emphasis on the recently passed Crimes Amendment (Inciting Racial Hatred) Act 2025 raise red flags. In particular, this review appears to be heavily influenced by the ongoing Antisemitism Inquiry and broader efforts to conflate legitimate criticism of Israel and Zionism with racial hatred and antisemitism.

This trend risks weaponising criminal law to protect political ideologies – not people – and in doing so, undermines the actual safety of racialised, Muslim, Arab, and pro-Palestinian communities, who continue to experience real, everyday hate speech, discrimination and police profiling in NSW with little to no public concern or legal redress.

If this review were genuinely interested in protecting vulnerable people and promoting social cohesion, it would:

Consider protections for Muslims, Palestinians, Sikhs, South Asians, African Australians, and other groups consistently targeted by racialised hatred, state surveillance, and media scapegoating;

Avoid providing cover for those who seek to silence political speech under the guise of preventing hatred;

Ensure intersectional, community-led consultation, not just input from institutional or politicised stakeholders.

Right now, this review risks entrenching a two-tiered system of protection – one for powerful interest groups, and one for everyone else. That is not social cohesion. That is institutional hypocrisy.

Sincerely,
Lauren Anderson
NSW Resident