

Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Bill 2026

Submission No: 401

Submission By: Cathy Stephens

Publication: Making the submission and your name public

Cathy Stephens



As a private citizen and taxpayer of this state and country I am writing to object to this ambiguous and undemocratic bill.

Opposition to the Bill

I oppose the Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns Out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Bill 2026.

While this bill purports to fight racism (of only one demographic of people), it actually targets social and political expressions. With no positive aims, it expands State powers to target democratically held beliefs.

1. Criminalising Political Speech

The choice to criminalise slogans attached to certain demographics' attachment to homeland and rights and suggest that these are "terrorist" is frightening.

The slogans can be widely interpreted, and I note that the rest of "From the river to the sea" is "Palestine will be free", indicating a need for freedom of movement and political freedoms that Palestinians—living between the Jordan River and the sea) do not currently possess. They have to pass multiple checkpoints to attend to daily life, unable to attend work and medical appointments—rights we take for granted as "free" citizens in Australia. Outlawing this phrase essentially means that other phrases requesting freedom of movement and equal rights could also be banned, which sends a frightening precedence.

While the phrase "globalise the intifada" has been mis-interpreted, it shows a need to bring the "uprising" or voice of the oppressed people to others to support a quest of civil rights. The fact that many have deliberately, for political purposes, mis-represented this phrase shows how loose and ambiguous these new laws would be. Essentially, this would ban calls for freedom and a sense of injustice for any repressed peoples in future.

The proposition that people can be imprisoned for two years—longer than many violent acts incur—could be seen as an attack on freedom of speech and a warning that those unlike by the government will be criminalised for beliefs that do not directly harm other Australians.

2. The Bill attacks a valid political movement

While I oppose antisemitism in any form, to tie these slogans to anti-Semitism denies the number of Jewish Australians who also support rights and freedoms of Palestinian people. To tie Jewish Australians to the brutality of soldiers shooting children and detaining pregnant women is in itself more anti-Semitic than the slogan. It would be akin

to banning pro-Ukraine statements, saying they are terrorism against Orthodox Christians. This would clearly be appalling.

If racism is to be addressed, tying it to one political movement sets a frightening precedent. It essentially criminalises one group of people's quest for freedom, but not others.

This is a deliberately divisive act, which may lead to further polarisation in Queensland and Australia, as people realise that only certain groups deserve the right to talk about their social culture and needs.

3. Australians have a right to protest war

The pro-Palestinian protest movements are a response to the extreme violence of one invading state on a civilian population for over two years. People outrage is not because of racism, but because of rightful horror at the deliberate targeting of women and children, as well as journalists and medical facilities. To pretend it is racism to object to the brutalities of war-crimes sets a frightening precedence that any objections to war—no matter how uneven and violent—is unacceptable in a free state like Queensland.

The deliberately vaguely written bill means that future objections to whole-scale violence can be easily implemented, which heralds an unprecedented and frightening time for Queensland.

This is not only frightening in a country that regards themselves as mindful of human rights but signals a change to the Australian character—as one that is accepting of atrocities and regards revulsion at these atrocities as a form of racism.

Conclusion

This legislation does not seem to be aimed at making anyone in Queensland feel safe. Quite the opposite, it sets the precedence of criminalising objections to violence, linking peaceful objection to terrorism.

I ask lawmakers to do more regarding safety of Queenslanders generally, protecting civil liberties and free speech.