


JOINT SUBMISSION ON THE

Second Exposure Draft

**OF THE
RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION BILL**

January 2020

**A PROPOSAL FROM MORE THAN
160 ORGANISATIONS
INVOLVED IN THE
AUSTRALIAN MUSLIM COMMUNITY**



WITH THEM AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND OUR FAMILIES TOO IN OUR HEARTS
AND MINDS, WE MAKE THIS SUBMISSION.
TO ALL THE FAMILIES OF THE 51 VICTIMS, WE EXTEND OUR PRAYERS AND
CONDOLENCES.

This is the second joint submission made by a number of national and state based organisations which are involved in, and represent, the Australian Muslim community. The relevant organisations, each of which is a signatory, are listed in Schedule 1 to this Submission.

This submission puts forward proposals aimed at mitigating the chance of another terror event like those that befell Christchurch from occurring in Australia.

On the 2 October 2019, approximately 160 national and State based organisations which are involved in the Australian Muslim community made a joint submission on the first exposure draft of the Religious Discrimination Bill 2019 (the Bill). That submission:

- (a) Raised a concern about the increasing experience of anti-Muslim sentiment in the Australian Muslim community which extended to vilification and other endangering conduct on the grounds of a person's religious identity and/or the manifestation of that person's faith;
- (b) Noted the absence of adequate and consistent appropriate laws at the federal level and also across the States and Territories to deal with the conduct of concern; and
- (c) Sought for a new civil remedy to be included in the Bill dealing with vilification.

It is apparent that the second exposure draft of the Bill remains silent on the issue of vilification on the grounds of person's religious belief or activity. As such, this further submission relating to the second exposure draft of the Bill again highlights the need for some civil remedy to be included in the Bill, to address the real and present concerns relating to vilification, and conduct, which presents a risk or endangerment to the wellbeing and lives of people of faith.

In the second exposure draft, the Government carves out what harmful expression cannot be protected by the Bill. This submission simply asks that this clause work both ways to operate as a shield for people of faith.

The Bill provides a unique and appropriate opportunity to set a standard, in an area where legal uncertainty is contributing to significant private and public harm.

The Government is asked to seriously consider the implications of not acting at this time.

We are aware of the position put forward by the Australian Council of Human Rights Authorities^[1], which supports the recommendation of Dr Sarah Moulds, to introduce the Bill in two stages in order to allow certain parts of the Bill to be referred for more detailed examination. If this path is chosen in the future, it is requested that our proposal for an anti-vilification shield be actioned in the Bill that passes immediately, rather than referred for future consideration. This further submission proposes such a provision below.

[1] Australian Council of Human Rights Authorities, *Submission to the Australian Government regarding the Religious Discrimination Bills*, 30 September 2019.

2019

'Bad culture growing': Report finds Islamophobic incidents becoming more brazen

Australia

Government condemns 'appalling' cases of Islamophobia detailed in new report

Islamophobic abuse mostly directed at women wearing headscarves while shopping, study finds

Good on him. He should have got a medal. Pity he only got 50

Like Reply

14

here breeding an army. It's the ultimate Trojan horse and they're already past the gates. They seem peaceful until they become a majority n with their birthrate it's only a matter of time.

The government should give the croats/serbs the order to ethnic cleanse these savages from Australia. Simple. Denounce Islam or Disappear.

caused by our brain dead immigration policies. If they are not HERE then they cannot make rape gangs, they cannot burn down our churches, they cannot invade homes, make sharia patrols, take over councils and electorates with population voting blocks, they cant build insulting mosques with names like Gallipoli on them, they cant launch jihad attackers to slash throats and seige cafes, and shoot police officers with guns they stash in their mosques, they cant block the

Looks like the need another mosque visitor

Like Reply

8



Above: A Muslim woman, 38 weeks pregnant, was the victim of an unprovoked attack by a stranger in a Sydney cafe, 2019

Left: Vandalism on Holland Park Mosque, 2019

I want people of faith and
people of no faith to be
able to live out their chosen
beliefs and to safely
navigate the contour of
their lives as they see fit.

PRIME MINISTER
SCOTT MORRISON
NOVEMBER 2019

I was shocked and scared. I still am. Cannot go out of my house without thinking I might be attacked again.

A TEENAGE GIRL'S REPORT TO
THE ISLAMOPHOBIA REGISTER
AFTER AN UNKNOWN MAN
REPEATEDLY TRIED TO RIP OFF
HER SCARF, WHILE YELLING
'TAKE THAT F***ING RAG OFF
YOUR HEAD'.
SHE WAS WALKING IN A
SUBURBAN STREET.
PERTH, SEPTEMBER 2019.

Almost one year on

The atrocity of the Christchurch terror attack continues to reverberate in the Australian Muslim community. From any perspective, the scale of the atrocity was unprecedented in Australian or New Zealand history in terms of loss of life and the manner in which those lives were taken.

The appropriate reassurance for targeted communities from Government following such a crisis would be remedial measures that mitigate against such harm eventuating again. Yet as the first anniversary of Christchurch approaches, Australian Muslims have never felt this unsafe.

In late 2019, a university study surveying 1034 Muslim Australian citizens and permanent residents¹, found the top five issues of which participants were 'very concerned':

- Media reporting on Islam and Muslims: 76.11%
- Terrorism by right-wing extremists 73.40%
- Anti-Islam sentiment: 71.47%
- Discrimination against Muslims: 69.25%
- Terrorism by Muslim extremists: 67.99%

We are deeply concerned that the free exchange of extreme hate rhetoric and bias narratives about Muslims as a group is contributing to all of the above; and creating an environment where the risk of incidents occurring, which threaten the life and wellbeing of Australian Muslims, is made more likely.

Anti-Muslim hate networks growing online

While there have been a number of international engagements by the Australian Government regarding 'terrorist or violent extremist content' online, the reality is that the fomentation of hatred towards followers of

¹ Assoc Prof. Halim Rane, Paul Mitchell, Shane Satterley, Jess Mamone, 'Islam in Australia Survey', Griffith University, 2020 (yet to be published research). The data sample was representative in terms of gender and people born in Australia compared to overseas.

the Islamic faith on mainstream platforms continues unabated, thanks to an environment of legal uncertainty.

Research in Australia has identified an 'increasingly radical milieu' that is leaning closer to violent outcomes.² Figure 1 includes its findings.

Figure 1

Analysing 41, 831 posts from 12 far right Facebook groups, the research identified five common narratives used within mobilisation frames:

1. Muslims are inferior, sub-human, and inherently incompatible with Western liberal norms and values.
2. Muslims are trained by their religion to deceive, infiltrate and populate as part of gradual takeover or covert religious war.
3. Examples of gang violence and terrorism are proof that Muslims are inherently violent and trained to be so by an inherently violent 'ideology'.
4. Muslims are always playing the victim card to silence criticism and gain preferential treatment in society.
5. Islam is about waging a war against Christian peoples and values, as evidenced by Muslim attacks on Christians overseas and Crusader history.

When these narratives are run repeatedly and together, an environment is created where it becomes socially acceptable to dehumanise and victimise people based solely on the fact they follow Islam. Part way on this trajectory, people are emboldened to abuse visibly dressed Muslims in public places and deface mosques. At the extreme end of dehumanisation and radicalisation spectrum, the

² A Victorian analysis of far right extremist activity online by Victoria University, published its preliminary findings in November 2018. Puecker, M., Smith, D. & Iqbal, M. (2018). *Mapping Networks and Narratives of Far-Right Movements in Victoria*: Victoria University, Australia.

Christchurch terrorist shoots to kill 3 and 4 year old children as they run away from him, on the basis of such narratives – arguing in his manifesto that it was necessary to manage future threats.

A threat to other minorities and broader community

There is also growing evidence that anti-Muslim extremist propaganda is successfully being used to groom people towards accepting further far right ideologies grounded in cultural and racial superiority, including an ultimate objective of targeting Jewish people.³

A cultural problem

The defence is frequently made that one can say what they like about Muslim people because they are followers of a religion, not a single race. The public advocacy of hatred against any group on the basis of a lawful attribute cannot be tolerated in a liberal democracy.

E-Safety Commissioner's support is very limited

The 2016 Census showed 37.2% of Australian Muslims were born in Australia, 62.8% overseas. The rise of anti-Muslim sentiment, often expressed as 'go back to where you come from' attitudes online, is

³ Above n 3, Puecker, M., Smith, D. & Iqbal.

See for eg, Julie Nathan, 'The Rise of Australia's Activist Far Right: How Far Will It Go?', *ABC News: Religion and Ethics*, 31 January 2018. 'In a Facebook message discussion between Blair Cottrell and another Nationalist, Neil Erikson, in February 2016 on the future direction of the UPF, Erikson advised: "My personal opinion is stick to the Muslim shit and Cultural Marxism for max support do Jews later you don't need to show your full hand." Cottrell responded: "Yeah good advice and that's my current attitude as well. It will take years to prepare people for the Jewish problem. If any of us came out with it now we would be slaughtered by public opinion."'

See also, Dr Andre Oboler, William Allington and Dr Patrick Scolyer-Gray, "Hate and Violent Extremism from an Online Subculture: The Yom Kippur Terrorist Attack in Halle, Germany", *Online Hate Prevention Institute*, December 2019 notes how the /pol/ community found on places like 4chan and 8chan have been responsible for four deadly terrorist attacks in 2019.

corrosive to the Australian identity and self-worth of Muslim youth and children. Yet the e-Safety Commissioner's remit does not include hatred online, unless it targets a specific individual. Online safety, and offline safety indirectly influenced by online activity, do not take into account the insidious private and public harms created by incitement of hatred and violence.

As an example, someone who consistently posts the following material in a Muslim person's inbox could face a legal consequence (**if** the police decide to prosecute under federal law), but if it was posted on a public page as a general remark, as it frequently is done – what is the consequence then? What standard is civil society able to hold public pages and social media service providers to?

*"Hey invasive species, how are ya bruh? Or too chicken s*** to respond still? Islamophobia? Who the f*** would be scared of sand niggers mate lol.... You're not welcome... Bitch arse n*****... The boys think its funny what's happening with China [reference to concentration camps for Uyghurs]. I can't wait for the day that Islam is wiped from the face of the earth. I will gladly support it. I would like to discuss it with you. I think it is a backward, vile and reprehensible religion. Along with all the others, but Islam is by far the worst. Bunch of goat f***ers running around beheading c**** with knives."*⁴

Extremist manifestos

The office of the e-Safety Commissioner does have remit in relation to extremist propaganda and referring manifestos to the Classification Board. However it has been reported that it will only do so if the Office considers the manifestos to be at risk of going viral in Australia.⁵ The narratives of those manifestos are freely shared online without

⁴ Directly quoted from incident report involving cyber abuse submitted to the Islamophobia Register Australia in December 2019.

⁵ Cameron Wilson, 'Australia Won't Ban Manifestos Similar To The Christchurch Shooter's Because They Didn't Go As Viral', *Buzzfeed news*, 16 January 2020.

consequence from the Commissioner's Office, police or social media service providers.⁶

Self-regulatory mechanisms online not working

The exposition of many of these bias arguments rely on words such as Islam, with Muslims referred to indirectly, to avoid detection by online self-regulatory mechanisms (Facebook for example will only breach 'direct attacks'). However, the effect is the same. Social media service providers cannot be left to navigate this particular issue alone.

Criminal laws not working

With many incidents of abuse not meeting the criminal threshold (because they are verbal) and the difficulty of locating unknown perpetrators, most incidents are not investigated or prosecuted by police. As such, there is also very low reporting. It is submitted that action is needed upstream where these public acts of hatred are incited and normalised.

Meanwhile the existing plethora of criminal laws are rarely applied in the online space. This is an area requiring urgent and concerted thinking across criminal jurisdictions. With regards to this criminal space, this submission notes the work of the Australian Hate Crime Network in advocating legal solutions to a range of inquiries.⁷

⁶ As highlighted in the Victorian analysis, above n3.

⁷ The AHCN is a partnership composed of three sectors of society: academics, representatives of NGOs from minority communities, and people from relevant government departments, including police. It is currently considering criminal law reform as part of its submissions to the *NSW Parliamentary Inquiry into Gay and Transgender hate crimes between 1970 and 2010*; and the Federal consultation process on the Online Safety Act. Some signatories to this Joint Submission are involved in the Law Reform Working Group.

The effectiveness of a civil remedy

As the Australian Jewish community has demonstrated with their use of s18C of the *Racial Discrimination Act*, civil remedies can work to push heinous examples of hate speech out of the mainstream.

In 2012, the Executive Council of Australian Jewry brought a complaint under the *Racial Discrimination Act* against Facebook, after it had failed to respond to a number of complaints. After conciliation, Facebook removed **'hundreds of crudely antisemitic racist images and comments that had appeared on 51 Facebook pages'**.⁸ Facebook suddenly became more accountable to the Australian Jewish community.

The Council has leveraged this protection numerous times through informal negotiation, some of the time through conciliation, and in rare circumstances, through litigation, for example to reinforce that Holocaust denial propaganda was unlawful.

In a submission to Parliament in 2016, the Jewish peak body wrote that this civil remedy provided **'redress and public vindication'** which gave the community **'reassurance about the essential fairness, tolerance and civility of Australian society and thus of preventing or counteracting the harms that public expressions of antisemitism would otherwise cause them.'**

The importance of this remedy for Jewish people is understood by people of Islamic faith, because it is a form of reassurance that they also desperately need as members of Australian society.

Proposal for Religious Discrimination Bill

In paragraph 42(2)(b) of the second exposure draft, the Government carves out what harmful expression cannot be protected by the Bill. This further submission simply asks that this clause work both ways to operate as a shield.

⁸ Executive Council of Australian Jewry, Submission to Parliamentary Inquiry into Freedom of Speech, 2016.

A new civil remedy could make it unlawful to engage in conduct 'that would, or is likely to, harass, threaten, seriously intimidate or vilify' a person or group of persons on the grounds of their religious belief or activity. This higher threshold imposes a consequence for speech that endangers innocent people, whilst not recreating blasphemy laws.

In our original Joint Submission, we acknowledged the divisive debate around section 18C and made clear that it was not our intention to re-open that debate.

Currently in half the state jurisdictions and at a national level, there is no civil remedy. In the online sphere, where determining correct jurisdiction is a clear hurdle to justice, a national civil remedy is vital.

From a functionality perspective, the Bill is an appropriate home for a shield against vilification on the grounds of a person's faith (or lack of). It can be achieved in the Bill in a fairly straightforward matter, using standard processes of complaint and conciliation that would be used under any other discrimination clause in the Bill.

Possible wording for an anti-vilification shield

- 1) A person must not, on the ground of the religious belief or activity of another person or class of persons, engage in conduct that would, or is likely to, harass, threaten, seriously intimidate or vilify that other person or class of persons.

Note: "engage in conduct" includes use of the internet or e-mail to publish or transmit statements or other material.

- 2) For the purposes of sub-section (1), conduct— (a) may be constituted by a single occasion or by a number of occasions over a period of time; and
- 3) A person does not contravene subsection (1) if the person establishes that the person's conduct was engaged in reasonably and in good faith—

- (a) in the performance, exhibition or distribution of an artistic work; or
 - (b) in the course of any statement, publication, discussion or debate made or held, or any other conduct engaged in, for any genuine academic, artistic, religious or scientific purpose; or
 - (c) in making or publishing a fair and accurate report of any event or matter of public interest.
- (4) (a) A person does not contravene sub-section (1) if the person establishes that the person engaged in the conduct in circumstances that may reasonably be taken to indicate that the parties to the conduct desire it to be heard or seen only by themselves.
- (b) Sub-section (4a) does not apply in relation to conduct in any circumstances in which the parties to the conduct ought reasonably to expect that it may be heard or seen by someone else.

As noted in the earlier joint submission, the above proposed provision employs the threshold language used by the Government in clause 42(2)(b) of the Bill. Inciting hatred and violence sets a higher bar than section 18C of the *Racial Discrimination Act* in recognition of the need to provide scope for religious criticism and debate. This threshold connects to the policy imperative of minimising risk and endangerment of people.

This wording also distinguishes between criticism or slander of religion, and vilification of people. Accordingly, it cannot operate akin to past blasphemy laws.

Concern regarding indirect discrimination clause

There are concerns that the reasonableness defence for indirect discrimination in the proposed Bill is not adequately defined to allow,

for example, fair protection for Muslim females not being allowed to modify a work or school uniform.

The second exposure draft sets out a proportionality test, which regards the nature and extent of disadvantage; how proportionate the disadvantage is to the outcome sought by those imposing the condition; and the feasibility of reducing or mitigating the disadvantage.

This proportionality test steps down from the standard set in employment law, and also in international law, which only permits such limitations on manifestation of religious belief which are established by law and which are “necessary” to ensure public safety, order, health or morals, or the fundamental rights of others (ICCPR Art 18).

One option is to move away from the proportionality test and instead consider whether reasonable adjustment or accommodation could have been made. The Government may wish to consider replacing the following clauses:

(a) the nature and extent of the disadvantage resulting from the imposition, or proposed imposition, of the condition, requirement or practice;

(b) the feasibility of overcoming or mitigating the disadvantage;

c) whether the disadvantage is proportionate to the result sought by the person who imposes, or proposes to impose, the condition, requirement or practice;

with

(a) the nature and extent of the disadvantage resulting from the imposition, or proposed imposition, of the condition, requirement or practice;

(b) whether reasonable adjustments or reasonable accommodation could be made to the requirement, condition or practice to reduce the disadvantage caused, including the availability of an alternative requirement, condition or practice that would achieve the result sought by the person imposing, or

*proposing to impose, the requirement, condition or practice but would result in less disadvantage.*⁹

Religious freedom and safety for all?

As we approach the anniversary of Christchurch, it is asked: what has changed, what will change?

Hate speech embeds twin messages:

The first message is to victims and says, '[d]on't be fooled into thinking you are welcome here'; the second is to the rest of society saying, '[w]e know some of you agree that these people are not wanted here... know that you are not alone... there are enough of us around to make sure these people are not welcome... [and] to draw attention to what these people are really like'.¹⁰

The increasingly public acts of hatred cited in the Charles Sturt University's *Islamophobia in Australia Report*¹¹ demonstrated that the social stigma attached to this form of antisocial behaviour is disappearing.

The Parramatta incident, where a woman of Islamic faith, 38 weeks pregnant, was brutally assaulted in a café by a complete stranger, underline the very real consequences to public safety and order.

It is incumbent on decision-makers to consider the impact on the next generation of Australian youth, Muslim and otherwise; on community resilience and social cohesion.

⁹ This wording is derived from the Equal Opportunity Act 2010 (Vic) sect 9 (e).

¹⁰ Jeremy Waldron, *The Harm in Hate Speech* (Harvard University Press, 2012) 2-3, quoted in Dr Andre Oboler, 'Legal Doctrines Applied to Online Hate Speech(2014) ANZCompuLawJl 4.

¹¹ Dr Derya Iner (ed), *Islamophobia in Australia Report II* (2017-2018). Sydney: Charles Sturt University and ISRA, 2019. See also: Dr Derya Iner (ed), *Islamophobia in Australia 2014-2016*. Sydney: Charles Sturt University and ISRA, 2017.

Summary of Recommendations

1. The Bill presents a unique and appropriate opportunity to set a legal and policy standard in an area where legal uncertainty is contributing to significant private and public harm. The proposed civil remedy provides a practical form of recourse against extreme hate rhetoric, as well as a form of public reassurance – as demonstrated by the civil remedy that has been a considerable source of strength to Australian Jews in their quest to banish extreme antisemitism from the mainstream. The Government is asked to seriously consider the implications of not acting at this time.
2. A modification to the reasonableness defence to indirect discrimination that places the focus on reasonable accommodation and adjustment rather than the current proportionality test is also necessary to avoid the diminution of protection already articulated in employment law and international law.
3. We are aware of the position put forward by the Australian Council of Human Rights Authorities, which supports the recommendation of Dr Sarah Moulds, to introduce the Bill in two stages in order to allow certain parts of the Bill to be referred for more detailed examination. If this path is chosen in the future, it is requested that our proposal for an anti-vilification shield be actioned in the Bill that passes immediately, rather than referred for future consideration. The insecurity faced by Australian Muslims requires an urgent response.
4. The undersigned organisations also implore the Government to work with the Australian Muslim community specifically in regards to the Online Safety Act¹², and to support a channel for this community as a key affected stakeholder in the upcoming work of the GIFCT¹³. One of key objectives of these interactions is to

¹² Australian Government Department of Communications and the Arts, Online Safety Legislative Reform: Discussion Paper, December 2019.

¹³ Global internet forum to counter terrorism, <https://www.gifct.org>.

ensure that social media companies include prejudice-based narratives, used as mobilisation frames within far right extremist movements (see Figure 1), within their definition of hate speech, and have effective measures in place for handling repeat offenders.

5. It is noted that the joint government industry Taskforce to Combat Terrorist and Extreme Violent Material Online¹⁴ formed in the wake of Christchurch did not engage with legal representatives from targeted communities to acquire a bottom-up perspective on the effectiveness of current criminal laws. This engagement is crucial and an effective process needs to be established to bring together this advice. It is *not* satisfactory for police to argue that they know the issues from their quarterly reference groups or community engagement work. A proper policy dialogue is requested.

¹⁴ Above n 13, p 16. The Taskforce has already published its findings.

Schedule 1:

List of signatories to this submission

Australian National Imams Council (ANIC)
Australian Federation of Islamic Councils (AFIC) - Muslims Australia
Australian Muslim Advocacy Network (AMAN)
Abu Hanifah Institute NSW
AIM VIC
AISA (Milli Gorus) VIC
Al Salaam Islamic Society WA
Al-Bayan Institute NSW
Al-Hidayah Center WA
Al-Khalil Mosque SA
Al-Taqwa Mosque VIC
Alquds Centre NSW
AMSSA (Somali) VIC
Arabic Community Association of WA WA
Ararat Islamic Welfare Association Inc VIC
Ashabul Kahf NSW
Aswj Auburn NSW
Aswj Liverpool NSW
Aswj Revesby NSW
Aswj SE - Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah, South East. VIC
ASWJ Sydney NSW
Auburn Islamic Community Centre NSW
Australian Burmese Rohingya Association VIC
Australian Institute of Islamic Culture (AIIC) NSW
Australian Islamic Cultural Centre NSW
Australian Islamic House (AIH) NSW
Australian Islamic Mission (AIM) NSW
Australian Islamic Museum VIC
Australian Muslim Women NSW
Australian Youth Community Centre VIC
Bankstown Masjid (IFAM) NSW
Bendigo Islamic Community Centre VIC
Benevolence VIC

Blacktown Mosque NSW
Board of Imams VIC (BOIV)
Bosnian Islamic Council NSW
Brotherhood Gym NSW
Carramar Mosque NSW
Centre for Islamic Thought and Education SA
Community Academy NSW
Council of Imams NSW
Council of Imams QLD
Council of Imams SA
Council of Imams WA
CYC Campbelltown Youth Centre NSW
Daar Al Muddathir NSW
Daar Ibn Abbas NSW
Dar Alarqam NSW
Dawah Centre WA
Deccan Australian Welfare Association NSW
Dee why Masjid NSW
East Turkistan Australian Association SA
Elssidiq Heidelberg Mosque VIC
Essence of Life, Wollongong NSW
FAMSY VIC
Fawkner Masjid VIC
FITYAH NSW
Furqan Islamic Association of Western Australia
Gippsland Australian Muslim Community Inc VIC
GIYC, Global Islamic Youth Centre, Liverpool NSW
Granville Youth Association NSW
Green Valley Mosque NSW
Greenacre Mussallah NSW
Guildford Mosque NSW
Gungahlin Mosque ACT
Hills District Muslim Society (HDMS) NSW
Hume Islamic Youth Centre - HIYC VIC
ICWA Islamic Centre Western Australia
IERA VIC
IISCA - Islamic Information & Support Centre Australia VIC

IMCG Dandenong VIC
Indonesian Muslim Community of Victoria VIC
Introduction to Islam Foundation NSW
IPDC VIC
Iqra'Academy WA
IQRO NSW
Iraqi Muslim Association NSW
Islamic Association of Monash Mosque VIC
Islamic Association of Western Suburbs Sydney NSW
Islamic Council of Christmas Island CI
Islamic Council of NT
Islamic Council of QLD
Islamic Council of VIC (ICV)
Islamic Council SA
Islamic Council WA
Islamic Education and Welfare Association of Dandenong Inc VIC
Islamic information centre SA
Islamic Malay Australian Association (NSW) NSW
Islamic Practice and Dawah Circle NSW
Islamic Schools Association of Australia NSW
Islamic Society of Darwin NT
Islamic Society of Geelong VIC
Islamic society of Gold Coast QLD
Islamic Society of Melbourne Eastern Region VIC
Islamic Society of Queanbeyan NSW/ACT
Islamic Society of SA
Islamic Society of Victoria
Islamic Women Association of Australia QLD
Islamic Women's Welfare Association (IWWA) NSW
Kuraby mosque QLD
Lebanese Muslim Association
Madinah (Mercy Mission) VIC
Malaysian Muslim Solidarity (ISMA). NSW
Markaz Imam Ahmad NSW
Masjid Al-Sunnah NSW
Masjid Alnoor NSW
Masjid Alsalam NSW
Masjid As Salam, Berkeley NSW
Masjid Ibrahim WA

MCYAS - Minchinbury Mosque NSW
MLN (Muslim Legal Network) VIC
Muslim Charity Community of WA
Muslim Defence League WA
Muslim Women Association SA
Muslim Women Association (MWA) NSW
Muslim Women Welfare and Advocacy WA
Muslim Youth Support Centre Western Australia
MyCentre VIC
National Zakat Foundation NSW
Newcastle Mosque NSW
Newport Mosque VIC
Noorul Islam Society WA
Onepath NSW
Palmerston Mosque Darwin NT
Parramatta Islamic Society NSW
Peace International WA
Perth Mosque WA
Pillars Of Guidance Community Center VIC
Quakers Hill NSW
Qubaa Mosque NSW
Rockhampton Mosque QLD
Roselands Mosque NSW
Slacks creek mosque QLD
Somali Muslim Association NSW
Southport Masjid, QLD
Spence Mosque ACT
Sydney City Masjid NSW
Tasmanian Muslim Association
Tempe Mosque NSW
Toowoomba mosque QLD
Townsville Islamic Society QLD
UMA Centre NSW
United Muslim Migrants Association VIC
United Muslims NSW Council
United Muslims of Brisbane QLD
United Sri Lankan Muslim Association of Australia VIC
USMAA VIC
Werribee Islamic Centre VIC