PRINT SCHEDULE

List of potential human rights violations in the National Response to Islamophobia

Sixty foreseeable Covenant and related-instrument conflicts if the Special Envoy report (12 September 2025) or the Australian Government response (18 July 2026) is implemented using a broad or undefined concept of "Islamophobia." These are potential violations, not court findings. Protect persons. Do not manage ideas.

How to use this sheet. For each implementing measure — taskforce rule, grant guideline, training module, curriculum change, platform duty, visa decision, parliamentary code, TEQSA condition, AHPRA action, AFP tasking — walk the sixty rows. Mark the row engaged or not engaged. One red cell on an engaged row blocks approval.

#	Instrument / article	Potential violation — question the decision-maker must ask	Cleared only if	Potential violation crystallises if
1	**ICCPR 19 — expression**	Does the measure use an undefined term ("Islamophobia," "narrative," "sentiment," "any form") as the trigger for a penalty, removal, funding condition or professional consequence?	The operative term is defined in foreseeable language confined to violence, threats, unlawful discrimination or Art. 20(2) incitement.	The trigger is undefined or includes "hatred of Islam" as a religion.
2	**ICCPR 19 — expression**	Does it restrict criticism of Islamic doctrine, history, law, political Islam, jihadist ideology or foreign policy?	No restriction, or the only restriction is Art. 20(2) incitement assessed under Rabat.	Criticism of ideas is treated as harm, misconduct or intolerance.
3	**ICCPR 19 — expression**	Does an inquiry, taskforce or review examine media, film or political discourse as a "driver" of hostility?	Terms of reference expressly protect journalism, academic work and parliamentary speech.	Political speech or journalism is an object of official investigation.
4	**ICCPR 19 / 25**	Do parliamentary behaviour codes or IPSC processes treat debate on immigration, integration, sharia, counter-terrorism or Gaza as "Islamophobic behaviour"?	Codes contain an express carve-out for political speech that is not Art. 20(2) incitement.	An MP or staffer can be investigated for a policy argument.
5	**ICCPR 19 — expression**	Do training modules for MPs, APS, police, teachers or lawyers require staff to treat specified arguments as illegitimate prejudice?	Training addresses violence and unlawful discrimination only, and states that criticism of Islam is lawful.	Completion or affirmation of an official narrative is a condition of work.
6	**ICCPR 19 — platforms**	Will eSafety or a digital duty of care remove "Islamophobic material" below the Rabat incitement threshold?	Removal is limited to illegal content or Art. 20(2) incitement; communal offence is not the test.	Offence to a religion, stereotype or "narrative" is enough to take content down.
7	**ICCPR 19 — press**	Are grants used to monitor media or to "counter Islamophobic narratives"?	Grants do not condition funding on suppressing lawful speech or on "positive representation."	The State funds monitoring of one side of a public argument.
8	**ICCPR 19(2) — receive information**	Can a visa or film restriction exclude a foreign speaker or work because it criticises Islam?	Character or classification decisions rest on incitement or ordinary criminality, with reviewable reasons.	Criticism of a religion is a bar to entry or to circulation.
9	**ICCPR 19 — campus**	Does TEQSA or the Student Ombudsman treat failure to adopt an envoy definition, or hosting a critical speaker, as non-compliance?	University duties are limited to unlawful discrimination and incitement; academic freedom is preserved.	Reading lists, protests or invited speakers are policed as Islamophobia.
10	**ICCPR 19 — arts**	Is arts or cultural funding conditioned on approved communal stories?	Funding is viewpoint-neutral as to religion.	Critical, satirical or ex-Muslim work is ineligible because of its viewpoint.
11	**ICCPR 19 / 17 — data**	Will a hate-crimes database or AFP portal log non-criminal speech as "Islamophobic hate"?	Only crimes are listed for enforcement. Non-crime incidents are not an enforcement list.	Lawful speech is catalogued as hate data.
12	**ICCPR 20(2) — incitement**	Does the measure collapse stereotype, satire, theology or foreign-policy argument into "incitement"?	Rabat six-part test is applied in writing: context, speaker, intent, content, extent, likelihood.	Prejudice or offence is treated as incitement.
13	**ICCPR 20(2) — incitement**	Are speaker and intent ignored (apostate, survivor, analyst treated as equivalent to a person urging violence)?	Speaker status and intent are recorded in every incitement assessment.	The identity of the target group replaces the Rabat factors.
14	**ICCPR 20(2) — equality of duty**	Is the incitement machinery built around one religion only?	The same incitement test applies to every religion and to non-belief.	Only anti-Muslim speech is administratively prioritised as incitement.
15	**ICCPR 18 — belief**	Is the purpose of the measure to change what people may think about a religion, rather than to stop assaults on persons?	The purpose is protection of persons from violence and unlawful discrimination.	The purpose is official management of beliefs about Islam.
16	**ICCPR 18 — dissenters**	Are apostates, reformers, Ahmadis, secular Muslims, Muslim feminists or LGBT Muslims coded as Islamophobic when they criticise doctrine?	Intra-Muslim and ex-Muslim dissent is expressly protected.	A peak-body narrative is treated as the community's only lawful voice.
17	**ICCPR 18 — compelled training**	Must a public servant, teacher or MP affirm an official account of Islam or of Islamophobia?	Training is informational, optional as to belief, and does not require affirmation.	Affirmation or "correct" answers on belief are a condition of office.

#	Instrument / article	Potential violation — question the decision-maker must ask	Cleared only if	Potential violation crystallises if
18	**ICCPR 18(4) — parents**	Does a school framework treat specified views of Islam or of the Middle East as intolerance that parents may not counter?	Parents can withdraw from or contest prescribed belief content; materials are published in draft.	A state account of a religion is taught as "tolerance" with no parental remedy.
19	**ICCPR 18 — official day**	Is observance of 15 March compelled in workplaces or schools?	Any recognition is voluntary and does not require speech or ritual.	Staff or students must participate in an official religious-political observance.
20	**ICCPR 26 / ICERD 1**	Does the measure treat Muslims as a racial group, or add a positive duty once so classified?	Religion is treated as religion. No RDA racialisation without a published compatibility statement.	Theological or political disagreement becomes "racial vilification."
21	**ICCPR 26 — grants**	Are grants, institutes, trauma protocols or leadership streams identity-exclusive without a tight, evidenced, time-limited justification?	Need is evidenced, the term is limited, and equivalent tools exist for other targeted groups.	Open-ended preferment on the ground of religion.
22	**ICCPR 26 / Constitution s 116**	Does APS recruitment or leadership design prefer Muslims or impose a religious test for office?	Hiring remains merit-based plus general non-discrimination. No religious test.	Soft quotas or religious preferment in public employment.
23	**ICCPR 26 — inquiries**	Is a commission of inquiry created for Islamophobia or anti-Palestinian/anti-Arab racism with no equivalent mandate for other documented hatreds?	Inquiry power is either general or justified by specific, published comparative evidence.	State investigative power is allocated by identity alone.
24	**ICCPR 26 / CEDAW**	Does "gender-conscious" design treat feminist analysis of religious gender rules as Islamophobia?	Women's equality analysis remains lawful. CEDAW Arts. 2, 5 and 16 are not subordinated.	Sex-based rights speech is recoded as religious hatred.
25	**ICCPR 25 — political rights**	Can advancement in the APS or a minister's office depend on internalising official Islamophobia training?	Political opinion is not a practical qualification for public service.	Viewpoint compliance is a condition of participation in public affairs.
26	**ICCPR 25 — elections**	Will publicly funded media or platforms filter one side of a live policy debate as hate during an electoral period?	Voters can still receive both sides of lawful policy argument.	One lawful side of a public controversy is administratively silenced.
27	**ICCPR 9 / 15 — liberty and legality**	Can AFP "social cohesion" or national-security teams task against non-criminal speech as a threat to cohesion?	Powers are used only for offences. Cohesion is not a substitute for a crime.	Security methods are used on lawful expression.
28	**ICCPR 14 — fair hearing**	Can AHPRA, a teaching regulator, a university or a workplace treat accusation as proof and deny contest of the definition?	The accused can contest the definition, the evidence and the penalty with equality of arms.	Complaint processes are one-way and the standard is circular.
29	**ICCPR 15 — no vague penalty**	Are livelihood, visa, registration or liberty consequences attached to "Islamophobia" without a foreseeable rule?	Every consequence is tied to a published, precise legal standard.	A person cannot know in advance what speech will cost them their job or visa.
30	**ICCPR 17 — privacy**	Does media-monitoring or a communications portal systematically observe online speech about Islam for official counter-narrative purposes?	Any collection has a clear criminal-law basis, retention limits and access rules.	Lawful political or religious speech is put under standing official watch.
31	**ICCPR 17 — reputation**	Will the State brand a journalist, academic or MP as a vector of Islamophobia without an incitement finding?	Official labels follow a fair process and a legal finding.	Reputational sanction is imposed by press release or training example.
32	**ICCPR 21 — assembly**	Are anti-Hamas, anti-theocracy, anti-sharia or pro-Israel assemblies treated as Islamophobic while the reverse is permitted?	The same assembly rules apply regardless of which side of a foreign conflict is being argued.	One geopolitical viewpoint is a condition of the right to assemble.
33	**ICCPR 22 — association**	Can a group be defunded or listed because its purpose is criticism of political Islam or support for apostates?	Listing and funding rules turn on violence or Art. 20(2) incitement, not on viewpoint about a religion.	Association is penalised for lawful dissent from religious orthodoxy.
34	**ICCPR 22 — compelled association**	Must a school, club or broadcaster join an official anti-Islamophobia framework to keep registration or funding?	Participation is voluntary.	Access to ordinary civic status is conditioned on joining the framework.
35	**ICCPR 27 — minorities**	Is Article 27 used as a sword against the majority's speech rather than as a shield for the minority's own practice?	Minority protection covers worship, language and communal life, not immunity of ideas from criticism.	Minority rights are cited to justify speech control.
36	**ICCPR 27 — intra-minority**	Does an official "Muslim community" voice erase intra-Muslim minorities?	Dissenting Muslims have equal standing in consultation.	Peak bodies monopolise the minority right.
37	**ICCPR 2 — remedy**	If accused of Islamophobia, does the person have a real judicial or independent path to test the definition against Arts. 18 and 19?	An effective remedy exists and the definition is justiciable.	The definition is official, circular and insulated from review.
38	**ICCPR 2 — attribution**	Are schools, universities, platforms, health regulators or broadcasters being used as enforcement arms?	Private restrictions required or incentivised by the State are treated as State acts and pass the legality tests.	The State outsources restriction and then denies responsibility.
39	**ICCPR 2 / 26 — distinction**	Is a denser administrative apparatus built for one religious identity than for other victims of religious hatred?	Any extra machinery is time-limited and justified by published comparative harm data.	Identity alone explains the extra machinery.

#	Instrument / article	Potential violation — question the decision-maker must ask	Cleared only if	Potential violation crystallises if
40	**ICCPR 6 — life / CT law**	Is the terrorist-act definition being altered to manage stigma rather than to fit evidence and protect life?	Any change improves Art. 6 protection without discriminatory Art. 2/26 effect, shown in a published compatibility statement.	The legal tool is blunted, or applied in a religiously discriminatory way, to manage image.
41	**ICESCR 6–7 — work**	Can a person be dismissed or barred from a profession for lawful speech about Islam?	Employment consequences attach only to violence, threats, unlawful discrimination or incitement.	A job or registration is lost for theology, history or politics.
42	**ICESCR 13 — education**	Does curriculum or early-childhood material replace open inquiry with an official account of Islam and "tolerance"?	Students may examine critical as well as affirmative sources. Academic freedom is intact.	Dissenting historical or theological material is treated as intolerance.
43	**ICESCR 13 — universities**	Must an institution "demonstrate commitment" to addressing Islamophobia as a regulatory condition?	Regulation tracks unlawful discrimination only.	A loyalty condition is attached to higher-education registration.
44	**ICESCR 15 — science and culture**	Is research or art on Islamist movements, integration, grooming or sex-based rights inside religious communities chilled by funding rules?	Scientific and artistic freedom is expressly preserved.	Those inquiries are treated as Islamophobic by design.
45	**CRC 13 / 17 — child speech**	Are books, speakers or news stories put off-limits to children as Islamophobic?	Restrictions meet CRC tests and do not hide lawful public debate from older children.	The State curates a single account of a religion for the child.
46	**CRC 14 — child belief**	Does school training catechise a state view of a religion?	Education informs; it does not compel belief. Parental liberty under ICCPR 18(4) is respected.	The child is trained that specified conclusions about Islam are forbidden.
47	**CRC 29 — aims of education**	Is "tolerance" taught in a way that blocks teaching of documented human-rights problems in Islamic law or in particular states?	Tolerance and critical human-rights education both remain possible.	Article 29 is applied in one direction only.
48	**CRC 2 — child equality**	Do Muslim pupils receive structured protection that Jewish, Christian, Hindu or apostate children facing religious hostility do not?	Protection of children from religious hostility is available on the same legal test.	Child protection is allocated by which religion is involved.
49	**CEDAW 2, 5, 16**	Does the measure treat analysis of guardianship, inheritance, testimony rules, compelled covering or honour-based abuse as Islamophobia?	Those analyses remain lawful. Partners are not limited to organisations that deny the issues.	Women's-equality speech is recoded as religious hatred.
50	**CRPD — health and capacity**	Does "culturally safe" care stop a clinician addressing a religious practice that harms a disabled patient?	The patient's health, capacity and freedom from exploitation prevail over communal sensitivity.	A communal rule overrides the patient's CRPD rights.
51	**ICERD 4**	Is a racial-hate regime being exported onto religious controversy?	Art. 4 is confined to racial hatred and read with freedom of expression (CERD GR 35).	Blasphemy control is smuggled through racial-hate law.
52	**1981 Declaration / UDHR 18–19**	Does the measure protect a religion from criticism rather than a person from discrimination?	Persons are protected. Ideas are not.	"Defamation of religions" is revived under a domestic label.
53	**ILO C111 — employment**	Is political opinion critical of Islam, or religious identity, used as a ground of adverse treatment or preferment at work?	C111 grounds are respected in both directions: no penalty for opinion, no religious preferment.	Opinion or religion decides who is hired, promoted or dismissed.
54	**Constitution s 116**	Does any Commonwealth rule establish a religion, impose a religious observance, or impose a religious test for office?	No establishment, no compelled observance, no religious test.	Public office or public money is tied to a religious-political creed.
55	**Systemic — chill (GC 34)**	Taken together, do training + codes + grants + eSafety + TEQSA + AHPRA + AFP portal + database cause speakers to self-censor before they speak?	Each component is independently necessary and the stack still leaves core speech free.	The stack is the restriction, even with no conviction.
56	**Systemic — official truth**	Do a research institute, storytelling grants, curriculum, national day, envoy office and index add up to a state-sponsored knowledge system?	Dissenting empirics remain fundable and teachable.	Disagreement with the official account is treated as denial or hate.
57	**Systemic — imported frame**	Is Islamophobia bundled with anti-Palestinian and anti-Arab racism so that a live war becomes domestic race law?	Foreign-policy argument remains ordinary political speech.	One side of a war is a protected racial characteristic; the other is hate.
58	**Systemic — children as surface**	Are early childhood, schools and under-16 online rules the main place the policy is enforced, where Arts. 18 and 19 are hardest to exercise?	Adult political speech is not laundered through child-protection rules.	The next generation is the enforcement surface for an adult speech policy.
59	**Systemic — two regimes**	Do parallel envoy architectures create two inconsistent speech rules (for example on Israel, Gaza, Islamism and antisemitism)?	One lawful standard applies to every community.	A person caught between the two regimes loses Arts. 19 and 26 at once.
60	**Residual legality test**	If every row above is marked not-engaged or pass, does the measure still fail legality, legitimate aim, or necessity?	A written compatibility note on the file shows the restriction is prescribed by law, necessary and proportionate.	The measure is useful, popular or funded—but not necessary. Withdraw it.

Clearance rule. Sixty rows. One red cell on an engaged row blocks approval. "Not engaged" must be written, not assumed. Keep the completed sheet on the agency file with the measure.