

JUSTICE COMMITTEE

HATE CRIME AND PUBLIC ORDER (SCOTLAND) BILL

SUBMISSION FROM E THORNTON

Dear Sir/Madam or Other

introduction

I can only offer a layman's point of view.

That its simplistic language and arguments will be met with clarity.

It is my hope that this will be seen as that and not as uneducated, offensive or sarcastic.

To the best of my knowledge, This is my first time responding to a proposal of the Scottish Government.

General

That it has made it so far with so little general public scrutiny, press coverage, debate or advertisement is disappointing at best.

In the introduction it has the line "Once the Bill Has Passed" inferring that this response is pointless.

To unpack the bill in its entirety IS NOT possible as it defies logical debate. It seems to be an emotional debate. This is best left to church not state.

If the previous laws are fragmented, confusing, not user friendly. Then revisit them or you are building on a bad foundation.

There is no rush and clear light on it will simplify it.

This seems to be more an exercise in redefining the understanding and use of common language. eg sex/gender/equality.

It already uses sex in the wrong context.

In short I find;

1. Confusing with no possibility of argument against it without being bulled or labelled. Then having the very laws used against you. Its definitions are circular in nature not definitive. In short school child level of argument.

2. It seems to requires NO evidence at any level. This could lead to an interaction with the police and a charge OR the recording of a non crime.

3. It fails to protect the majority from being harassed under the law by a minority. It seems to puts one group above another. This is hardly equality and will stir up the very thing it is to prevent. This may be confused with privilege BUT the greatest privilege a race, group or individual may have, is equal in the eyes of the law. This bill fails to do so.

4. It dose not protect men against misandry.

5. When accused. There is no defence I can see in a court of law. It would be an excises in perspective. You can not defend in court. A hostile level of conviction that knows what the accused was thinking and doing.

6 It will kill all debate within the home and hearth and leave it in the professional level and fully restrict it. This is very dangerous.

7. Overreach of Government sectarianism is a good example. It was fading out until it became a Law/Statue.

Summary

I find the implications of this proposed Bill terrifying. This is not an understatement.

I can not find the words to express it fully.

With what is going on in America and The UK with talk of segregation of the races is not good.

This Bill is an empowerment of that ideology.

This Bill has the possibility of future abuse stamped all over it.

A little bit of history shows this.

Conclusion

This Bill be rejected in full. The underlying laws be revisited and clarified by judges not political entities or groups.

Pressure groups are very loud and ideologically driven the court should not be.

E Thornton
19 July 2020