

JUSTICE COMMITTEE

HATE CRIME AND PUBLIC ORDER (SCOTLAND) BILL

SUBMISSION FROM SCOTT HADDEN

I am writing to you today, to express my opinions on the Hate Crime & Public Order Bill. There are multiple reasons why this bill should, under no circumstances, pass through government and become legislation.

Firstly, the language used to describe the additions and alterations to current legislation is deliberately vague, this will lead to the law being used and abused frequently, if not exclusively, by individuals with a vendetta or ideological bias. The concept of "stirring up hatred" is one with such a loosely applicable and wide-spanning definition, that all that is required to define "hatred" is the perception of an individual, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, that an action is done with contempt or malthought. Such accusations are made especially frequently in the United States and their current political climate, and are mostly dismissed as foolish claims. I can only hope that such accusations will, likewise, not be taken seriously here, should this bill pass. However, given some past cases regarding "hate speech", I can't say I believe they will be.

Secondly, the passing of such a bill would create a law in which people are not allowed to fairly criticise based on an accurate measurement of their characteristics. For example, it would be considered illegal to say that an elderly person is poor at using technology, because of their age and being from a generation for which current technology was within the realm of science fiction, in spite of how such a statement is, from an objective standpoint, true. This means that the act is, in some instances, in stark opposition to objective truth.

Thirdly and finally, I'd like to make a comment on the notion that this bill was made by "consulting the Scottish people". This is false. Reliable persons inside the seminar where this "consultation" happened mentioned that the only people consulted about the content and writing of this bill were representatives of groups that were already wanting this bill passed. This is primarily due to their pre-existing biases, that being the inclusion of Misogyny and exclusion of Misandry from the bill, thus creating a scenario where a man can be sentenced for his acts against a woman, whereas a woman will not be sentenced for her acts against a man, as well as making religion a characteristic that cannot be criticised, for example, the leader of the support for the bill, not wanting Islam, his religion and that of his father, being criticised for practices that most people in Western society find distateful, if not downright inhuman.

Thank you for taking the time to read this e-mail.

Regards
A concerned citizen
Scott Hadden
7 July 2020