

JUSTICE COMMITTEE

HATE CRIME AND PUBLIC ORDER (SCOTLAND) BILL

SUBMISSION FROM G CUNANE

I have also read the Bill on this page however it involves a lot of legal jargon which I'm not sure about

<https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/CurrentCommittees/115036.aspx>

so I'm going by the number system on this page instead

<https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/CurrentCommittees/115038.aspx>

8. The words "strongly dislike" and "hate" are extremely commonly interchangeable words.

If you let this bill pass then you will be criminalising people for expressing strongly disliking particular behaviors or topics. Bad Behaviors should be determined by the free market of ideas.

Some behaviors are totally unacceptable in the modern day and it is necessary to talk about them in order to prevent them from occurring e.g violent crime/police brutality...

... (**9** if police brutality does exist specifically against the black community it is important to talk about it without jumping conclusions and falsely accusing a black person or any other person is stirring up hate against people from other racial backgrounds. With that said, Scotland is about 92% white so it is no wonder so many high end jobs are filled with white people. even if you call me a racist by stating that fact, even if I am wrong on anything I am willing to listen and improve, but it is impossible to learn if I can't be legally be allowed to talk about it regardless what the SNP thinks about the topic, taking away my freedom of speech is regressive not progressive) ...

...murder/rape/ pedophiles taking advantage of the LGBT community to get access to under age children or the Rotherham/British grooming rape gang scandal that is being currently processed by the Home Office but we can't talk about without false accusations of racism and death threats despite the specific demographic tends to be from middle eastern countries or from Islam which isn't a race but an ideology etc.

The only way this bill is existing is because of freedom of speech which is the direct thing that it seems to be trying to destroy, so it is hypocritical but worse creating a "deadlock" that prevents the future generations of cultures that are going to exist to make amendments if it turns out to unintentionally become destructive for society due to the nature of this bill actually changing culture itself to promote people to not stand up for themselves if they are wrong in a discussion and become even more reliant/dependent on the government to be the hero they need from their perspective to swoop down and save the day against the horrible horrible people that said the wrong gender pronoun just because they are that special kind of person that likes to visually appear as something they clearly aren't biologically existing, **(If I am wrong**

about the biology then I should still be legally aloud to at least talk about it and witness the opportunity for my opinion to be changed.)

In a modern Liberal democracy society anybody should be allowed to visually appear however they like and I will defend to the grave people's right to dress however they like. I am against tyrannical coercion to prevent themselves from doing so, however what this bill is doing is preventing people from even having a discussion about the issues regarding forced change of what is culturally acceptable/preferable.

Unfortunately it seems more common than ever that a lot of fully grown adults act like unstable children and cause tantrums over this issue.

Beecause they can be one of the lucky identities that are within the category of "intersectionality" they have the ability to use the government as a shield against what could be classed as genuine criticism over the legimemacy of things like gender disphoria and wether or not permantly cutting off genetalia and preventing the ability to create children is the best option for a demograhic that is already vulnerable of about 40% rate of suicide.

My intent is not to mock people that want to transition the appearance of their gender but to genuinely help them to get to the stage that they can be mentally independant to make their own decisions and rule their own lives without their friends rally them on too early into making poor decisions that would lead a demographic which are already extremely depressed into even further depression that most likely will drive them to suicide, We as a society need absolute freedom of speach to be able to ask these people what is specifically is wrong so we can figure out how to impove their lives, Even if I can't relate towards them I still want to care for them and hate speach laws are making it even harder to achieve the dificult but necesary conversations. I don't care how much they are upset over me for attempting these conversations with them suicide should never be an option for anyone.

3. Genuine criticism is Not the same as harassment, Genuine criticism is when someone simply disagrees with someone else and feels the need to express that disagreement in order to create a better society by solving problems. Whilst harassment is when someone intentionally is stalking someone else for the sake of being creepy.

If someone sends too many messages within a small period of time then the receiver is free to turn off notifications and simply not message back. My goal is to live in a world where every interaction is consensual and this bill forcibly exiles people out of important conversations against the individuals will.

Outsourcing the job of handling disagreements/arguments to the government is going to be an even larger unnecessary job than the people who decided on this bill will unintentionally expect since it will criminalise crude jokes that are misinterpreted to be intentionally harmful which is filling up the courts.

Violent Crimes are more important than destroyed feelings.

I agree verbal abuse does lead to damage of mental health, but unfortunately going down the path of believing all victims when it comes to whether or not their mental health is top priority is a waste of time compared to physical/ visual casualties of violent crime because there is objective proof of damage from the incident.

Everyone says things within their lifetime that they regret or can be taken out of context, if you create a system that punishes people when they make jokes then it disincentivizes people from expressing their grievances that might actually be legitimate so you are rewarding people for taking advantage of the legal system in order to grant themselves a power grab over people whom may have expressed their legitimate grievances in the form of comedy.

7. The reason most people express their grievances in the form of comedy is because it takes the edge off and allows them to feel comfortable about the topics without having a mental breakdown and crying over them, There is an extremely common phrase "if I don't laugh then I will cry" this is true almost all the time. You should not ban people from making edgy jokes just because a few bad people could take advantage of humor to radicalise people. I always believed that the best way to de-radicalise people is allow them to speak and let the free market of ideas determine whether or not those opinions do evil things, everyone has their own individual agency to control their actions **4.** (except from children because they haven't had real world experiences yet and legally mentally disadvantaged or people which have legally have alsimers or other brain related illnesses.)

6. Individuals should be liable for their own behavior not for other people's behavior. individual justice is the purest form of justice. Guilt by association whether that is associated by friends or associated by similar genetic identity is evil. I fully believe investigation based on association is necessary to solve crimes but that is not the same thing as punishment.

I believe if the government has any sort of purpose at all then it is the purpose of preserving rights not arbitrarily granting people rights based on identity that they are born with and can't control. If the government does go down the route of granting rights based on identity then it is not going to treat everyone equally under the law but instead allows government backed privileges.

The difference between a free market company and a government organisation like the police is that if you don't like a product that a free market is providing you have the option to not buy it, whilst when it comes to a government organisation like the police you are forced to fund a system through taxes even if you disagree with it or feel like it is corrupt.

Many people see democracy is an alternative to services based on wealth because poor people are unfairly treated, however there are many downsides to democracy in my opinion are the following:

- Forced conformity to majority opinion even if the majority opinion isn't scientifically accurate.
- It allows everyone the same bidding despite the fact that the majority of people are not enthusiastic towards political topics.
- Democracy does not cater towards the needs of minority identities because in order to win an election you need a majority vote.
- If resources are distributed based on popular demand and not materialistic demand that consequently means that resource distribution is less efficient and incentivises people to not figure out what industries are useful for the best outcomes for society and what outcomes are not beneficial for society.

If I say something and someone misinterprets what I said then it is the job of both of us to come together and attempt to figure out where our differences lie on a particular topic. One of the last things I want in my lifetime is to be imprisoned or fined based on the interpretation of my opinion instead of my physical actions that I have committed and stuck in the trap of not being successful due to things that I might have regretted in the past and the legal system always voting against my dissenting narrative that I am trying to express.

Rehabilitation is necessary, condemning someone over what they have said in the past for the rest of their life is barbaric.

The reason people may vote against my narrative most likely is because they have never heard it before. The reason they have never heard it before is because I am constantly being discriminated against not because of my race or gender or age but simply because I hold a different opinion than them.

So it becomes a vicious cycle where the best ideas are unintentionally pushed aside.

The road to hell is paved with good intentions- John Ray.

I strongly believe that most time if the government tries to micro manage disputes it actually escalates confrontations further than necessary, if they left the dispute alone then it most likely will be de escalated by the next day and people will improve over time. We need to create a culture that encourages people not to get upset over mean words because at the end the day they are just mean words.

10. People who personally hold religious/atheist views should be able to express them no matter what. I am personally "Agnostic" which means I am impartial on the question whether or not god exists, and I believe that is the most progressive way you can run government since it is also impartial to anyone that is a citizen of Scotland, there shouldn't be any bias to any gender or race or any other identity in courts.

Thank you so much for allowing me to email you, hopefully I can receive a message back on how this is getting on.

G Cunane
[07 July 2020]