

JUSTICE COMMITTEE

HATE CRIME AND PUBLIC ORDER (SCOTLAND) BILL

SUBMISSION FROM DAVID WHYTE

I hereby give my response to the proposed Bill being put forward.

1. No, I do not think there's a need for this bill; indeed, I think our existing hate crime laws need ripped up and started over. In it's existing state, the possibility for manipulation of context is extraordinary, being dependent only of the perception of the aggrieved complainant. This is an insane position on which to judge whether or nay a true hate crime has been committed, being so easily manipulable by a complainant. The proposed changes only further allow for such manipulation.

2. I refer to my previous answer.

3. Here, we see an incredibly sexist aspect of these proposed changes, whereby misogyny shall be punishable, yet misandry shall not. This demonstrates, I believe, that this Bill has been shaped more by the strengths of certain lobbying groups, rather than via a balanced concensus of the people of Scotland. Frankly? This alone is almost grounds for this Bill to be rejected utterly.

4. I'm inclined to agree that ageism is an increasing issue in society, and would welcome changes to strengthen the law against such instances.

5. Sectarianism should remain seperate from any hate crime law. A lot of what passes in law as 'sectarianism' on paper, exists only as banter, often between friends who happen to support different football teams. True, dark instances of said are rare, and too easily confused on paper with harmless banter. Again, context is everything.

6. Who defines what entails 'stirring up hatred'? This is another example of a massively manipulable charge, where meaning and context can be put to one side entirely. A nonsense.

7. 'Threatening and abusive' are more easily recognisable and defineable, though I maintain, easily twisted. 'Insulting'? We are all insulted daily, and backbones are of more need than this proposed addition. Indeed, much of this Bill technically insults me.

8. An individual should have the freedom of expression to utterly criticise any Government, Religion, aspect of Religion, Monarchy, or other organisation in a position of influence and power over a populous. This should be set in stone.

9. No, I disagree, again, on the basis of potential manipulation of base context.

10. It matters not. Whether or nay you remove the offence of Blasphemy, it is already being punished under existing hate crime laws, and further potentially, with this Bill, just in different ways.

Regards,

David Whyte
[08 July 2020]