

JUSTICE COMMITTEE

HATE CRIME AND PUBLIC ORDER (SCOTLAND) BILL

SUBMISSION FROM GARY WATSON

I think a public consultation is essential because the majority don't realise the common man's freedoms are being removed in a discriminatory manner. However, the quiet way this is being conducted is to tick boxes and give the appearance of listening to the people in my opinion. The SNP's policies are in no way a reflection of what the common man wants as can be seen by the Labour Party's massive defeat in England. If Scots woke up to what the SNP is really doing and it's similarities with English Labour they would be voted out.

Firstly I believe that the hate crime laws should be abolished. I believe that creating protected groups is a lie to satisfy lobbyist groups who have achieved a supremacist, elevated status above the common man with other groups tagged on. Our justice system should be blind to who you are and existing laws covering discrimination and threatening behaviour contained relevant protection equally already. That is what real equality is. Decide what constitutes a crime and prosecute accordingly. If you rank the identity of the victim, relate the crime to them and then prosecute according to the identity of the victim this is not equality. This is discriminatory (sharia esque) and a mockery of what was great about Scottish law and society.

Adding mysogyny proves how one sided and non sensical this approach is. This is a cynical move to satisfy radical feminists threatened by GRA reforms. GRA reforms that ignore science and favour feelings. Women should be protected but making mysogyny a crime is ridiculous. We have a justice secretary who does not understand equality of opportunity and the tyranny that comes with aiming for equality of outcome.

Removing "insulting" makes sense because who decides what is insulting? Free speech is a pillar of Scotland and the cornerstone of the development of the western world. It requires that people are free to express themselves and open to critical argument short of threatening behaviour. It's our duty to seek out both sides of an argument in order to form an opinion. The growing movement of universities to deplatform speakers they don't agree with is a national disgrace. These universities should teach the value of critical thought. This emphasis on having a view over knowing what you are talking about is irresponsible. If they cannot perform that basic balanced function it's time we moved funding to technical colleges and apprenticeships to broaden skills the country can actually use. Judicially, we've seen examples where context has not been considered and obvious injustice meted out by the Scottish government already so I wouldn't trust our current system to apply impartiality regarding what constitutes an insult especially if juries are removed.

Regarding racially aggravated harassment the current administration's recent (non) debate was a national embarrassment. There's a collective failure to understand basic history regarding the universality of slavery. It should be taught as a worldwide issue with a worldwide history. Marxists had Gulags, North Africans enslaved whites, Romans enslaved more than the atlantic trade in 20 years than Europe in 200 years, the East African trade continued to serve Arabian markets for over 100 years after

whites abolished it etc etc. Racism is being taught in a discriminatory manner resulting in an increase in violence towards whites and not in any way discouraged by our current administration. When the top of the govt speaks so aggressively demonstrating such clear bias, failing to take into account demographics, history or current talent pool it's a major concern. Another example of the creeping madness that we are teaching is defining asking "where are you from?" as a micro aggression? It's going so far that showing interest in someone is being deemed racist? This approach encouraged by the govt and laws are causing division not unity. I wouldn't trust the development of this approach by our govt as it will be arbitrary as to what's illegal and biased against the white Scottish people based on it's current anti white stance.

It seems odd that blasphemy is to be abolished, I agree wholeheartedly that it should be as this is a secular country. However, if "islamophobia" is to have the extremely open ended definition put into law while abolishing blasphemy that is a clear case of my previous point being proved. Islam will be an elevated group while every other religion has it's protection removed which is unjust. This invented word and definition should be struck off as a power grab by Islamic extremists. Every religion including the justice secretary's should be open to criticism and protected from threatening behaviour or abuse in the same manner. This is a supremacist move so to label it protection is beyond naïve and should be challenged.

In summary the creation of elevated (protected) groups is unjust and discriminatory. It has been taken advantage of by narcissists and theocratic groups who are vying to benefit from this separation of justice depending on identity. We are moving away from true equality under the law and this is a crime in itself.

Gary Watson
05 July 2020