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### A/. HATE CRIME.

1/. **Hate Crime** is “any criminal offence which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by hostility or prejudice based on a personal characteristic. Hate crime can be motivated by disability, gender identity, race, *religion* or faith and sexual orientation”.

2/. At the heart of the debate on *religion* in Hate Crime is **cultural identity** as a social construct. All peoples see themselves as part of a cultural narrative, when that narrative is challenged it can create deep seated fears. This can apply to indigenous populations as well as immigrant population and the tendency to gravitate towards those with whom one feels comfortable is inate.

3/. Successive governments have pursued a policy of **mass immigration** to meet the economic and structural needs of the country but without a clearly defined and approved system of integration; by 1970s 1.4m non-white residents. In1972 in two months 28,000 immigrants from Uganda; in 2000, 125,000; in 2015 net immigration 333,000.

4/. In the absence of debate a choice was made between the popular alternatives that other countries were following of **Assimilation or Multiculturalism.** The basic difference being that Assimilation looked to all newcomers to adopt the citizenship, language, responsibilities and commitments of the indigenous population under the law (most notably characterized by the French restriction on Muslims of the wearing of the burka) while Multiculturalism allowed for retention of basic cultural diversity (most notably characterized by the Muslim setting up of Sharia courts). Both countries have Islamic areas characterised by large mosques in claimed ghetto areas.

5/. **Multiculturalism** had been accepted into UK political dialogue symbolising a tolerant and accepting society. However, this seemed to go against the wisdom of the experience gained by the tragedy of the nineteen thirties and Germany’s Jewish cultural ghettos bound together by its strongly politicised religion structure that created huge tensions. Unfortunately our adversarial nature of legal and political exchange does not help rational debate.

6/. Any form of integration needed **careful and detailed consideration** for distribution and infrastructure. There is a sense that there was no plan and the Hate Crime legislation is sticking plaster over fallout.

7/. The needs and demands of the different social groupings will at times cause **tensions.** The Referendum has highlighted those tensions often by perception rather than fact. Demands on services like hospitals, schools, and housing together with distribution of tax-payers’ money on benefits to newly arrived immigrants and where they are distributed on the basis of need, antagonism builds up in those who have been denied or displaced in the queue.

8/. **Blasphemy ‘law’,** the most tyrannical law left over from the Dark Ages, only abolished in the UK in 2008, but still imposed by fear across the world. Those that had for years decried the hypocrisy and abuse of power by the Christian Church, became a force for a Secular State but
unable to debate with the 3m UK Muslims. (UK 2013 figures; 5.5m Christians, 269,000 Jews, 98,000 Buddhists, 272,000 Hindus; 13m non-religious).

9/. At the same time the Fatwa against Salman Rushdie for his blasphemy against Islam gave a clear signal of the Established Religion in retreat and a State unable to protect freedom of speech or its citizens against extremism. A death bounty (now $3.4m) since 1989 remains in place today.

10/. But added to this is a gulf in culture attitudes with Anjem Choudary, the convicted Islamic cleric, having 45,000 followers on his facebook site offering emotional radicalism; Imams adding support for the murderer of Mr. Shah the Glaswegian shopkeeper for blasphemy; and 64 MPs opposing the abolition of the blasphemy laws.

11/. The education system in grappling with national identity and the latest BBC survey show 40% non-participation in the Government’s anti-radicalisation Prevent initiative to promote British values, with only 6% Muslim referrals. Cultural roots go deep and are worn with pride.

12/. The isolated young is symbolise the Committee’s concern for the ‘Loan Wolf’ fixated person. Many spend 20 hours a week streaming in to their private screens the nurture of horrific gaming and uncensored ideologies. The curriculum has ever narrowed, tightened and extended its grip on our ability to rationalise and philosophise. Now after 13 years of institutionalizing learning by rote with a brain-numbing conformity, still 40% of children are unable to get a grade C in five GCSE, and with no training in logic or philosophy fertile ground for the simplistic ideologies.

13/. Some claims of Hate Crime have parallels to the murder in March of Asad Shah, a much liked shopkeeper in Glasgow. He had posted on Facebook that he was a prophet which the Sunni Muslim community in Bradford viewed as blasphemy and had inspired Mr. Shah’s murderer. Last week Judge Lady Rae sentenced him to ‘life’ with a minimum of 27 years claiming his act was “barbaric in a civilised society”. She ruled it was not Hate Crime, and the courts dealt appropriately with the offence.

14/. Charlie Hebdo mass murder by Islamic extremist in France highlighted the questions of the ‘right to offend’ under freedom of speech. Many decent non-religious folk found their publication highly offensive and might say inappropriate in a ‘civilised society’, but the response abhorrent. In the case of Gerry Springer; the Opera in 2005 in the UK there were 55,000 mostly Christian complaints to the BBC but the non-violence was appropriate to a ‘civilized society’. For the majority of the UK public there is no discernible distinction between the ‘radicalised’ and the benign in Islam and no overall authority to articulate a coherent Muslim creed in a ‘civilised society’.

15/. Attached Photo 1 https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/aug/24/french-police-make-woman-remove-burkini-on-nice-beach captures the heart of the problem. The photograph of three armed policemen shortly after the Nice lorry atrocity, standing around a Muslim woman on the beach and issuing a ticket “for not wearing an outfit respectful of good moral and secularism” under French law. People on the beach shouting “go home”. Peoples’ abuse and French law is not directed at the person but a creed that seems to embrace violence. The victim’s fear as she is viewed as provocative when exercising her right to freedom of dress in a ‘civilised society’. Hate and fear exist on both sides, but with no dialogue on offer alienation grows.

16/. Attachment 2 http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3521516/Moment-racial-tensions-spill-Christian-man-Muslim-Niqab-argue-Shepherd-s-Bush-grocery-store.html#ixzz4Il1UFtCe is a video put on YouTube by a lady in a naqib who confronted a Black Gentleman with two children for what she heard him say, provokes her anger. This clearly is not hate of race but of ‘clothing with belief connotations’ that gives offence or causes fear. It also exposes a degree of incitement and goading, and maybe even promoting racial discord by posting it on Facebook; but her actions seem to her a defence of her freedoms in a ‘civilised society’.
17/. There is a heightened world volatility as all connected incidents get streamed into individual’s homes by preference. Whatever your penchant or prejudice it can be fed.

18/. Tensions are also heightened by media coverage of racially or religiously inspired acts of terror where the perpetrators are identified by colour, facial hair and clothing, all of which create a sense of identification by uniform.

B/. Referendum.

1/. The Referendum exposed fault lines in our social cohesion. There was a pent up energy. The electorate had been anticipating a voice on constitutional changes ever since the country had joined the Common Market. There had been a consistent erosion of democratic involvement on important constitutional and legal matters.

2/. Referenda are polarising events. A binary decision, lacking a package of policies that spell out the benefits and consequences of the vote, or seeking to mitigate the damage of competing visions and equitable distribution of services, lead to extreme claims dominating the debate.

3/. The reactions of some of the victors clearly saw the possibility of their views being represented by a sea change in policy and a rebalancing of community ethnicity. For some, with little religious literacy, an often drunken yobbish minority, an opportunity to vent their spleen and descended into wanton violence.

4/. Also ugly were the calls for a rerun of the referendum based on the claim of ‘ignorance of the voters’ and a desire to ‘disenfranchise older and poorer sections of the community’. Although ageism and snobbery are not hate crimes (or are they?), the vitriol was of the level to invoke anger and set a climate of ‘hate’, but this was entirely handled within the Public Order Act.

5/. As Brexit develops it is hoped that the scapegoating of ethnic minorities will cool down, with UK control of boarders being seen as the gateway only for those invited in, including refugees from war. Immigration will get general approval once seen as subject to the democratic process.

C/. Jo Cox MP.

1/. The accompanying ‘disconnect’ picture symbolises the disconnect that epitomised much of the Brexit thinking. A clear divide between Birstall world and that of Remain. A remote gravy train of the political elite standing together against the Common Man; the mega rich business and celebrity beneficiaries of current structures sticking two fingers up at those deprived of their livelihoods; A world of unemployment, food banks and Sharia law. Familiar community becoming foreign that in the main had contempt for one’s historic values, that spat on one’s patriotism, where some even gloried in the atrocities of extremists; laws to deprive one of freedom of speech by political correctness; rules on blasphemy imposed by fear, and murder of apostasy. The headlines of the daily newspapers and billboard advertising and accentuating the extremities of competing views and an electoral system that presented the voter with a minority MP (28% of the electorate) with passionate global views but who called Brexit unpatriotic, while they saw themselves as Defenders of The Faith (for many non-church goers, a defender of Britishness).

2/. Jo Cox a dedicated and passionate internationalist knew the risks and had informed the police of her concerns yet she pursued an aggressive campaign for Remain, quite happy for her young children to be part of the publicity. Her and her advisors’ experience would have made her aware of the violence that can erupt as shown by the Britain First parades in her area and the murder of
Anna Lind just days before the Swedish Euro Referendum. Jo Cox MP put her causes above personal safety.

D/. Comments on Terms of Reference.

1/. There must be a question mark against the effectiveness of current legislation when Anjem Choudary is able to pursue his hate of the West on our streets for 20 years, goading and inciting hatred without legal response.

2/. Clearly there should be some form of redress for verbal abuse and it would seem that this is already covered by the Public Order Act 1986 where it is an offence to “threaten, abuse or insult” if causing “harassment, alarm or distress”. The post Referendum abuse of ethnic groups may not be long lived once it is recognised that those who now live and contribute to our society are welcome guests and not imposed by an unaccountable EU. A further reduction in freedom of speech at this time runs counter to the desire for proper debate and scrutiny of faith groups claims of the Divine guidance leading to violent radicalisation.

3/. Social media and youtube are in the forefront of promoting alternative news channels and public debate. Support for established institutions of news is diminishing as trust declines. Corporate control and influence in newspaper ownership and editorials has created a growing trend to turn to these alternatives.

4. They have become in the most part forums for debate and expressions of frustration and anger and allowed the causes of hate crime to be aired and identified. Rather than looking at them as opportunities to prosecute, the Government should seek to analyse the nature of this polarization. The Referendum showed that Parliament was very much behind the curve of public opinion and exposed our democratic system as wanting. New emphasis should not seek to close down debate even further; it would be a retrograde step and play into the hands of those that oppose Western values.

5/. The use of the Voluntary Sector and community representatives has had its complaints during the 10 years of the Prevent scheme. It is seen by some as a Snoopers Charter and similar attempts in Scotland to combat sectarianism in football crowds are claimed to have driven a wedge between police and supporters. But these initiatives are popular with the majority and vital to combating radicalism.

6/. Of course statistical evidence is always valuable when formulating legislation but as shown by the Rotherham child abuse scandal and EDL Luton experience policing and public representation has become so skewed that the National Identity has become a hostage to fortune and inviting one section of society to parade its grievances while preventing a proper forum or outlet for all elements of the complaints which further divides communities.

E/. Conclusions.

1/. The Offence of ‘religion’ (a free will choice) Hate Crime is not helpful to social cohesion.

2/. Recording of the offence should clearly distinguish between ‘religion’ and ‘race’ motivation.
3/. Intent to incitement and provocation by ‘complainant’ should be equally defined and registered.

4/. Political correctness has been forced on the indigenous population to the extent that it does not allow them reasonable freedom of speech and democracy as understood in the Western World thus in time creating a backlash as we may see now on the streets and in the media.

5/. The electoral system requires overhauling, as shown by the disconnect of the Referendum and the 2015 General Election in Batley and Spen. Use of Referendum should be increased as barometer of public opinion.

'My kids can't even see your face. Are you a man or a woman?' Muslim in a veil posts footage of furious row with 'racist shopper who called her Batman'

- Man makes batman remark to Ahlam Saed, 25, and asks why she wears Niqab
- During lengthy tirade he continually screams and swears at her in shop
- Despite his young children watching man argues until customers intervene
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The shocking moment a Muslim woman is racially abused by a man in a west London shop has been captured on camera. Ahlam Saed, 25, said the row flared up, in the Shepherd's Bush store, after the man called her 'Batman' when she went in to buy some sweets wearing her full veil. Throughout the upsetting dispute, the man swears at Miss Saed and repeatedly asks 'why do you wear that?' referring to her face veil.

Miss Saed, who is of Somali heritage, said she heard the man humming the theme tune to the Bruce Wayne cartoon before saying to his two young daughters: 'Look kids, Batman has walked in'

She claims he added: 'Say what you want girls, she won't understand English anyway.' It was at this point that Miss Saed decided to film the man with her phone. In Miss Saed's clip he is heard asking: 'How do they know if you're a man or a woman?'

Read more: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3521516/Moment-racial-tensions-spill-Christian-man-Muslim-Niqab-argue-Shepherd-s-Bush-grocery-store.html#ixzz4IL1UF1Ce