The current and proposed legislation and policy concerning “hate crimes” is fundamentally misconceived in its rationales, and catastrophically counterproductive.

Introduction

1. There is a complete lack of rational analysis. A lack of genuine analysis of why people engage in “hate crimes”, or of what causes them to “hate” in the first place. Instead, democracy-defying billionaire-funded pressure groups of hate-driven fanatics such as so-called “Hope Not Hate” prefer to just harshly bash those who do not share their ideological assumptions. That may indeed be a profitable formula for a growing pseudo-“anti-hate” industry, but it comes at a disastrous cost of increasing social division and disorder tending to breakdown.

2. A force-obsessed unreflective mentality assumes that a bigger hammer is the better tool for just about any job, or in this case even harsher criminalisation is the best solution to stopping anything they don’t like.

3. The Terms of Reference here go on about “democracy” and about the death of Jo Cox. But what change of “hate crime” law could have prevented Jo Cox’s death? And quite why has “hate” become such a big issue just now, after numerous centuries of the world-admired English legal system? And talking of democracy as you do, when did we have the referendum on importing so many immigrants? Oh, but that would be “populism” instead of course. Democracy is only your proper democracy when the preference of rich greedy people wins rather than that of the Benefits Street scum.

4. The fact is that fatcat Westminster people reckoned to impose indiscriminate immigration in order to gain unearned profits from their rising property valuations and from rising rental income and lowering of workers’ wages. They “kindly” welcomed the immigrants, but not to their own Islington or Hampstead or Chipping Campden but only to the Benefits Streets where other less important people would be priced out of their housing and jobs and into desperate destitution.

5. And that is what caused the anger and hate. The people who really caused this hate were and are the clique in Westminster, lying for decades about the wonderful “huge benefits of immigration”. Meanwhile there were only huge downsides for those who had to live with the immigrants. Were the residents of Small Heath, Smethwick, etc, ever consulted over the plans to convert their neighbourhoods into foreign countries, so-called “Muslim areas”?

6. I well remember forty years ago, before all these “huge benefits of immigration”, when I could just walk into any job of my choosing, and most men’s wives did not even need to have a job. Whereas now, thanks to decades of these “huge benefits of immigration”, even graduates are benefitting from zero-hours contracts, unpaid internships, food banks, rough sleeping, and even benefits sanctions imposed randomly. Am I too thick to understand something here, or is it just you lot down in Westminster that stinks? Oh, hang on, it’s the additional huge benefits of all those motorways and airports and HS2s that I’m overlooking.
7. And having caused that hate, the Westminster liars then presume that they can persuade oppressed people to magically become nice by telling them that they are not only criminals but the vilest form of criminals, below even mere greedy burglars or sadistic bullies. The fact is that the death of Jo Cox can be fully understood in terms of her cheap nasty hate-generating lies about “the huge benefits of immigration” even while the victim Thomas Mair was having his life ruined by that deceitful policy. Oh but let’s pretend that that’s not true and that my sentence there was just “hate speech” instead.

8. Unfortunately your fascistic policy of forcing your nasty lies down people’s throats by hyper-criminalising those who reject them is failing. Brexit and Trump are just the beginning of your end. Winning people over by first lying to them and then telling them they are evil criminals doesn’t work and is going to increasingly not work.

9. The fact that Thomas Mair’s life sentence was consigned to page 30 of the Daily Mail is a reflection of how humungously out of touch the Westminster clique have become. Re which, as the Religion of Peace’s favourite book says in its typically friendly verse 59:2: “So learn a lesson, O ye who have eyes!”.

10. There is also a false assumption being made that the Brexit result “caused” an increase of hate. In reality the hate was caused by the many years of lies and oppression from the anti-democratic Westminster globalist-greed people. All that the Brexit result did was cause the balloon to be slightly punctured so that some of that pressure was released at last. Suppressively imprisoning an explosive mass inside a metal case makes it more deadly rather than less.

Disastrous downsides

11. The policy of making extra fuss about “hate crimes” has no positive value, but certainly disastrous downsides.

12. Firstly, it makes people even more resentful and angry and hence more hateful. And it is you scum in Westminster that they hate, hence the death of Jo Cox even despite the terrible penalty predictably imposed (and nothing to personally gain). “Oh but we’ll solve that by using an even bigger hammer in future.” Indeed, what crude authoritarian fools you Westminster geniuses are.

13. A second downside is that such bigger hammers discourage interactions with the supposedly oppressed groups. Some police forces explicitly state that “you will be believed”. But that necessarily equates to “we will assume guilty until proven innocent”. And besides being utterly incompatible with our most basic principles of honest justice, it is an open goal invitation for abusers to make maliciously false accusations of “hate crimes” against innocent victims. So I am now well aware that Muslims I encounter are liable to be ticking prosecution time-bombs. And so thanks to your stupid policies I rationally choose to have as little as possible to do with Muslims, lesbians, and so on, in case they set off one of their nasty false accusations against me and I end up being criminalised with added nuke power thanks to your “bigger hammer is better” crude hate-mindset.

14. A further downside is the victimhood competition. Look we are bigger victims than them so we need even harsher criminalisations. Competent commenters such as Trevor Phillips (in Race and Faith, The Deafening Silence, Civitas 2016) point out that this serves only to make people more preoccupied with these categorisations and thereby increasing the frictions rather than resolving them.
15. There is no honest rational reason for making extra fuss about “hate crimes”. Hostility to alien (and sometimes debatably civilised) populations coming into one’s settled beloved homeland is a natural instinct, and not one which can be “cured” by criminalisation. Likewise with the widespread natural instinct of revulsion against homosexuality. While these may be regrettable characteristics they are hardly any worse than the motives underlying crimes driven by selfish greed or jealousy or rivalry or enjoyment of sadism. These latter are the self-rewarding motives which need to be policed more intensively because otherwise they can go cancerous and take over as happens in too many failed societies.

16. And there is nothing whatsoever gained by your hyper-criminalising other than causing even greater resentment and hatred. And that is hatred of you people in Westminster, though also endangering many innocent victims elsewhere.

17. A further serious problem with the current “hate crimes” regime is the sloppy subjective definition in terms of merely whether someone thinks it to be motivated by hate. Such subjective definition of crime is completely unacceptable, especially in this area so wide open to serious abuse as aforesaid, and where the greatest sensitivity and clarity is required instead, and even worse where such obnoxious sloppy accusations are to be tried only by magistrates rather than a proper jury process.

“Hate speech”

18. The abusive “hate” legislation gets even more misconceived in respect of so-called “hate speech”, as has been pointed out by numerous highly competent commentators such as Trevor Phillips (Race and Faith, the deafening silence, 2016), Timothy Garton Ash (Free Speech, 2016), Frank Furedi, Claire Fox, and others.

19. Free speech is supremely essential for a healthy harmonious and productive society. And the most important, most necessary free speech is the freedom to say unpleasant things to people who very much do not want to hear them. Without such unpleasant things being said, and said frankly, and said repeatedly rather than a token single time (before thereafter constituting a so-called “crime” of “harassment”), societal chasms of misunderstanding become wider rather than narrower, with catastrophic results we are already beginning to see.

20. Not the least problem with legislation inhibiting free speech is that people can no longer trust one another to say what they are really thinking. They say one thing while thinking another. Few things can be more corrosive of the social fabric than such lack of honesty and trust in one another, being replaced by unconstrained suspicion instead. The whole reason why cold wet Britain became the most advanced civilisation in history, in terms of the agricultural, scientific, and industrial revolutions but also in politics and enlightenment thought, was because in this remote island at the edge of the world, people could build a unified non-multicultural society, and then concentrate on what was true and sensible rather than having to constantly look over their shoulders worrying about what others might find offensive about it. This greatness of Great Britain all happened in the centuries before all these stupid fascistic oppressive laws were introduced.
21. Furthermore, when people are oppressed from the necessary speaking of unwelcome thoughts, their oppressed resentment builds up, and they end up reacting in less civil ways. They may at best express themselves more clumsily, more emotionally, more angrily, and less civilly. Or they may end up resorting to violence instead, as per the case of Jo Cox killed by a man who otherwise had no voice for his terrible distress to be heard with.

22. Predictably your cliques now rant only about the heroic saintliness of Jo Cox and the vile evilness of her killer. But your cosy navel-gazing make-believe is not going to save you from the backlash to the problems you caused. And that extra-heavy enforcement against “hate crimes” is not the cure, but rather is the very cause of her death. The basic trouble with you politicians is that you always start with your pre-set attitudinal conclusions and then adjust the “facts” to fit them, rather than working the sane rational other way round.

23. There is a false assumption that a freedom to say unpleasant things would cause more harm than good, and that “hate speech” legislation is needed to prevent that harm. The actual historical evidence speaks very much to the opposite, as discussed in Garton Ash above-cited and also Lights Out by Mark Steyn. Only very specific exceptions can be usefully criminalised, such as words directly inciting or organising violence, as further explained by Garton Ash.

24. The unsoundness of the criminalisation of “inappropriate” communications is attested not least by the history preceding the Third Reich. The “liberal” Weimar Republic had already had strong laws clamping down on “hate crimes” free speech. When Hitler came to power he merely applied the existing fascistic statutes which were already in place. Far from helping, the repressive legislation paved the way to the greatest fascism rather than prevented it.

25. Again, in respect of “hate speech”, the legislation is abysmally sloppy, with unacceptable subjectivity of definition and again an open goal invitation for abuse by false accusers. Especially as there is such an excessive incoherent collection of laws available to apply or rather mis-apply to any particular case. And again where such obnoxious sloppy accusations are tried only by magistrates rather than a proper jury process.
Humungous hypocritical bias

26. All the preceding here is made even far worse by the grossly hypocritical double standards bias applied.

27. For instance just now while I have been typing this I have been repeatedly hearing on the BBC the phrase “hideously white”. And that same phrase headlining now in the Guardian. But if anyone dared to similarly use the phrase “hideously black” or “hideously Muslim” it is a safe bet that they would rapidly be hauled in by your regime’s thought police and imprisoned, not to mention having their career destroyed for committing a “racist” “hate crime”. Likewise so-called “anti-racists” have prominently promoted a book titled “Stupid White Men” with no challenge from your regime, and yet the consequences for any book titled “Stupid Black Women” would be so obvious I don’t need to state them here.

28. Even more hypocritical, consider if I were to distribute copies of a book which contained the following verses (among numerous others of equal character):

“Those who follow our non-Muslim God are merciful to one another, but ruthless to Muslims.” [48:29]
“O you non-Muslims! Fight those of the Muslims who are near to you and let them find harshness in you.” [9:123]
“Surely the vilest of animals in God's sight are the Muslims.” [8:55]
“If anyone desires a religion which is Islam, it will never be accepted of him, and in the Hereafter he will be in the ranks of the losers.” [3:85]
“You shall be called upon to fight a mighty nation, unless they leave Islam.” [48:16]
“...kill the Muslims wherever you find them.....” [9:5]
“Fight against the Muslims until they willingly pay the jizya tax, being brought low as dhimmis.” [9:29]
“Go forth, light-armed and heavy-armed, and strive with your wealth and your lives against the Muslims!” [9:41]
“Verily, those who believe (in the religion of Islam, the Qur’an and Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him)).... are the worst of creatures.” [98:6]

.... and just for good measure suppose I “educate” the readers in the supposed “fact” that those are the immortal commands of the one and only God.

29. And yet every week on numerous high streets in this country, copies of the hate-filled Qur’an are freely handed out with not the slightest challenge from your regime’s thought police. And those words are not hate-inciting merely in academic theory but are right now still actively inspiring a huge amount of deadly violence extending into just about every country which Muslims reach. Oh but it’s different. Because as the regressive left Guardian and other “anti-racists” tell us, all whites are racist, whereas no non-whites can be racist.

30. And so much more. For instance Salma Yaqoob was videoed in 2012 inciting a mob of youths to rampage around Birmingham, including waving her fist at the crowd, at which the mob did exactly that rampaging with the consequence that three innocent bystanders of the “wrong” colour got nastily injured. Was she ever prosecuted for that crime? But, of course not. Instead she is honoured as a regular panellist on Any Questions and such like — where we never hear the voice of Tommy Robinson even though he has never made such a call for violence but repeatedly the opposite.
31. And need I really mention the vast cover-up of the thousands of pedo-rapes by “Asian” grooming gangs, gangs of followers of the “Religion of Peace”. Where was the police’s “you will be believed” for those victims? And don’t mention the Cologne cover-up either.

32. And meanwhile dissident politician Paul Weston gets locked up merely for reading out a speech by Winston Churchill. But at least we don’t have a regime here as they do in Korea or Russia. In reality, just as “populism” is your Orwellian Newspeak for when democracy gets the “wrong” result, so “hate crime” is your Orwellian deceit-terminology for thought-criminalising of people who merely don’t share your own ideological bigotries.

**Genuine tolerance as opposed to your hypocritical pseudo-tolerance.**

33. The logical outcome of imposing your “hate speech” and “hate crime” regime without the gross bias would be that you have to ban the Qur’an and its distribution as clearly being hate speech and incitement to hate-motivated violence. It should be pointed out that there is the very clear wording itself (and numerous Qur’an verses insist it is “a clear guidance”, and many others insist that “Allah is all-powerful”, so he could hardly be expected to be incompetent in presenting his most important message, and indeed it gives no directions for recognising any subsequent people as “experts” qualified to “interpret” it). And the extensive actual violence clearly inspired by the Qur’an (and claiming thus to be) can no longer be credibly dismissed with your further hollow assertion of being “nothing to do with Islam”. The list of recent atrocities and groups supposedly “nothing to do with Islam” is now so tediously long that it has rightly inspired the ironic aphorism that “Islam is nothing to do with Islam”.

34. But unlike you I am a genuinely tolerant person and I think the only thing that should be banned is banning itself. Everyone including Muslims need to start reading the Qur’an for themselves to see what it really says rather than what the Guardian pretends it says. And not miss out verses such as 18:86-90 which educate us that the Earth really is flat. (And meanwhile verses 2:85-6 condemn those who pick and choose only those verses they prefer.)

35. So you have a choice here. Carry on being gross hypocrites and imposing your “hate crimes” legislation subject to an absurd exception for the most hate-inciting document in history**. Or alternatively dump the entire fascistic, authoritarian, nannying, and disastrously counterproductive scheme as the thoughtless folly it really is. (**Further information on this point can be found at www.PoliticalIslam.com and www.TheReligionOfPeace.com)**

36. The cited works by Garton Ash and Trevor Phillips point out that the competent way forward is by civil discourse rather than criminalisation. People need to be inspired to value genuine tolerance of unpleasant matters and uncomfortable encounters. They need to be encouraged to develop thick tolerant skins rather than thin intolerant ones generating customers for the “offence” industry. They all need to be taught the traditional saying from what was at that time the greatest country in history: “Sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never hurt me”. Not your pathological “Sticks and stones can’t break my bones but words will be a terribly upsetting hate crime requiring imprisonment for an extended term”. 
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Charter for genuine free speech.

37. In conclusion, we need to get rid of all this hypocritical and disastrously counterproductive “hate crime” legislation. Murder, assault, and incitements to the same will still be crimes in their own right as they have always been. And being an obnoxious person will continue to reap its own negative rewards in terms of not exactly being the greatest formula for winning friends and influencing people.

38. And we need to introduce a Charter for Genuine Free Speech. That is because the crucially most important communication is the uninhibited communication of unpleasant, distressing messages to people who do not want to hear them, and more than once, and especially across societal chasms such as of race and religion.

39. Essential to that Charter will be the following principles.

   None of the following are permitted to constitute criteria per se for reckoning a communication to be criminal:
   - that its content is unpleasant, distressing, unwelcome, or felt to be “offensive” or “insulting”, no matter how much it may be so;
   - that for those reasons the recipient does not want to receive it and even makes clear that unwillingness; (People participating in a democratic society cannot have a right to refuse information merely due to a disagreement with or dislike of it, because if only “preaching to the choir” is permitted then “free speech” is a worthless nonsense.)
   - that the recipient is unwillingly exposed to the communication on more than one occasion, within reason (“within reason” being for instance not every day for a year, or being constantly hectored all day long when busy with something else).

   Any arrest or investigation or detention or prosecution or threat thereof, based merely on those criteria, must be prosecuted as a serious criminal infringement of this Charter.

40. This Charter of Genuine Free Speech needs to be enshrined as a constitutional principle of the nation, and all the mess of sloppy legislation about “malicious communication”, “hate speech”, verbal “harassment”, and so on, needs to be repealed and replaced by one single clearly thought out and clearly stated statute of what communication is unacceptable or not. Garton Ash argues that the scope of that criminally unacceptable classification should be little more than that which incites or organises violence, and I see no reason to disagree.

Commentary on this document, whether inoffensive, hatefully Kuffarphobic, or otherwise, is welcomed at {feedback at socialcausality dot org}