

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: We currently live in a society where some are very sensitive to any comment with which they disagree. Previous notions of tolerance have morphed into intolerance unless another agrees and affirms their position. Indeed there are those who actively go out to find or assume they will find racism or sexism etc in each and every situation.

As a result I think it imperative to retain the two stage test. This will still enable genuine cases to be progressed, that deserve to be criminalised. We must recognise that there is a balance to be struck and freedom of speech is not something to be jettisoned lightly.

It will be dangerous to move to a situation where only one arm of the current test is required to be proved. How is intention to be proved? If the words are not in fact threatening, abusive or insulting as understood by 'the man on the clapham omnibus' and no hatred has in fact been stirred up, we are drifting into a rather authoritarian situation where mens rea aside from actus reus alone is required. And how is that mens rea to be established? Just because someone voices a view that is currently not in vogue (eg opposition to gay marriage in the church), does not mean that the intention IS to stir up hatred, but there may be some who would presume it to be so. The two stage test is an important protection here.

Question 46: No

Expand: I am concerned that this proposal would limit genuine disagreement in areas of current controversy. Some people find even the mildest statement disagreeing with their view offensive or describe it as abusive. Often people take disagreement very personally, even when stated in a civil discussion. The standard of proof that the proposal suggests means that that it would be much easier to shut down healthy discussion. (At present we see the debate about transgender issues for teenagers in the courts for example, this is an important national debate and impacts the wellbeing of our society overall.)

To accuse someone of 'intent to stir up hatred' is very serious and will be life changing. It must be very clear that this was the deliberate intent of their actions and not just presumed to be so. Our standards should in no way hinder free speech.

Question 47: No

Expand: The current law's distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation is sensible. Race is an inherited physical trait and it is right that it is treated differently from matters such as religion and characteristics such as transgender identity or sexual orientation. Beliefs and behaviour, which these latter characteristics are, can be discussed and debated; race as a protected characteristic is qualitatively different.

Beliefs and behaviour can be controversial in debate and it is important that only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. In particular this must not be extended to the subjective area of what may be described as 'abusive'. Already some are labelling disagreement as 'abusive' as part of campaigning for law change, when in reality all that has happened is an airing of differing perspectives.

Question 47 Part 2: No. Threatening is sufficient.

Question 48: No

Expand: Transgender identity and disability are very different!

Transgender ideology is currently very controversial and being investigated in the courts as well as by two recent government consultations. There are increasing numbers of vocal 'detransitioners' speaking out about this at the same time as others campaign to ban detransitioning. The debate is live and we must ensure for the good of society that it is not inhibited and that new hate legislation does not in anyway clamp down on healthy debate. In addition there are other issues such as safe single-sex spaces for chromosomal XX Women; those who speak out on such matters, are already facing no platforming and social media vitriol. It is imperative that we do not let campaigners clamp down on important debate in this area.

Hate legislation could make it hard for these groups – women in favour of safe single sex spaces and detransitioners – to speak out without fear of others accusing them of a hate crime.

As a general observation, we must be wary of bringing in increasing legislation in this area. We are moving to an increasingly authoritarian approach to people's thoughts and actions in this country. Anecdotally it appears that our society is far more humane towards those who are disabled than even thirty years ago.

Question 49: No

Expand: I do not think that increasing hate crime legislation is the solution to this matter. The matters raised in your consultation paper actually require greater questions of why this is emerging in our society.

Question 50: I am very concerned that as a society we are embracing too uncritically 'critical theory'. We are perpetuating a division of society into oppressed and oppressor and whilst I think there are useful things to learn from work on intersectionality and critical theory, we are actually ending up with a much more combative and divided society. The danger is that we develop a group of people who actively go out looking for these things.

I think current legislation is sufficient without adding intersectionality.

Question 51: No

Expand: This is a very worrying suggestion for the direction of a 'free society' I note that the Scottish administration has come under strong criticism from unlikely allies (comedians and the religious) for similar proposals

Are we expecting teenage children to 'inform' on their parents or household guests to 'inform' on their hosts? People should be allowed to express their own views in their own homes. The proposal does beg the question what we really mean by hate crime and whether we are not spilling into an area which is not to do with public order

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Both s29 and 29A of the POA1986 should be extended if the other areas are extended

Many protected characteristics are controversial and free speech protections must be retained

Question 52 Part 2: If you choose to extend protected characteristics, which I recommend you do not, then please ensure that people are not prohibited in the transgender debate from commenting that biologically/ chromosomally there are only two sexes; that a transgender woman is not a woman (see recent debacle over JK Rowling's comments on menstruation); Being able to use a person's birth name and pronouns (some believe to do otherwise is to lie; others would be sensitive to the transperson's wishes but this should be a matter of conscience for the speaker).

Question 53: No. Race is qualitatively different from religion and sexual orientation. Race is an inherited trait and whilst some argue that sexual orientation is given at birth, science is far from conclusive on this point and the consensus emerging is that it is far more fluid.

Question 54: No

Expand: This is an important check on such a prosecution being brought Given the seriousness of the charge and the free speech/ human rights implications, it is appropriate that the Attorney General should be consulted, as someone one step removed from the CPS This is an appropriate check and balance

Question 55 Part 1: Yes. It is important that robust debate should be allowed to proceed, without fear of a charge being brought

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No The appointment of such a figure would just generate an expansion in this area of legislation.

At a time of pressure on the public purse this would not be a prudent appointment.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Not applicable

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: I am against this proposal because it would amount to an anti Free Speech Bill I think the concept of hate crime should be abolished because it is totalitarian and seeks to police people's thoughts and speech

Question 2: No

Expand: No, I think we should abandon the idea of protected characteristics. I don't think we should view people as victims and members of protected groups Potentially this could result in never ending categories of protected characteristics I think we should stop this dangerous identitarianism and tribalism, which inevitably causes resentment and conflict between the groups it creates and return to treating all human beings as individuals, all worthy of equal respect.

Question 3: No

Expand: This is a circular argument You state that hate crime categories should be based on evidence that that category is particularly targeted for hate crime But you could identify literally any group of people, for example people who like cats, and then find "evidence" that they are targets of hate crime on the basis of them reporting "hate incidents" of people saying mean things to them about cats.

I do not necessarily agree that there is a clear evidence based demonstrable need to protect certain categories of people more than others, that is not equal treatment under the law

The idea of "additional harm" is far too intangible and subjective and again is contrary to the principle of equal treatment . How do you quantify the harm allegedly suffered by a gay person (a protected category) as a result of what they perceive to be homophobic comments versus the harm allegedly suffered by, for example, a person with red hair or a very big nose (neither of which are currently protected categories) who claims to have suffered harm because of hurtful things said to them about their hair or big nose? How can it be proved that the "harm" suffered to the gay person is greater or more serious than the "harm" caused to the red headed person? It is entirely subjective and depends to a large extent on the sensitivities of the individual Some people are much more easily offended than others I don't think that the answer is therefore to make red headed people or people with big noses into additional protected categories because this just contributes to the absurdity of never ending categories of protected characteristics.

Question 4: No.

Question 5: No

Expand: You specifically mention “inflammatory cartoons” in your crackdown plans: “recent incidents involving inflammatory images create grounds for concern... These include Islamophobic cartoons...” This is clearly a reference to the Charlie Hebdo Mohammad cartoons You call these Mohammed cartoons “infamous”, suggesting “the British media were right not to publish them”. I profoundly disagree with this. I think that the British media should have published them and that their failure to do so in the aftermath of the Charlie Hebdo terrorist atrocity was an appalling act of cowardice and abandonment of free speech

Your paper suggests the offence of “stirring up hatred” should extend beyond written material, so publishing “inflammatory images” could mean up to seven years in jail. I find this chilling and completely contrary to our British tradition of free speech As a Christian, I frequently encounter cartoons, films, books, articles, jokes, plays etc which mock my Christian faith and are inflammatory, but the idea that the people responsible for such materials should be criminalised is absurd I have no right to not be offended, I have no right to demand my faith not be mocked. The price we pay for religious freedom is freedom of speech Your proposals put both of these fundamental freedoms at risk

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No What an utter absurdity

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: For reasons previously stated, I disagree with the proposal to extend the protected characteristics

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: For reasons previously stated, I disagree with the proposal to extend the protected characteristics

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: I think it is wrong to scrap the requirement of intent People should not be criminalised where they had no criminal intent.

Question 11: No

Expand: For reasons previously stated, I disagree with the proposal to extend the protected characteristics

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: It should not include either, there is no need for sex based hate crime protection. The law already provides sufficient protection. Women are not weak and vulnerable “protected categories” We are more than half of the population

Question 13: No

Expand: there is no need for sex based hate crime protection. The law already provides sufficient protection. Women are not weak and vulnerable “protected categories”. We are more than half of the population

Question 14: No

Expand: Please see above

Question 15: For reasons previously stated, I do not believe that the protected characteristics/categories should be extended

Question 16: For reasons previously stated, I do not believe that the protected characteristics/categories should be extended

Question 17: For reasons previously stated, I do not believe that the protected characteristics/categories should be extended

Question 18: For reasons previously stated, I do not believe that the protected characteristics/categories should be extended

This is a particularly dangerous Pandora’s Box Some “alternative sub-cultures” include immoral and unethical practices The idea that people could be criminalised for criticising or challenging such cultures is frightening and Orwellian.

Question 19: For reasons previously stated, I do not believe that the protected characteristics/categories should be extended

Question 20: No, I think this idea is absurd and ridiculous. Protecting a philosophy based on rational and limitless inquiry is laughable and completely contrary to free speech Punks, for example, as a philosophical belief, are famous for distrusting state authority - do they really need state protection?

Question 21: No

Expand: This is contrary to the principle of equal treatment under the law If a person assaults 2 people and the first victim has a protected characteristic and the second one does not, under your proposals the first victim will potentially get greater justice in the form of a longer prison sentence imposed against the perpetrator than the second victim would. This is contrary to principles of English law- that the law is blind and equal treatment under the law and principle of natural justice

Question 22: No

Expand: Demonstration of hostility is too low a standard Law should require proven intent

Question 23: See above

Question 24: No

Expand: As stated above, I believe that aggravated hate crimes are contrary to principle of equal treatment under the law

Question 25: No

Expand: As stated above, I believe that aggravated hate crimes are contrary to principle of equal treatment under the law and do not think that protected categories should be extended

Question 26: No

Expand: As stated above, I believe that aggravated hate crimes are contrary to principle of equal treatment under the law and do not think that protected categories should be extended

Question 27: No

Expand: There is already too much surveillance of speech in our country. Your proposals suggest you now want to police people's conversations with their families in their own homes. If people use words "likely" to "stir up hatred" at the dinner table, they could be jailed for up to seven years. This is shameful. In the Soviet Union, totalitarian surveillance made parents fear their own children. This is not the kind of country we want to live in.

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: No. Intersectionality is a post modern Marxist far left pernicious dogma which has no place in our legal system

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand: This is contrary to principle of equal treatment under and equality before the law.

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: This is contrary to principle of equal treatment under and equality before the law

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: This is an appalling attack on our freedom of speech

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: I think that this should only be to the extent that they have knowingly allowed the dissemination of actual crimes such as incitement to violence or preparing, inciting acts of terrorism etc It should not include any dissemination of so called hate crime Free speech should be upheld.

Question 43 Part 2: No. Intention should be a requirement

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Absolutely not The policing of people's conversations inside their own homes is an appalling breach of our freedom of speech It is totalitarian It is not what free people in a free and democratic society expect and the fact that this is being seriously proposed by the Law Commission is shameful and a terrifying indicator of how fast the decay of western civilisation is happening

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: No. Let's stick to equal treatment before the law

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The consent of the Attorney General restricts over-zealous prosecutors. This is a safeguard that must be retained

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2: Yes all of the above.

Question 56: Other (please expand)

Expand: I am very concerned about the politicisation of sport and particularly football. I think it is very important that "racist chanting" is not extended to include football fans showing their disapproval of players taking the knee in deference to BLM. To do so is not racist. BLM is a highly political and divisive movement and to criticise it, mock it or fail to show support for it is not racist and should definitely not be treated as a hate crime.

Question 57: No

Expand: This is too vague and I would question whether there is a need for it. The middle class elites' obsession with criminalising football chants is another example of class snobbery and controlling what they perceive as the uneducated unwashed masses

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No. Totally unnecessary. A waste of public money

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18: I'm not sure they should this is problematic: there are probably endless groups that could be classified as "alternative subcultures".

Question 19:

Question 20: As above, I don't think so; this could be problematic, as it could result in almost anything being classified as a hate crime.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: I don't think they should - they would tend to operate on the "safe side", presuming that material is unlawful (where they are uncertain or don't fully understand the law), which would have a chilling effect on free speech

Also, I suspect it is impractical for them to police the sheer number of posts, etc, on social media platforms.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: It is, I suspect, quite difficult to prove intent; it would be necessary to infer it from the words, or there might be some risk that intent is assumed by the person being spoken to, the police, etc (especially in the sensitive climate we have now).

With such a low burden of proof, something additional (e.g. the words are threatening, as I believe is the case already) is required

"Abusive" or "insulting" words are also problematic, because the concepts are very subjective (a merely heated discussion could be taken to be abusive by a sensitive person, and it is possible to take almost anything as an insult, even if it wasn't intended to be)

Question 46: No

Expand: Prosecuting words "likely" to stir up hatred is dangerous, especially in the absence of intent it would have a chilling effect on free speech, since it is possible that a mere expression of disagreement could be considered, by some, as likely to stir up hatred. This is likely to relate to issues that are highly controversial, such as transgenderism, in wider society, such that an expression of disagreement is entirely reasonable (and in line with freedom of speech). But, at the same time, there are some who would take any such disagreement as hate speech

In short, such prosecutions may well be used as weapon to silence reasonable disagreement or debate.

"Stirring up hatred" is a serious matter, such that a prosecution could seriously damage someone's life; it should have a "high bar".

Question 47: No

Expand: Some of the protected characteristics are less controversial than others. For example, race is not controversial (it is a morally neutral, inherited characteristic, with no behavioural element), and stirring up hatred on grounds of race is much more obvious and easy to show

Whereas, many reasonable people do not consider sexuality, transgender issues, etc, to be morally neutral, and because they are controversial (and involve beliefs and behaviour), debate is far less likely to be hatred. And, yet debates about such subjects could be labelled as hatred by those who are politically motivated.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: It is unfortunate that two very different things are "lumped together" in this question:

Disability, like race, is a characteristic that the disabled person has no choice in (and is morally neutral, with no inherent behavioural or belief element), so it would be OK for disability to be covered by the offence of stirring up hatred. This would not be the least controversial

Transgender identity is very controversial, however, with ongoing discussion. It has been seen, I think, that there are some activists who consider any debate or discussion of transgender identity to be hatred; so I think that such an offence would be used as a weapon, by a very vocal minority, to silence legitimate discussion and debate (e.g. the

legitimate attempt by women to protect single-sex spaces or of why there has been a large rise in the number of children referred to gender identity clinics).

In short, I *don't* think that transgender identity should be covered by the offence of stirring up hatred, unlike disability.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: I think private conversations, at home, should not be subject to regulation. Freedom of speech should certainly be allowed with private home conversations.

Indeed, hate speech laws are part of public order and should not apply in the private sphere.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Since some issues covered by the stirring up hatred offence may be controversial, and subject to legitimate debate, it is vital that there is protection for free speech.

Question 52 Part 2: I think free speech provisions should also apply here. Specifically, it should not be an offence to use a person's birth name or pronoun. And it should be legally acceptable to state that a person born a man is not a woman, and vice-versa. Lastly, it should be legally acceptable to state that there are only two sexes.

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The offence of stirring up hatred is serious (up to seven years in prison, I believe) which should have a high bar, to prevent malicious or over-zealous use (especially, as I've said already, it covers mere speech on issues which are highly controversial).

Without such a high bar (that the Attorney General gives consent, and not just the Director of Public Prosecutions), it would have a chilling effect on free speech.

It is important that the attorney general is answerable to parliament, so it is more likely they can be held to account for poor decision making in this regard.

Question 55 Part 1: Yes; reports of parliamentary and court proceedings need to be an accurate record.

Question 55 Part 2: Yes; reports of local government meetings need to be fair and accurate and should be exempt from stirring up hatred laws. And peer-reviewed scientific material should also be exempt.

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: using a person's birth name and pronoun, saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Wild Woman

Name of Organisation: Wild Woman Writing Club

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request: The women involved in WWWC have lost careers, contracts, relationships and physical safety for speaking against the capture of literary and artistic institutions. Trans activists have proven dangerous to women who express thoughts they don't like, see the assault of Julie Bindel by a male trans activist outside Edinburgh University. Anonymity is a condition of expressing this dissent. Please don't add fuel to violence against women by breaching our anonymity

Question 1: No

Expand: We are in favour of repealing all existing hate crime legislation on the basis that, instead of fulfilling its intended purpose of deterring racially aggravated crime, it is in practice used as a tool to suppress unpopular political speech. We do not think that adding misogyny as a hate crime will serve women's interests as male transgender activists will use it to suppress women's political speech, while the police and the courts will lack the political will to use it to prevent hate crimes against women because of our sex.

Question 2: No

Expand: For the reasons given in Q1, we are averse in principle to hate crime legislation as currently conceived.

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand: It is indubitable that violence against women—motivated by misogynistic hatred has a deleterious effect on society as a whole. Domestic violence is still not taken seriously and men are killing women at the rate of nearly 3 a week since lockdown. However, unless proper consideration is given to the conflict between women's sex based rights, and the inclusion claims of trans-identifying males, in practice hate crimes on the basis of gender reassignment will continue to trump women's right to live in safety and freedom from violence. If, on the other hand, the Law Commission continues on this path, excluding women from protection, we will see more cases like Kate Scottow's (conviction overturned on appeal) in which men with gender recognition certificates will use broadly-drafted hate crime laws to attack women using public authorities as proxies. Women, once again, fall between the cracks and lack any real protection.

Question 4: We disagree with the legislation in principle and do not think that adding ever more protected categories will achieve any measurable benefit for society at large

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: Don't be ridiculous. In what sense is not feeling sexually attracted to anyone a sexual orientation? It's a non-activity. We detect the influence of the gender identity lobby in this question. The GIL seeks to erase sex and thus women's rights to and same-sex sexual orientation from law and policy. We would question the independence and impartiality of the Law Commission if it deems such a surreal question pertinent to evaluating hate crime legislation.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: We strongly disagree. People with gender recognition certificates should not, under current law, be denied jobs and housing. However, to protect this whimsical, ever-expanding list of sexual practices and subjective identities merely empowers predators and opportunists to abuse the law to silence those who point to their misdeeds. Anyone can claim one of these identities with no objective basis or legal gatekeeping. Protection of cross-dressers would be wielded to intimidate and cow women who object to men invading women's toilets and changing rooms, for example. We doubt the independence and impartiality of the Law Commission that it is even contemplating such an irrational reform.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Intersex—rare genetic disorders of sexual development—have nothing whatsoever to do with transgenderism. The trans lobby—Stonewall et al—merely weaponise people with DSDs to throw a cloak of medical respectability over their agenda to erase sex from the law. All the above identities are unworthy of legal protection as it takes no commitment for someone to claim one of them for nefarious reasons. We legislate on the basis of humanity in the law, not body rejecting idealism and half-baked queer theory. We say NO.

Question 8 Part 3: Leave the law as it is for now, there is no evidence that any of the reforms proposed here would improve society. Instead they will strengthen existing tools for suppressing the political dissent which is the lifeblood of a democracy. We need to start from scratch with hate crime laws and what we have is not what the McPherson report envisaged.

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: If you attempt to get "gender" made law via this route, to the detriment of women's sex-based rights, there will be public outcry. Women are watching very closely the manoeuvres of public bodies captured by the sex denialism lobby, of which the Law Commission seems to be one (your biased consultation on legalising commercial surrogacy did not pass us by). We will not countenance any attempts to formalise "gender" in law by the back door. Sex is a protected characteristic in equalities legislation, and must remain so, but is not covered by hate crime laws. We previously explained why we do not trust the Law Commission to advance with women's interests clearly in mind. Sex and gender cannot simultaneously be protected as gender is the means of women's oppression by men, not coterminous with sex. We say a strong NO to "gender" as a protected characteristic for the purposes of hate crime laws.

Question 11 Part 2: It seems you have already made up your minds to purist gender not sex, at the behest of the trans lobby. We object. FGM, forced marriage and sexual assault

are male crimes against females because of our sex. Why should these momentous issues be carved out from a law which further institutionalises men's whimsical adherence to feminine sex role stereotypes? What an insult to the victims of FGM, and the 3 women murdered each week by their male partners! We are genuinely repelled by such a suggestion. If you must pursue one line at this time, make it sex not gender, but we do not trust that the LC has women's interests in clear view

Question 12: So the men's rights activists have got to you too? Male violence against men is ubiquitous, and closely regulated under the criminal law. Women are not violent towards men on anything like the same scale. Where this line of thinking leads is towards the further skewing of crime stats by the recording of trans identifying males' crimes as women's crimes, when they are simple male violence. Where are the statistics to support protecting men from women via hate crime laws? We object

Question 13: No

Expand: We see you! So much room for manoeuvre and manipulation in this wording. Woman means adult human female, but you will queer the definition so it includes men who identify with feminine stereotypes. Sex and gender are not coterminous: gender is the means of women's oppression

This is Stonewall Law in the making, and that is no law at all. You aim to ensure that men who think of themselves as trans are considered women for the purposes of hate crime laws. You aim not to protect women's interests but to arm men with another tool to oppress women, under the mantle of therapeutic concern for transsexual men. We say no.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex is biological, objective, observable

Gender is a set of stereotypes applied to men and women, to the disadvantage of women.

They are not coterminous. Conflating the two is the reason so many women are suing public bodies to uphold our sex-based rights and freedom of expression

Gender identity is presumed to enable men to become women. Sex is immutable, and the legal fiction of sex change is just that: a fiction limited to a few settings and circumstances. We say no to the strategic conflation of sex and gender in law and policy

Question 15: This just gets sillier and sillier. So, your reform proposal is for legislation to protect everyone from everyone else for every reason under the sun? Be serious. It is obvious that all of these add-ons are intended to obscure the primary purpose of these reforms: putting women back in their box by way of gender identity ideology. We see you.

Question 16:

Question 17: Prostitution is not a job, it's institutionalised rape of women by psychopathically misogynistic men. Framing this human rights abuse as a mere job in this legislation paves the way for legalised sexual exploitation of women. You would do well to be sceptical of the demands and manipulation of the pimp lobby. We see you. We say no

Question 18: Sillier and sillier. Where does it end?

Question 19:

Question 20: Wow. It didn't take you long to get down to totalitarian brass tacks, did it? We are interested to make FOIs regarding who the frightening authoritarians are at the Law Commission

Holding a belief cannot be an act of hatred. Women are entitled to mock, deplore and loathe the excesses of the gender identity lobby. To do so is not hatred but self respect. Maya Forstater's feminism will be exonerated in courts in April Try again

One expects that such a law would sooner be used to shut down women's dissident speech than, say, to curb the activities of incels and trans activists who call for women like us, and like JK Rowling, to be killed for our beliefs You must acknowledge material context and social reality, instead of forging ahead with this scarily idealistic nonsense.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: "Demonstration" could mean a few tweets. This is totalitarian repression. We say no So should you, because you can't guarantee that you won't be in 'the wrong crowd' over an issue one day. We certainly never expected to find ourselves defending women's free expression from these extraordinary power grabs, but here we are

Question 23: You cannot legislate the feelings in a persons' heart. Why are you trying? Aside from shouting fire in a crowded theatre, and libel, we should all be able to say and write what we mean Pleas desist from this slide towards totalitarianism!

For example, we have few warm fuzzy feelings towards the men who have attacked our livelihoods and safety. That's a legitimate response. It must we be legislated to turn the other cheek? No thank you We reserve the right to mock and rail against bad law and policy

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: For reasons given previously

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand: We also responded to the malicious communications consultation in similar terms. We note the timing of both consultations to coincide with what, for most women, is the busiest time of the year: the run-up to Christmas. We see you and we do not trust the Law Commission's independence and impartiality.

We see that you are following the notorious Dentons Document strategy of avoiding public scrutiny. We intend to scrutinise what you are doing ever step of the way.

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32: “Recognition of intersectionality”? In hate crime legislation? This concept imported from the US, deriving from its very specific racial history, has caused no end of disruption there. Do you seriously think that embedding it in the UK legal framework would somehow achieve ‘social justice’? If you do, you’re an idealist in the grip of a quasi religious belief system We don’t make laws on that basis

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: This is what they are trying to introduce in Scotland: new blasphemy laws. Every sector of society has spoken out against the measure How interesting that the Law Commission has tried to slip this past before Christmas No We reject new blasphemy laws because we do not recognise the new gods which American corporations and philanthropists wish to install

Question 41: No

Expand: No. This will be used to clamp down on feminist speech and criminalise women for speaking out against the insanity of the gender identity lobby (see the Keira Bell court case—that’s the type of horror we object to). No. No. No to totalitarian laws which will end democracy

Question 42: No

Expand: “Innocent disseminators.” Oh my word. You really want to see us back in the C17th don’t you? Has the chilling effect on publishing and political activism occurred to you? No. This is not the right path to take It brings to mind mid century East Germany under the Stasi, which was pure hell for its citizens.

Question 43 Part 1: The laws won’t be used against those companies, though, will it? They will be used to punish little people

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: "Transgender identity" is so broad and vague that it includes the opportunistic rapist and sexual offender Karen White. This cannot be made law. Women have a very real, vital interest in robustly criticising the policy and law reforms imposed by the trans lobby. These men want access to the spaces where we are most vulnerable; they want to destroy any chance of our daughters becoming professional athletes; they repeatedly demonstrate contempt for women and believe we are props for their sexual fetish (the authorities seem to agree that's what women are for). How can we object to such an egregious attack on our rights & dignity without risking criminalisation for "stirring up" hatred against the men who don't seem to respect us at all? There is a real conflict of rights and we must be allowed to speak freely and campaign on that.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand: Please don't take this road of new blasphemy laws. Sex and gender are not conterminous.

Question 50: If you have to go down this path (and we don't think it is wise or justified) then yes, all of the EA 2010 PCs should be imported.

Question 51: No

Expand: This consultation document is genuinely terrifying. So totalitarian! Please stop. Learn from history. Don't set out to persecute those whose thoughts you'd rather not think about. This is appalling.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: See previous answers

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: There should be no such thing as 'hate crime' laws. Assault, discrimination etc is already illegal.

Question 2: No

Expand: Not for the purposes of hate crime laws, no People should be protected from discrimination based on immutable characteristics.

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: No, there is no need to continually divide people based on race in law.

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: There is no reason for sexual orientation to be referred to in law

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: The law must stop pushing the notion of transgenderism

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Sex should be a protected characteristic under the law, gender is not a meaningful concept There is no need for specific hate crime laws

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: There is no need for hate crime laws to address assault or discrimination against either sex

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex is meaningful, gender is not

Question 15: Again no need for a hate crime bill

Question 16: No, ridiculous can of worms

Question 17: This is an unclear question. It should be perfectly legal to say that 'sex work' is exploitation of women

Question 18: No, freedom to criticise all ideologies

Question 19: The assault/abuse of vulnerable people should already be against the law, no need for hate crime bill

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: No need for additional laws

Question 23: Irrelevant, unnecessary Assault/discrimination already illegal

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: This is ridiculous, unnecessary and obviously designed to prevent criticism of some ideology

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand: Stop trying to censor speech.

Question 28: No

Expand: These crimes should already have serious penalties regardless of who the victim is

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: No, because everyone should be equal under the law

Question 33:

Question 34: 'Empowered'?

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Stop censoring speech

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand: No, stop trying to censor free expression

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2: No, because 'stirring up hatred' is a bogus, nonsensical charge. We are not school children, this is a free country, stop trying to censor

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: How do you intend to show that someone intended to stir up hatred without referring to their words? You are, again, simply trying to censor speech.

Question 46: No

Expand: Obviously the burden of proof is on the accuser but the charge of 'stirring up hatred' is still bogus Stop the censorship

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Only if someone is directly threatening a persons life should any action ever be taken on their words.

Question 48: No

Expand: This is intended to silence women from protesting about men in our private spaces

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: Neither hatred nor love can be compelled or legislated upon so stop trying.

Question 51: No

Expand: What people say in their own houses is none of the business of the government

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Disability and sex are the only immutable characteristics in that list

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand: It's a public order offence therefore already covered

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: No, assault is already illegal and therefore covered

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: That would be a no to his High Wokeness, the Moral Authority, thanks very much.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: Given the sensitive nature of this consultation and the fact of our "woke" culture causing many who do not hold hateful views of any of the five protected groups to be fearful of expressing views that challenge or contradict the new orthodoxy, I do not wish my details to be made public

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: I agree that it is sensible to have one piece of legislation and accompanying regulations and SIs etc. in one place rather than scattered across many different places. However I query the use of the word "Hate" It may have become the popular "catch all" term but it is heavily laden with emotion. I do not doubt that there are some who are motivated by hate in their words or actions but it is a word that has become "weaponised" in this debate to shut down debate of different views however calmly expressed etc

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: The difficulty with that is that it already makes others feel excluded by law ginger haired people, stammerers etc Those who are already included are well organised and funded in many respects: others are not and so they are more difficult to identify.

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: I query whether "suitability" is working correctly at the moment for the existing protected groups. Again it would seem to come down to the amount of funding the "group" is able to garner to be able to record statistics etc The current groups are well funded and able to get their message out etc.: others are not and perhaps therefore require greater protection.

Question 4: In principle I agree that these groups should be included BUT this should not be an excuse for not learning the language etc. I live in Birmingham and attend a church where most of the congregation are asylum seekers/refugees most of whom are Iranian, Kurdish or Afghan I appreciate that it is more difficult to learn a new language as you get older but much greater emphasis and assistance should be given in this regard - on top of which the state provision needs to be vastly improved again I speak from the experience of some of the asylum seekers who have attended college in West Midlands

I am also aware that many, especially the women, do not learn English but stay in their own cultures etc. This does not endear them to others who may also be struggling for housing or work etc It is part of a much bigger problem and simply making it a hate crime solves none of the wider issues.

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Is there a need? What is the evidence of any hatred towards such a group?

Question 8: Other (please expand)

Question 8 Part 1: This all goes back to the basic use of the word "hate". Furthermore, apart from cross dressing, all the other categories will only become evident initially through conversation with that individual - assuming the conversation moves to such personal matters. In that context a difference of opinion and view should not be construed as hate. It is just that a difference of opinion/world view. If the person is being vilified so to speak by others then that may well be "hate".

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: It all goes back to the fundamental issue of the difference between hate and holding a different world view/opinion. At the moment the pendulum has swung too far or is perilously close to doing so in favour of "weaponising" difference of opinion

Question 8 Part 3: see the thrust of my answers above

At the moment there seems to be a fair bit of hatred from those who seek the protections proposed

Question 9: Clearer thought and research and discussion with charities dealing with people with autistic spectrum disorders and acquired brain injuries needs to be undertaken as they may well commit hate crimes unwittingly because of their mental disability or equally be the victim of "hate" crimes.

Question 10: There should be a protection for this group as outlined in the answer to the previous question. Particular discussion with the likes of Headway charity and others needs to be had as they have carried out research etc. into this area.

It does create yet a further quagmire into which all this legislation could become embroiled!

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hatred against either sex should be and no doubt is already a criminal offence. A person's gender will be manifest overtly as either male or female. That of itself is unlikely to attract hatred. Hatred that vilifies or leads to physical harm against anyone should be an offence. The difficulty arises when those in the existing and also proposed protected groups seek to "weaponise" their protected status as if they were an endangered species in order to silence any debate, critique or other view

Safeguards against this happening as can be seen in the "cancel" culture so prevalent at the moment. I myself and others feel afraid to express any view against the current orthodoxy as it were for fear of being victimised/ostracised etc. by those in the protected groups or their ardent defenders.

Question 11 Part 2: This is simply making matters more complicated. These should all simply be offences

Part of the problem is that these are cultural and or learned behaviours passed down from one generation to another. Pornography plays a role in this and the ease with which it is available on-line and the inability/unwillingness of the platforms to adequately patrol this and also report offenders.

Question 12: Of course it should include both even if it is rarer against men. How are you defining men and women? Transgender people are no doubt subject to hate crime whichever sex/gender they have changed to.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Please see above

Question 14: No

Expand: Your sex is your gender: in the same way that we currently perceive paedophilia and anorexia amongst other issues as a mental illness I have yet to be satisfied that there is sufficiently clear accepted scientific research to show otherwise as regards sex and gender I am aware that the quality of research to show otherwise is often deficient.

Question 15: Why not? Apart from anything else it is an aspect of life over which one has no control

Question 16: Hate is hate at the end of the day. If it manifests itself in damage to the person or their property or provenly to their reputation then it should be a crime of not already whatever race, sex, age, ability or religion etc

If it is teasing through to humiliation then sufficient account should be taken of the perpetrator's character etc. to better understand if the intention was hate or simply a different view That is the danger at the moment Expressing any view that upsets the "victim" or is perceived by (over zealous) police can lead to being caught up in this tangled web.

Question 17: Again research needs to be done to find out the background. Are the sex workers hated by those who live in the area and do not want their children potentially becoming victims? Or some other reason?

Hate is hate but to prevent people legitimately expressing concerns such as above even if it includes marches and banners should not be construed as hate per se. It is at that point that great care needs to be taken in drafting and implementation.

Question 18: Great care is needed at this point not to create "endangered species" mentality whereby these sub cultures become emboldened to stifle proper debate etc.

Furthermore this will no doubt lead to conflicts between these groups when there are competing rights and "hatred": whose rights prevail? who has been hated the most? It already applies between religions and and between religions and some of the existing protected groups.

Question 19: No There should be existing offences to cover this See also my comments about legitimate "protests" etc above at q17.

Question 20: Again research etc needs to be undertaken and care needs to be taken as to how all these groups are to interact when they each have protection

It also begs the question of what freedom of speech means now.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand: I have insufficient information

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: Each word needs careful consideration and definition The basic freedom of speech to disagree with a lifestyle/point of view/religion etc needs to prevail Furthermore it should not be grounds for any "punishment" by employers etc. as seems to happen too frequently today What happened to diversity?!

Question 23: I agree although I note that you phrase the question as whether the crime was motivated by "hostility or prejudice" towards the protected characteristic (a concept) not the person who identifies as having the characteristic. That is a very important distinction and raises a fundamental differentiation.

There may be occasions where a person "misspeaks" in the heat of the moment or is unaware of the latest correct way to say something. That should not be the cause for prosecution or being called out by press or whoever but a simple quiet conversation and apology. There are cases at the moment where the sentence seems to far outweigh the crime.

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: There may already be case law on the question of "demonstrates, or was motivated by, hostility on the grounds of ..." but there needs to be clear water between the calm expression of a genuinely held point of view/opinion which simply disagrees with the "victim's" world view and those which are ostensibly motivated by hostility. Again "hostility" cannot be equated to "a different view".

I appreciate that this becomes difficult: should a person who states that the Holocaust never happened be entitled to a different view or is it hostile. Context and the individual's overall history in this regard need to be considered.

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: There may already be case law on the question of "demonstrates, or was motivated by, hostility on the grounds of..." but there needs to be clear water between the calm expression of a genuinely held point of view/opinion which simply disagrees with the "victim's" world view and those which are ostensibly motivated by hostility. Again "hostility" cannot be equated to "a different view".

One area of difficulty at the moment is when feminists (or other women) challenge the present acceptance of transgenderism when it comes to use of women's facilities and sport by people born male (see JK Rowling). They have been physically and verbally abused and cancelled. This is NOT acceptable and the law needs to row back against that otherwise freedom of speech is illusory and the law (even more of) an ass.

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: Each person expresses themselves differently so that the individual's overall behavioural pattern needs to be considered. Jordan Peterson has the ability to offend but this is partly his style of conversation, partly the interviewer or panel "colleague" and partly his intention to challenge. I do not consider that "hate". But for many who behave less assertively than Mr Peterson they may well be challenged, cautioned or even prosecuted by the police.

Question 27: Other (please expand)

Expand: Again context may be all. A simplistic implementation simply adds further "ammunition" to those who wish to silence any debate, criticism or review of their own views etc.

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: What is the purpose?

Sadly some who commit these offences have been led in to a way of thinking either by family or the internet. Where is the proof that increasing the penalty will achieve anything?

Far more research as to what may result in changed lifestyles and behaviour is needed: if genuine change can be effected (and there seems little evidence the current resources are achieving this) that is far more effective than incarceration that will avoid the need for more court time and cost and overcrowded prisons

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: Why on earth not if you want to do it for the categories in Q28. This seems to smack of muddled thinking

Question 30: Yes where committed against vulnerable people young or old including the disabled

In this category the penalty for internet phishing, scamming etc should be reviewed I suggest there are fines of x% of the value of the crime with a minimum of £10,000 with charging orders possible including against earnings, benefits and property. There should be simplified ways of achieving this to avoid the costs currently incurred.

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: Agreed but may be leave the door open within legislation so it can be introduced more easily if needed in future.

Question 32: I think this will be unworkable and very prone to abuse by the victim. And if it is adopted, for what purpose? If someone is "hateful" towards a person on grounds of sexuality it is likely to be for all non alignment with heterosexuality and identifying with birth gender/sex.

Question 33: In so far as different tariffs apply, the "victim" is likely to want to seek prosecution for the one with the highest tariff if at all possible. It may lead to false and fanciful claims. Is that appropriate?

Question 34: No: that is a non sequitur and may simply lead to "victims"/police pursuing an aggravated offence knowing the base offence will be accepted if an aggravated offence is not proven.

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Again research needs to be done. Guidance may be appropriate to Judges etc The difficulty is that this whole area of law is so sensitive and in its infancy that I suggest we do not know where the base line truly lies as between freedom of speech and characteristic protection

Add in to the mix religious world views and the issues that arise when the tenets of, say , Islam hit up against a protected characteristic there are real issues in a liberal democracy.

More work needs to be done where these real issues intersect - as again with feminist v trans views.

Clear and unambiguous rationale needs to be given as well. Again there is the danger that the public at large perceive that it is vocal and favoured minorities that are privileged in this debate of world views and creeds.

Question 38 Part 2: A lot more research that is from a very wide range of views not just interested parties within the "protected characteristic" categories needs to be done. A real understanding of the different views and why these may be held needs to be undertaken. Much freedom of speech is currently being stifled and it is critical that the current legislation and any changes do not stifle this further especially by giving the present and any future groups "tools" to silence debate

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: Other (please expand)

Expand: Subject to all the usual safeguards as to freedom of speech etc. Whilst agreeing that no form of communication should be excluded the points expressed at 1.99 of the consultation are very important coupled with a perception among many (probably not those with protected characteristics) that it requires very little to be found guilty of a crime in this whole area of life.

Part of the problem must also be laid at the feet of Internet platforms. They need to be given clear guidance on what is and is not acceptable and there must be large fines for breaches maybe a % of their global profits to demonstrate the seriousness of the problem.

Another part of the overall problem is the snowball effect whereby if a person says or "writes" something that offends current orthodoxy they can lose their job and much more. Simply to hold a different view should not be penalised in the way that it seems a number of employers are. The concept of "equality" and "freedom of speech" seems to be ignored. It is this knock on effect that is stifling debate and causing people unnecessary hardship.

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: Again there needs to be a careful definition of "inflammatory" that permits true freedom of speech and requires those with protected characteristics to understand that many for religious or biological and scientific reasons do not accept much of the current sexual "ideology" and others for the speed with which it has all happened.

Many people are simply asking to be allowed to civilly disagree and are not calling for any conversion therapy, death penalty or whatever for those with a sexually protected characteristic.

Failure to show such grace to others makes those with a sexually protected characteristic as guilty as those from the past who legalised against homosexuality etc.

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: This flexibility should be available to all of these offences if it is not already.

Question 43 Part 1: Yes. They should be made aware of the law and given clear guidance and be liable on a strict liability offence basis and fined a percentage of gross profits increasing for each offence.

The danger then becomes that these providers take a very conservative view on what may offend. I am aware that some are already being shut down for, for instance, having views that challenge Islam in some way or another (especially if made by non (ex) Muslims) and also challenge the views of the Palestinian claim to a homeland or the outcome of the US election etc.

Clearly there needs to be a proper mechanism for dialogue between the platform provider and the "poster" with appeals etc. At the moment it seems these are weak and, again, seem simply to align with current orthodoxy so that, for an easy life, sites can be shut down even if there is no actual offence or the "victim" is being unduly sensitive or maybe aggressive in protecting their viewpoint.

Question 43 Part 2: Yes Why not?

Question 44: Yes Hopefully this would bring clarity It needs to be "future proofed" and also be robust. My fear in the present climate is that the bar is set too low given the overall stifling effect there has been in recent years as regards freedom of speech where views contrary to current orthodoxy are given

In the context of live debate or even written pieces may be there could be a disclaimer (as there currently is on the news about flash photography or "some viewers may find part or all of the following item upsetting") so that people can know NOT to watch/listen/read or whatever. Likewise there should be a separate crime of disrupting and aggressively heckling live events so that the offenders are properly fined and penalised Presently it seems that this tactic is often used to stifle debate and, sadly, there seem to be a number of reported occasions where the police have advised the person holding the contrary view to call off the meeting or whatever That is mob rule and needs urgently addressing and is simply "hate speech" from those either with a protected characteristic or those rooting for them.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive

climate. People react strongly against even mild statements

that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and

prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir

up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will

be hugely damaging to freedom of speech Unpopular views will

be penalised As indicated above different people have different ways of expressing themselves without intention to offend. This is likely to catch those who may be provoked in debate or led by the interviewer or co-panellist in to "misspeaking" or having to answer in a way that it is perceived as intention

The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure

only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught Freedom

of speech is precious Outlawing mild language purely because

intention to stir up hatred is presumed and regardless of

whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous It could mean the

criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately.

In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion.

Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered.

There is already a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and

transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred,
it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss
beliefs

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Transgender identity and disability are mutually exclusive categories. They should not be considered together in this type of question.

Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate.

As previously indicated women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences

This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development.

The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: No

Expand: Again these are still contentious issues in terms of recent developments. There are many scientific and biological arguments that diverge from the current orthodox view. Stirring up offences should not be extended in this way as the recent "changes" are controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate.

Question 50: Please see above comments suggesting no such changes are appropriate.

Question 51: No

Expand: Absolutely not. Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes.

As the consultation acknowledges education plays a part. There are already too many cases of social workers and others removing children etc. from their families for misreporting conversations etc. from home leading to their removal from their parents.

This would take censorship to a completely new level especially in the current occasionally febrile atmosphere around these topics.

Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience as well as resulting in children reporting what they think the police want them to say - perhaps so that they can go home etc.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate

Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion.

Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation.

Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect:

- using a person's birth name and pronoun,
- saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and
- saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2: see above

Question 53: see above

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights.

A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent

requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech

The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check

The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1: The background to this question is not clear. Why should parliamentary reports be exempt or be the subject of a new offence? Because MPs are intemperate in their language or because they alone are to have the right to complete freedom of debate? It should be a common standard so that there is freedom of debate generally

If court proceedings are likewise exempt will this prevent lawyers and police etc from learning from earlier cases and decisions and debate?

Question 55 Part 2: These should be exempt but as indicated above so should much other debate on these issues that are still very contentious.

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: not known

Question 58: Yes

Question 59: Yes

Question 60: only with caution: this is becoming very subjective

Question 61: If it is widespread then probably it is not. Enforcement needs to be quick, efficient and effective

Question 62: No Previous experience suggests that these roles are insufficiently impartial and robust to defend true freedom of speech and debate and are more blown along by the winds of fashion

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: This is a personal response

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: I am very concerned that the current situation is seriously misguided and that this needs to be addressed before anything extra is added to it. We are in real danger of becoming a nation of people who are afraid to express how they feel on a number of issues from fear of inadvertently committing a crime. This problem is linked to a more fundamental one: we no longer have a cultural "yardstick" with which to assess whether something is right or wrong. For at least 1,500 years the UK, and Europe in general, had such a yardstick. What we have now is a determined effort by a minority to deliberately discredit that yardstick and work against it in any way possible. Christianity formed the bedrock of European culture for all those years. Certain principles of behaviour were readily accepted by the many of the population which stemmed from Christianity and were acted upon by the many whether they were Christians or not. I am 74 years of age and can remember a time when this was the case. The Bible was acknowledged by most to provide the cultural foundation of our society even by those who did not personally believe much of it. Speech is dealt with extensively in the Bible. It's pages urge us not to repay evil with evil but to overcome evil with good; to speak in a way which will build people up and not pull them down; to love our enemies. More and more legislation will not solve the current problem.

Question 2: No

Expand: A much more fundamental overhaul is required. The current legislation already has a chilling effect on free speech.

Question 3: No

Expand: "Hostility" and "prejudice" are loaded concepts. Crimes that are legislated for should not be as vague and open to misinterpretation as this or we will soon become a police state with the "thought police" in operation everywhere and people denouncing other people.

because they don't like them. There needs to be concrete evidence before bad behaviour can be defined as a crime.

Question 4: I believe that those who seek asylum or wish to migrate to this country should be treated respectfully and fairly but that goes for the rest of us too. Abusive behaviour is everywhere, affecting everybody, especially via social media. We need to recover our ethical and moral foundation and then these problems would at least be mitigated. To criminalise more and more is very dangerous. Bad behaviour is reprehensible but there are better ways to deal with it than making everything a crime

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: I am not sure about this. I do not trust the current generation who are dealing with these matters. They often do not seem to understand that religions vary greatly. Treating "religion" as though it meant one thing is ignorant and dangerous.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: I am uneasy about the whole thing so do not feel able to comment on this specifically.

Question 7: This whole thing is a nightmare. We have lost our moral compass and so anything goes. We are in a very dangerous situation and our children and grandchildren are suffering because of it. Once we decide that any individual can decree what their personal definition of sexuality is we have entered the realms of phantasy. Once again I plead for this whole area to be revisited

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: We must not indulge the madness that our society seems to have fallen into, If people are being treated badly, it doesn't matter who or what they are; it should be the criminal action that is dealt with. If they are being insulted that is very bad behaviour but so is lots of bad behaviour that is not treated as a crime. As an evangelical Christian I am regularly insulted but I don't feel the need to have the police involved. If the verbal abuse became physically violent that would be a completely different matter but the crime would be the violence irrespective of any other factors.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: My earlier responses explain why I think this would be a dangerous development.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: I do not feel equipped to comment on this

Question 10: Again, I do not feel able to provide an opinion.

Question 11: No

Expand: Where will this process end? It is frightening, when seen through the lens of the possible emergence of a police state.

Question 11 Part 2: I can't answer this. It doesn't make sense to me

Question 12: The whole thing worries me but I see no reason why it should not apply to both.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Once again, I don't feel able to respond to such a surreal question.

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: See answer to the previous question None of the key words in Question 14 seems to me to have any real meaning anymore.

Question 15: It is a tragic denunciation of our society that such a question needs to be asked Creating more categories for crime is not the answer

Question 16: If you do the latter, the term will no longer have any meaning.

Question 17: The fewer categories the better. A campaign for all people to be treated with respect might achieve more The fundamental problem in all this is that "there is no fear of God before their eyes."

Question 18: My answer is the same as for Question 17

Question 19: Again my answer is the same We are in danger of becoming a police state because people no longer have fear of God and his righteous judgement.

Question 20: Again, my answer is the same. All these threats of criminalisation will eventually stop all debate.

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: I don't feel qualified to comment

Question 22: No

Expand: The whole thing needs to be revisited.

Question 23: How dangerous this would be! One person's idea of prejudice is another person's belief that they just hold a different view. This is potentially terrifying.

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: I don't feel able to comment on this I just feel deeply depressed and frankly, terrified, by the whole thing. The more specific legislation there is the more potential there is for

people with an agenda to try to silence those they disagree with

Question 25: No

Expand: I am terrified by the very concept of hate crime. We have become such an amoral country that we can't be trusted to make subtle moral judgements

Question 26: No

Expand: I don't trust the whole process for reasons given earlier although I do appreciate that good motives lie behind what is being proposed Unwittingly, a situation is arising which will silence debate on issues of morality.

Question 27: No

Expand: For reasons given earlier

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: I don't feel qualified to answer this

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: Again, I don't feel qualified to provide an answer.

Question 30:

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: I can't comment

Question 32: I reject the whole concept of intersectionality

Question 33: I can't comment.

Question 34: I can't comment

Question 35: I can't comment

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: I can't comment

Question 37: Other (please expand)

Expand: I can't comment

Question 38 Part 1: I can't comment

Question 38 Part 2: I can't comment

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: I can't comment

Question 40: No

Expand: There is far too much legislation already

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: I don't feel able to comment

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: Under all circumstances where there is sufficient evidence.

Question 43 Part 2: Yes

Question 44: "Likely to" is too vague a term, too open to different interpretations

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: How do you propose to know if there was intention there or not? There must be many instances when this would not be possible

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand: I don't see how you could do this safely.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: There is far too much legislation already

Question 49: No

Expand: See above.

Question 50: I beg and beseech you to revisit the whole concept of hate crime, especially as it relates to speech. You are playing with fire.

Question 51: Other (please expand)

Expand: I can't comment

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand: As above

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53: I can't comment

Question 54: Yes

Expand: This whole thing is a dangerous minefield

Question 55 Part 1: I can't comment

Question 55 Part 2: Yes, there should be as many exemptions as possible

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: I don't know enough to comment

Question 58: Yes, they should be

Question 59: Yes, they should be.

Question 60: I can't comment

Question 61: I don't know

Question 62: I do not support this. Far too much is being made of this issue. The basic problem is the loss of a moral foundation for how our society should behave and that is what needs to be addressed

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Labour and Co-operative Candidate for Warwickshire Police and Crime Commissioner

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: The definition of race should be amended in hate crime laws to include migration and asylum status as well as language, to avoid reliance on Court of Appeal judgments and give more clarity to victims, police and anyone involved in the sentencing process

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: In light of growing evidence that people who are asexual experience forms of discrimination as well as abuse and discrimination based on their asexuality, it is vital that they receive protection under the sexual orientation definition.

There is no reasonable argument for excluding 'asexuality', and I fully support the efforts of Stonewall nationally and Warwickshire Pride locally to ensure the law protects this group

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: This is a particularly complex area, in which I am minded to defer to the expertise, views, wishes and feelings of the excellent advocacy groups and individuals affected by this definition.

Question 10: There is a strong case for this situation to be included within hate crime laws, particularly as people can often feel targeted precisely 'because' of their disabilities. However, while awareness raising is required for all forms of hate crime, this change in particular would require an investment in public education in order to be an effective deterrent or fair criminal justice response.

Question 11: Yes

Expand: I fully support gender or sex becoming a protected characteristic for the purposes of hate crime law. This was a key policy included in the Labour Party's 2019 manifesto and I congratulate Stella Creasy MP on her efforts in the campaign to make misogyny a hate crime. Having discussed this with Stella and her team, I am committed to seeking ways to

implement this approach in policy if I am elected as Warwickshire Police and Crime Commissioner. It would be vital for consistency across the country if the appropriate legal change was made and accompanied by robust guidance for police forces and the public

Protection under hate crime legislation would effectively complement other efforts to combat violence against women and girls in particular, such as found in the Domestic Abuse Bill. I thank the Law Commission for comprehensively setting out the case for gender or sex to be better protected, and fully support this recommendation.

Question 11 Part 2: If gender or sex are protected for the purposes of hate crime law, I feel it is better to keep this definition broad and inclusive. However if there are specific and nuanced cases to be made for particular issues, then I would again defer to the expertise of relevant advocacy groups and individuals affected.

Question 12: In line with the Equality Act 2010, I believe that protecting "sex" should be a generally defined characteristic. Monitoring the effect and outcomes of this new hate crime protection should give rise to ways to ensure all genders are better protected from prejudice, abuse or violence.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Women and girls may be more appropriate, or this new hate crime legislation could risk discriminating based on age.

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15: I believe age should be recognised as a protected characteristic for the purposes of hate crime law. There is clear evidence that prejudice, discrimination and criminal targeting occurs based on age. Particularly likely to be targeted are older people or children and young people.

Question 16: Age-based hate crime protection should include people of all ages.

Question 17: Yes, 'sex workers' should be recognised as a hate crime category, following the long standing success of such an approach in Merseyside.

Question 18: I fully support the Sophie Lancaster Foundation's brilliant campaigning efforts, and have seen this approach in action during my time working for the late Ron Hogg, then Durham Police, Crime and Victims' Commissioner. With more than a quarter of police forces in England and Wales recognising the 'alternative subcultures' hate crime category, it is time for the law to end the postcode lottery and include it.

Question 19: I absolutely support 'people experiencing homelessness' to be recognised as a hate crime category. This is one of the most vulnerable groups in society and people are frequently stigmatised and targeted. Working with various police forces, I have encountered frequent problems with violence against and exploitation of people who are rough sleeping. One incident which emphasised the need for 'hate crime' to be considered was when a group of university students drank champagne in front of a person who was rough sleeping and poured part of the drink on to him and his bedding. Better protection is urgently needed for this group. It could also be an important tool against those organised criminals who exploit people experiencing homelessness in order to sell drugs.

Question 20: I do not agree that 'philosophical beliefs' should be recognised as a hate crime category, primarily because my experience has not shown a considerable need for it to the

same degree as other categories mentioned above. I also do not think it is a practically workable, and could easily become too broad, or in fact too narrow in which case the distinction between protected and unprotected beliefs is arbitrary

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: Yes this appears to be the most workable and fair option.

Question 33:

Question 34: They certainly should be empowered to find a defendant guilty of the base offence should the aggravated element not be considered proven beyond reasonable doubt.

Question 35: No. I agree with the Law Commission's conclusion in this regard: "we are currently unpersuaded that the removal of increased maximum penalties is a desirable reform outcome; principally due to the negative message it could send to already marginalised racial and religious groups."

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: There should be robust complaints/flagging systems for users to alert social media companies to issues, and then clear consistent timeframes for action should be set out in law. Failure then to act should result in criminal liability if hosting unlawful material.

Question 43 Part 2: Yes, but it must be very clearly defined.

Question 44:

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Yes

Question 48: Yes

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50: Yes it should.

Question 51: Yes

Expand:

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I would support the introduction of a Hate Crime Commissioner, although would also welcome a very clear (possibly statutory) focus on hate crime for the current Victims' Commissioner. In Warwickshire, I am standing for election to be the next Police and Crime Commissioner, and if successful I will seek to introduce a Victims' Commissioner for the county whose remit will include taking action to improve hate crime awareness and protections.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: We need to beware of the idea of a 'hate crime' in terms of speech.

In terms of jurisprudence, it is safer and wiser to criminalise actions than words, whenever possible. If words must be criminalised at all, it must be very obvious that they are intended to incite violence or terrorism or other well-defined bad-things.

Free Speech must be protected at all costs, along with the opportunity to freely and passionately disagree, including charging others with being wrong, unhelpful, unwise, immoral, etc., ... without any fear of reprisals.

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: By giving credence to the idea of a 'self defined' gender as distinct from biological sex, the whole system of legislature has opened itself up to a can of worms.

If someone can say, "I am a bat", therefore we all agree that they 'are a bat', it is almost impossible to protect them from everything from criticism to derision

To protect somebody's purely subjective view of 'what/who they are', which has no basis in fact or science, is a pathway to disaster.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18: No

Be sensible. Jurisprudence leads us to minimise the number of laws and categories of interventions

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: Unless you can define 'hostility' in a legally precise way, you are in real trouble

We all have some antipathy to various things, especially including things that are imagined, subjective or untrue

Free speech must be protected at all costs

Question 23: One man's "prejudice" is another man's truth, is another man's worked-through opinion

The attempts to stifle free speech by condemning an expression of antipathy is most dangerous and unwise in a free democracy.

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: All purely-subjective 'self-definitions' should be excluded, notably the current concept of 'gender' as distinct from biological sex. Otherwise you can offend anyone who thinks they are a womble or a monkey, by saying, "I think you're talking nonsense" ... free speech must allow people to respond in this way, otherwise you make a free population slaves, as in an oppressive regime like China or the former Communist bloc.

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: In all cases, no prosecution should proceed without an obvious and provable INTENT to stir up hatred.

Free speech must continue to be valued and upheld in plays and performances

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: "Likely to" stir up hatred is far too subjective

It would be wise to have to prove INTENT to stir up hatred.

There is a huge band of people who want to argue that anyone speaking their mind, who happens to disagree with them, is LIKELY to STIR UP HATRED We must give such people no opportunity to inflict their own views on the whole population.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: As at present, it should need to be established that BOTH elements are proven.

Otherwise the Woke people of our day, who tend to be over-sensitive to anyone who dares to disagree, will be shouting, "foul", whenever someone simply says what they think

Free speech must be protected at all costs and here in particular.

I feel very strongly on this point

Question 46: No

Expand: 'ABUSIVE' is an extremely subjective term. Anyone who dares to disagree in public is today accused of 'abuse'. The word is becoming meaningless and jurisprudence should lead us to avoid it in this type of legislation, I believe

'Hatred' and 'threatening' are likewise words that a growing minority of persons and groups are using to seek to marginalise those who take courage to disagree with them.

We need to be very careful in framing legislation in the wake of the current crisis [of ever increasing obligation to assent to various items of 'political correctness'], where accusations of 'hatred' and 'threatening' and 'abuse' are being thrown left, right and centre, against anyone who disagrees

Free Speech needs to be protected most strongly here.

Question 47: No

Expand: "Likely to" is too subjective to be safe or useful here

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Because of the recent invention of a subjective concept, called "transgender identity", with no basis in biological or scientific reality, we would be unwise to make further legislation to protect such a subjective opinion/concept

The Emperor has already been seen to have no clothes on, with e.g. male prisoners pretending to be female (in their head) and getting transferred to female institutions, where they then sexually attack real [biological] females

If you try to use the full force of the law against those who rightly perceive such a purely subjective idea to be very subjective, you will undermine not only free speech, but also common sense

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: No. Free Speech must have protection in dwellings most especially.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Derek Sparrow

Name of Organisation: Wolverton Evangelical Church

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: It is important that BOTH intention and words used-categories should be present & proven for there to be any offence.

Otherwise there is the danger that normal free speech will be criminalised

Question 46: No

Expand: There is a danger with over-reliance on a subjective combination of words such as:

likely

threatening

abusive

Those who wish to propound their own views most vehemently and wish to silence those who disagree, are commonly using such words to condemn what is no more than the right of Free Speech

The law should avoid the folly of playing into the hands of the many, who wish to use these concepts to criminalise those who speak out and disagree on certain controversial issues.

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Andreas Dimopoulos

Name of Organisation: University of Huddersfield

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: A long-standing criticism of the legal definition of disability has been that it is based on the medical model of disability. By focusing on the underlying 'medical' issue to define disability, English law perpetuates the stigma of medicalisation, and abnormality. The social model of disability, which views disability as a direct result of negative responses, prejudice, and other barriers which exclude and marginalise persons with disability, does capture the lived experience of disability in a better way. It also explains why Deaf persons do not see themselves as having a disability. My opinion is that the social model is unworkable as the legal definition of disability.

However, the current definition, with its strong medical model connotations, must change. Based on Ron Amundson's work, my suggestion would be to change the definition of disability as the lack (perceived or not) of a biological trait or ability, which is socially valued or prized. This definition is much more neutral than the current one. It retains an objectively observed measure (biological trait or ability), which is expressed in neutral terms. Impairment is a negative term. Most importantly however, it retains the link between the biological trait or ability and its social reception, in a way that coheres with notions of

othering, and also with how hate crime works. We value smart people, and that is why some hate people with intellectual disabilities.

Question 10: It would be beneficial to include such crimes in the ambit of hate crime law This is because there are many invisible disabilities on the one hand, and also because able-bodied persons should not be the arbiters of who has a disability, or not, or to what extent the person with disability conforms to the stereotypes of able bodied persons Examining the motive of the perpetrator is an effective means to ensure that 'situational misunderstandings' will not be prosecuted

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18: Insofar as these groups are easily identifiable, they should be protected from 'othering' and being targeted because of their otherness.

Question 19: Yes. In the case of homeless people, their situational vulnerability makes them an easy target of abuse The more difficult question here is whether any vagrancy legislation should be repealed (it should), and whether the infamous cases of people burning money in front of homeless people should be classified as hate crime. My understanding is that defacing, but not destroying, money is a crime, and hence a specific legislative provision should be introduced to target this.

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23: Persons with disabilities are sometimes the targets of crime because they are seen as easy targets by perpetrators. The motivation behind these crimes remains clearly disablist These victims are selected because they are 'inferior' to able-bodied persons, even if, in terms of animus, the perpetrator may be indifferent to persons with disability. Hostility or prejudice are inapposite concepts to capture this harm

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: None

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Yes

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Yes

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59: ■

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: It would seem to make sense to bring together diverse, confusing laws into one specific law which is easier to understand and interpret. However one should note that law is complex by nature and trying to simplify it may cause as many problems as it seeks to solve. Given that hate crime differs dependent on so many variables I'm unsure whether one act could successfully encompass them.

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: There are characteristics which expose an individual to prejudice, discrimination and hate. There are difficulties with ensuring which characteristics should be included and in striking the right balance to ensure that freedom to express opinions on matters are not constrained by clumsy or inappropriate hate crime laws, whilst at the same time preventing crimes which incite hatred or harm to individuals.

Question 3: Yes

Expand: I think that intent should also be relevant. If through ignorance harm is caused then this is surely different from proving an action set out to cause that harm

Question 4: Yes. Those characteristics are often interlinked and certainly harm has been caused to people seeking asylum or migrants through deliberate acts by others

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: Intent is important in a definition of hate crime. Religion is a characteristic which should be protected in terms of hate crimes but with the caveat that careful consideration be given as to how free debate and differences of opinion on religious views can continue without being labelled hate crimes. For example in recent discussions over anti-Semitism I believe that some people have made comments which were not intended to cause harm but which were a result of ignorance or a difference of opinion. The harm they may have caused should therefore consider if the person knowingly shared those opinions with the intention of harming a person who held those religious beliefs. The premise should be that the law is able to distinguish between criticism of a religious philosophy and persecution of a person because they hold those religious beliefs.

Question 6: Yes

Expand: Different sections within religions should already be covered within the existing protected characteristics

Question 7: If a law called hate crime exists and someone has a characteristic which causes them to be subjected to hate, intolerance and persecution then yes asexuality should be included. It should be as inclusive as possible as any characteristic which a person has should not expose them to hatred. Once again the distinction has to be made at the level of individuals.

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: People who are transgender, non binary or intersex are exposed to high levels of hate speech. It is a difficult path to tread to protect people from harm and getting the right terminology so that suddenly people who hold differing opinions about transgender issues are not criminalised. It's really important that the views of the transgender community are included in this consultation as threats, violence and intolerance are a daily experience for many people so it's important to carefully define the characteristics that will protect them from hatred

Question 9: Once again the definition of disability should be inclusive. It's the principle of hate crime that should be defined in law not necessarily defining each specific characteristic. If someone is subjected to hate or persecution because of something about themselves then that should be defined as a hate crime.

Question 10: Intent should form part of any hate crime. A hate crime can only be defined as such because the person committing the crime knew of that characteristic and used it as the basis of intolerance, abuse, discrimination or violence. Surely if you didn't know that a

person was disabled but subjected them to abuse etc this might still be a crime but not a hate crime as it was not the basis of the hatred.

Question 11: Yes

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: Surely if those characteristics are protected then those subsequent acts of harm come under that law if you can prove that those crimes were committed because of a person's sex or gender? In others words the harm was caused through hatred of that protected characteristic. For example a person may be violent to their partner through their hatred of women and express their violence in those terms

Question 12: Both. If a man in a relationship with another man, for example, is subjected to harm because the perpetrator commits that violence because of his

expressed hatred of men (or gay men) then this is surely defined as a hate crime

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15: Yes if the principle is that any characteristic which a person has could cause hatred towards them. If it can proved that there was intent and evidence of the harm caused to a person based on their age then surely that must be included. I certainly have heard of older people being the target of abuse and violence because of they are elderly

Question 16: All ages. It's a legal principle here not necessarily defining every characteristic which may or may not be protected.

Question 17: If a person is specifically targeted because of they share a characteristic and they are subjected to harm because of it, then yes.

Question 18: If I could use an example. We know that some people who express themselves as part of a subculture such as goths are the subject of hatred by others. Intact we know of incidents where some 'goths' have been sought out, targeted and murdered because they were a goth. They were murdered because they were a goth that is the definition of a hate crime

Question 19: Yes, yes. Once again some homeless people have been specifically targeted because of their homeless status and subjected to harm because of it

Question 20: If you are a humanist or have any other kind of philosophical belief and someone persecutes you and causes you harm because of that belief then that is a hate crime

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand: But intent to cause harm through that hostility must also be proved (or the knowledge that it would cause harm)

Question 23: Yes as this could show intention to cause harm based on the protected characteristic. However it is possible to have hostility and prejudice but for this not to be the basis of an attack. For example a person may have expressed hostile views against migrants and at a later date is involved in an attack on a migrant but it would still have to be proved that this hostility was the basis of the crime and not, for example random. Motivation should be part of an examination of whether the crime was intentional in causing harm because of a person's characteristic.

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: I agree but there may be other serious crimes carried out with intent to cause harm based on a protected characteristic, in particular sexual crimes. It is not within my understanding to determine if any such crimes could be aggregated and as such carry a harsher sentence but for me they are worthy of consideration. For example the rape of a gay man because he is gay.

Question 29: No

Expand: Surely any crime which is inflicted to cause harm to a person based on a characteristic could be considered as aggravated? But if that is not the case under the law currently then the same should continue under hate crime legislation.

Question 30: As the above response. Any crime which can be considered aggravated under current law should potentially be considered as aggravated under hate crime legislation.

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: Mmm it's difficult to know without seeing the approach in action as to whether it's workable or fair but in principle it sounds sensible

Question 33: These are legal questions which I do not have sufficient knowledge to answer

Question 34: Please refer to my response above

Question 35: Please refer to my responses above. I do not believe I have sufficient knowledge to comment

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Yes as it would allow judges to consider a wider definition of hate crime

Question 38 Part 2: A combination.

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand: Not qualified to answer

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand: Intent is the key here and there needs to be robust systems to prove this

Question 43 Part 1: If social media companies have been alerted to such material and fail to act, thus allowing harmful material to continue to disseminate then they should be criminally liable.

Question 43 Part 2: Yes. It has to be proved as the basis of any sound law

Question 44: There must be an attempt to prove that an offender was knowledgeable of how likely actions or words or materials were likely to encourage racial hatred. This should be defined in law to help interpretation and aid clarity

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: I think that both should be demonstrated.

Question 46: Yes

Expand: Only in respect to 3 and 4. Intent can be proved by the knowledge of likely to cause harm. Then it must be shown as per 1 that harm was caused.

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand: Unsure

Question 47 Part 2: Unsure

Question 48: Yes

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50: Yes

Question 51: Yes

Expand: Surely if someone is subjected to a hate crime in a domestic setting it's still a hate crime?

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: Yes a protected characteristic is one by virtue that it is treated the same under the law.

Question 58: If the gesture or missile is against someone on the basis of a characteristic and causes hatred then yes.

Question 59: Yes

Question 60: Yes

Question 61: Unsure

Question 62: I think that this is a sensible suggestion as it allows for a co-ordinate consistent approach

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Private individual

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand: Simplification of the statute book is always worthwhile

Question 2: Yes

Expand: It makes sense to describe hate crime with regard to certain categories in order to clarify and illustrate the meaning of hate. However, it is improbable that any list of specified characteristics would be comprehensive and the law should reflect that

Question 3: Yes

Expand: This fair enough as far as it goes: criteria of this kind will help to identify certain common objects of hate, but to limit hate to such specified characteristics seems short sighted and does not properly define hate.

Question 4: Yes. These characteristics are likely to be the subject of hate from some people

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: I have no informed view on this matter

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: I have no informed view on this matter.

Question 9: I have no informed view on this matter

Question 10: Yes. All people should be protected from criminal conduct based on hate.

Question 11: Yes

Expand: All people should be protected from criminal behaviour arising from hate To add gender or sex to the law would not be unreasonable, but would still not make the law comprehensive.

Question 11 Part 2: This could be done, but would not make the law comprehensive as all people deserve to be protected from criminal behaviour based on hate.

Question 12: If the characteristics of sex or gender are included in the law then it should be as inclusive as possible

Question 13: No

Expand: Misogyny is the hatred of women so there is no need for this change.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex and gender are widely regarded as not the same thing, so it would be better to separate them in the definition

Question 15: All people deserve to be protected from criminal behaviour based on any reason for hatred, so age could be included. However, this would not make the list of characteristics comprehensive

Question 16: If the category of age is included then it should apply to all ages as all people deserve to be protected from criminal behaviour based on hate.

Question 17: This is a very specific category. There is no reason not to include it in a list which is already far from comprehensive, but only if the law recognises that it is not comprehensive. There are so many other types of worker who might be mentioned. All people deserve to be protected from criminal behaviour based on hate.

Question 18: I do not know what this phrase means.

Question 19: All people deserve to be protected from criminal behaviour based on hate.

Question 20: All people deserve to be protected from criminal behaviour based on hate.

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand: Demonstration should include in its definition the notion of intent to cause harm.

Question 23: This would be correct provided that an intent to cause harm was contained in the meaning of hostility or an act of prejudice.

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand: But this list is not comprehensive of all who may be the object of hate crime and the law should recognise that other categories could be included.

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand: The above should be included in the offences with aggravated versions as they constitute offences very similar to grievous bodily harm.

Question 30: It is right to maintain a differentiation between offences against the person and those against property.

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: As soon as an online platform is made aware of unlawful material it should be removed and neglect to do so should be criminal. Online platforms cannot instantly spot all unlawful material, but a reasonable time limit could be applied

Question 43 Part 2: Yes.

Question 44: Intent to cause harm must be key. Without the demonstration of intent there can be no proof of hate. The phrase "likely to" should be carefully defined as it risks dependence on the perception of interest groups who do not want their views questioned. Likelihood should take into account the understanding of people who do not hold committed views in the area of hate crime alleged – the ordinary person in the street, not the interest group.

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1: If intent is demonstrable then it should be criminal regardless of the words used.

Question 46: Yes

Expand: But the definition of likelihood needs not to become the hostage of particular interest groups rather than the ordinary person.

Question 47: Yes

Expand: A single definition of likelihood would logically apply to all forms of potentially hateful speech.

Question 47 Part 2: Insulting, threatening and abusive should not be part of the definition as insult and offence, a perception of threat or abuse can wrongly be taken in unreasonable ways. Likelihood should be defined according to a common sense understanding of the effect of words

Question 48: Yes

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50: Yes. This follows from the view that all persons deserve to be protected from criminal behaviour based on hatred

Question 51: No

Expand: This feels like an intrusion upon free discussion within a family. The expression of views amongst family members should be excluded from hate crime legislation. Actions of hatred will be criminally liable in other ways, but parents and children are in a different relationship when speaking or writing to each other than those intended to be covered by hate crime legislation which concerns public activity.

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: The current protections in sections 29j and 29a in regard to race and religion should be removed.

Question 53: I believe these protections are restrictions on free speech which should be removed.

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: These should be maintained as such reports are not new expressions of hatred intending to cause harm, but merely reports of such with other intents.

Question 55 Part 2: Newspaper and other media reports which maintain an objective level of reporting and do not lend any support to views of hate which have an intent to cause harm should also be exempted.

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: All people deserve to be protected from criminal behaviour based on hate

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: If the law is well expressed, then the courts should be able to interpret and apply it without the need for a Hate Crime Commissioner

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: I am responding in a personal capacity, with professional knowledge as a psychologist.

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I request this information is treated confidentially. There is a considerable level of poor behaviour and professional treatment in the psychology profession, where difference of opinion is not appreciated nor accepted.

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: The existing hate crime laws should be repealed.

The premise that a subjective "feeling" or "perception" of one party about another's actions and motivations is fundamentally untenable, and the law as it stands, and also as proposed here in this model of reform, is grossly used in a way that causes severe harm to individuals and society.

As a psychologist, I can attest that the subjective feelings of victimhood, perceptions of being attacked, and assumptions of hateful motivations in others are frequently:

- sincerely felt, but objectively unwarranted

- deliberately and knowingly fabricated

- often a symptom of psychological distress/disorders in the complainant

There appears to be a total lack of acknowledgement of the entrenched subjectivity involved in the perception and the concept of "hate", a subjectivity which makes the law illogical and decreases trust.

These are unpopular realities to discuss, but nevertheless must be. There are in some circumstances significant benefits to be had by making a complaint of a hate crime, and such benefits and motivation by the malicious complainant are currently supported in law and by the police.

Of course, there are non-thought crimes committed through a motivation connected with the possession of certain characteristics. Such crimes should be dealt with using current law.

Where the Hate Crime Act and current Hate Crime law additionally falls, and the presumption that a crime committed accompanied by such a vague concept should be dealt with any differently than an identical crime committed without the concept. Why should that be? Why should an assault on a white person be treated to a lesser degree than an assault on a black person, and the latter most frequently automatically assumed to be motivated from "racial hatred", using a different Act and incur a greater penalty? I write this as a mixed race person who has suffered both anti-asian and anti-white racism.

Of course the fundamental flaw in all Hate Crime law is the definition of "hate", and the deplorable suggestion that thoughts and conversations in one's own home will now fall under Hate Crime law. Different opinions must be allowed to prevail, be respected, and encouraged. We have already passed the point where opinions are silenced, debate forbidden and speech cancelled. For a civilised society where debate is key to developing understanding and progression, we must cease this degradation now. As an example, if an

individual believes they are a lamp post, it is an insult to the considerable thought and insight that has gone into making our laws to date, to insist that others must refer to them as a lamp post, must treat them as a lamp post, and to refuse to do so is a Hate Crime in its extreme sense, or even recorded as a report of Hate thought/speech if no crime was found to have been committed.

To continue along this vein, does not help any of the individuals concerned, or society. We can see already the harmful effects of Hate Crime law across all sections of society.

I support moves to repeal all Hate Crime law.

Question 2: No

Expand: Protected characteristics introduce an inappropriate hierarchy, with the notion of some more deserving of law and harsher sentences than others, despite any underlying crime being identical, based purely on their possession of a characteristic

Allow me to give a civil example in the workplace. Person A is bullied at work by Person B. Person A and B are white. Person B feels professionally threatened by Person A given their accomplishments, Person B also has psychological and behavioural issues which results in erratic outbursts, inner frustrations etc, all of which he takes out on Person A. Person A complains the HR, Person B is regarded as having a 'bit of a problem' but the more junior Person A continues to suffer at Person B's hands, HR do nothing, and Person A is forced to leave.

As it stands, there is very little that Person A is permitted to do, in law

If Person A is non-white, and experienced identical behaviour from Person B, whole avenues of opportunity both within the company with HR and in law available to them, yet the bullying has no connection with their race.

We now have this circumstance in criminal law. Race should not be a consideration, nor assumed to be a consideration, unless it is proven to be so. If it is confirmed as a factor, it is immoral for it to be given a moral weight any more than any other contributory factor, for example ginger hair, height, weight, accent, IQ, mannerism, dress sense, family circumstances, taste in music

Again, I argue for the complete repeal of Hate Crime law.

Question 3: No

Expand: 1 How is hostility and prejudice measured? If an individual does not wish to refer to another person as a lamp post, despite that person wanting them to, would that be prejudice or hostility? Or merely a rational mind wishing to remain rational and to not take part in an act of delusion, whether the person is mentally ill or not

Prejudices in general are part of the human condition. There is not an individual alive who does not possess a prejudice. The presence of a prejudice does not equate to "demonstrate need"

2. The harm here seems to be based on self-created perception rather than objective reality. People don't like other people for many reasons, the presence of race does not automatically mean the motivation is race based, and the presence of such a 'protected characteristic' should not automatically mean any "additional harm" is created. If threats are

made to members of the targeted group, or to wider society than that can be dealt with under existing laws. Anything else is self-created perceptions of harm which are entirely subjective and unproven

3. Protected characteristics do not fit logically within any offences and sentencing frameworks, they do not prove workable in practice, they do not represent an efficient use of criminal justice resources, and they are wholly inconsistent with the rights of others

Question 4: There should be no Hate Crime law. Race should not be a protected characteristic.

Migration and asylum status, and/or language are not races. No crime committed against a migrant/asylum seeker, no matter what the language, should receive preferential treatment above any other identical crime committed against another without this status

All people should be protected by identical laws

Question 5: No

Expand: As with all other characteristics referred to in the Bill, religion should not be elevated

Religion is a belief system. The decision for an individual to follow a particular belief system is a decision all people do. It should not afford them a privilege above another who makes a different decision.

Again, this hierarchy of privilege brings shame to the standing of our law.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hate crime laws are illogical, untenable, clearly unworkable. There should be no hate crime laws with special privileged groups or without.

Question 7: Nothing should be included

A point regarding asexuality - this is a subjectively reported concept only. It refers to both manifestations and thoughts and feelings towards others. It is impossible to have a valid law that presupposes 'hate' towards something which can only be known as existing by the complainant themselves in their mind in the first place.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Transgender and non binary are both self-defined statuses only

Our language already appropriately describes a person who "cross dresses" - they are a transvestite.

Intersex is a physical condition. An intersex individual would be correctly described as an intersex individual.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: There should be no such category, however titled

Question 8 Part 3: Humans can believe they are anything: from lamp posts, to The Pope, to other species and other sexes. The psychotherapist RD Laing wrote famously of the woman who believed she was a waterfall. Indeed, the research points to a vast array of such delusions in which people believe they are something they are not. Research shows

that a ripple effect of delusions is created once delusions are given sanction and rewarded with attention, privilege, special status etc. This is what we are observing today.

The belief in an individual that they are the Pope, does not make it true, or real. Nor should anyone be forced to call them the Pope, who treat them as if they are the Pope.

We quite rightly allow people to continue to regard others as they truly are: not lamp posts, not The Pope, not an elephant, not the opposite or no sex. To do so is not prejudice, it is not hostility, it is not hate, it is a rational acceptance of reality.

Such people need to be treated with sensitivity and without deliberate harm. But this cannot be at the expense of societal sanity, all logic, reason, and sense which harms others in the process by forcing others and society as a whole to accept their delusion.

Question 9: Retained definition

There should be no duty imposed upon the courts however to increase the sentence if offence is committed against a disabled person, for reasons given above. There should be no privileged hierarchy based on protected characteristics

Question 10: There should be no hate crime laws

Wrongly or correctly presumed lack of disability on the part of the victim should make no difference to sentencing

Question 11: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws and no protected characteristics.

Question 11 Part 2: There should be no hate crime laws

These are all served via existing laws.

Question 12: There should be no hate crime laws.

No sex should be elevated above the other in a hierarchy of privilege

Any reference to people in law, and their status, should be according to biological sex.

Question 13: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws

There should be no specific 'hate crime protection'.

Question 14: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws

All categorisation in law should be based on the unchangeable innate category of biological sex.

Question 15: There should be no hate crime laws and no privileged protected characteristics in law, including age.

Question 16: There should be no hate crime laws and no privileged protected characteristics in law, including any age

Question 17: There should be no hate crime laws and no privileged protected characteristics in law, including profession

Question 18: There should be no hate crime laws and no privileged protected characteristics in law, including culture.

Question 19: There should be no hate crime laws and no privileged protected characteristics in law, including residential status.

Question 20: There should be no hate crime laws and no privileged protected characteristics in law, including philosophical beliefs

Question 21: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws

Aggravated offences result in greater harm. Laws should reflect the harm done, not have a set of laws based solely on a particular set of characteristics which dictate the privileged status of some victims of crime only, leaving others to see the perpetrators of their identical crime receive lighter sentences

The concept of higher sentences only for the perpetrators of crime against members of a government stated privileged group is abhorrent

Question 22: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

This is wholly illogical and shows no understanding of human mind or the nature of "hostility".

Question 23: There should be no hate crime laws, and no protected characteristics in law.

Motivation tests do not test motivation, as demonstrated by their infrequent use. Their use is untenable now, and will remain so, no matter how much it is amended.

The premise of this and hate crime law is fundamentally flawed.

Question 24: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 25: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws

There should be no characteristics protected by aggravated offences.

The list of characteristics here is inconsistent. Some are real characteristics: intersex, disability. The rest are self-created thoughts

Question 26: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 27: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 28: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws

Question 29: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 30: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 31: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 32: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 33: There should be no hate crime laws

Question 34: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 35: The only model which is preferable is the repeal of all hate crime law. It is fundamentally illogical in its nature, immoral in its privileged hierarchy, and unworkable in practice.

Question 36: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 37: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws

Question 38 Part 1: There should be no hate crime laws

Characteristic protection has no place in law.

Question 38 Part 2: These suggestions only worsen the situation

There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand: This is worsening the situation, not improving it

There should be no hate crime laws

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: This is worsening the situation, not improving it.

There should be no hate crime laws

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 43 Part 1: There should be no hate crime laws

Once their awareness beyond automatic publishing is proved and they have been given a chance to remove it within a defined time period.

Question 43 Part 2: There should be no hate crime laws

Inclined to say yes, though significant issues of proven and claimed intention/unintention of course arise

Question 44: There should be no hate crime laws.

No.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: This is worsening the situation, not improving it.

There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 46: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

The notions of hatred, intent, likely to, knew or ought to have known, threatening are today all untenable given that now saying something another person doesn't like is considered behaviour which is knowingly "threatening".

Question 47: No

Expand: This is worsening the situation, not improving it.

There should be no hate crime laws

Question 47 Part 2: This is all untenable

Question 48: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

This question is invalid since it refers to both a thought and a reality in the same sentence

It is an emotional and physical impossibility for a person to display acts of hatred towards a thought in another person's mind. It is however possible for a person to display acts of hatred towards a transvestite, motivated by their being a transvestite, and also motivated by other factors irrelevant to their transvestitism.

In contrast to the thought in a person's mind, it is possible for a person to display acts of hatred towards a disabled person

Question 49: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 50: There should be no hate crime laws

There should be no protected characteristics in any law.

Question 51: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws

This proposal can only be described as utterly grotesque and catastrophically damaging to individuals, families and society in general.

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Nothing should prohibit or restrict discussion, criticism or expressions of antipathy, dislike, ridicule, or insult

Question 52 Part 2: There should be no hate crime laws.

Nothing should prohibit or restrict discussion, criticism or expressions of antipathy, dislike, ridicule, or insult

Question 53: There should be no hate crime laws.

Nothing should prohibit or restrict discussion, criticism or expressions of antipathy, dislike, ridicule, or insult

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 55 Part 1: There should be no hate crime laws

Question 55 Part 2: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 56: No

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

The subject of the chant (race) should have no privileged status and should remain in the Public Order Act 1986

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 57 Part 2: There should be no hate crime laws

No.

Question 58: Yes.

Question 59: Yes

Question 60: No.

Question 61: Fines should not be greater because of any one characteristic.

Question 62: Absolutely not.

There should be no hate crime laws.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: Possibly, but only to row back previous bad legislation which has had the effect of reducing the right to freedom of speech Protected groups is not the answer in a civilised society.

Question 2: No

Expand: This protection has only lead to more division within society.

Question 3: No

Expand: I do not agree with your idea that we need to protect groups It is akin to special treatment.

Question 4: Why should it? I have a right to comment on issues such as illegal immigration and the number of asylum seekers

How could a ration argument be made at a General Election about immigration numbers etc?

This whole legislation is a nonsense

Question 5: No

Expand: Religion should not be protected

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: Eliminate the lot. An individual is allowed to insult somebody without it being a criminal matter

Question 7: Why should sexual orientation be an issue at all?

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Apart from the perpetually offended, what relevance is any of this nonsense to the majority of the UK population.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand: Why should it be distinct? One law one land.

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No, more wasted public money

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: There are sufficient protections in existing legislation; an extra level of legislation is a great cause of concern that militates against genuinely held convictions and tradition, and against the principles of open debate and free speech on matters of exceptional importance to a large proportion of families and the population nationally.

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: The test of stirring up offences needs to be very specific and objective; it should not be applied because of a subjective viewpoint deems or accuses a subject to be stirring up There should be complete protection for conscience and the Word of God expressed in the Old and New Testaments of the King James Bible as carrying its own authority being the final arbiter on truth, and on which our laws and tradition has been largely based over hundreds of years. The same test and reserve should be applied to written materials quoting from those texts. To speak the truth is not hateful even if to some it may be subjectively unacceptable

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: 'Intent' is a subjective issue, and the proposal is fraught with risk. The proposal removes the current safeguards and balance of the requirement to demonstrate i) threatening words or behaviour, and ii) the intention to stir up hatred.

The proposal risks criminalizing the expression of an opinion or personal belief, conviction or discussion where free speech is a precious established right.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is a very serious accusation to make of a person whose views expressed may be traditional or contrary to those held by others. Words could simply be misrepresented where no intent is intended. A criminal conviction for words used with no intent to stir up hatred, but reported by a person who holds a differing view, could result in a person holding an accepted or long held traditional or moral viewpoint being ruined for life by a criminal record. The basis of report rather than test of law where there must be proof of intent alongside of proof that the words were threatening, is highly concerning for free speech.

Question 47: No

Expand: Only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered under this heading. There is a serious risk that disagreement about a matter could be labelled as hatred by a politically motivated complainant, and what is abusive is a subjective matter. If discussion is about politics, religion, sexual orientation, transgender identity, etc could be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it would have a chilling effect on the fundamental right to a person's own opinion and free speech.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Transgender and disability are two completely separate issues which cannot be covered by a yes or no response.

Transgender issues should not be the subject of a stirring up offence; it is a controversial subject which is the subject of major political debate, which could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people and persons who need protection.

As a matter of intense concern are the women who have undergone sex change and now regret it, and who could be the subject of prosecution for speaking out.

Also women who desire the privacy of single-sex spaces could be affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: The household and family is an area to be jealously protected, without the intrusion of Government. In essence opinion, guidance and teaching could be criminalised, where there is best intentions by parents, but an opposite view may be held by some family members. What household has not had disagreement about where to shop, where to go, what to do or what to listen to!

To criminalise words or discussion which may simply be a traditional view, but unpalatable or unconventional to another party, is an unspeakable intrusion into the most private and precious areas

How many of us have been thankful ultimately for parental guidance in review, when perhaps unacceptable to us at the time.

Democracy is undermined by this oppressive proposal

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Public debate must be protected on controversial issues such as political discussion, religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity. Free speech is a foundation of a free society.

Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. The principle of natural family must be protected and is the bed rock of our society

Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: using a person's birth name and pronoun, and saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The Hate Crime proposals carry a very significant penalty of the potential of seven years of imprisonment, which needs the safe guards of the highest level of consent in view of the seriousness of the penalty, and the contentiousness of the issues involved

To delegate this responsibility to the Director of Public prosecutions removes an important check on an over-zealous prosecution, and sends the wrong signals regarding free speech.

It is important to recognise that this check was included because stirring up hatred law has the potential for serious infringement of human rights, and the Attorney General is answerable to Parliament making it more straightforward for them to be held to account by democratically elected representatives

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: It shouldn't be present

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: Should be separate

Question 12: Neither

Question 13: No

Expand: Female

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: No?

Question 16:

Question 17: Lol no

Question 18: No

Question 19: No

Question 20: No

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: Absolutely not

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Never

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: Including white victims

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand: If it cannot be proven, it cannot be proven

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Absolutely not

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: Migration and asylum status should not added to race for the sake of the law. We should ensure that there is a right to protest, a right to comment and a right to speak freely. One person's offensive comment is another persons freedom of speach. I may not appreciate your comments but i defend your right to say them. We must be allowed to have different views

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Asexuality is a fashion with no basis in fact. We should not be legislating for fashions.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: If we enshirne in law the right to say one is something that one is not then I, a white male should be allowed to black up and be protected at law from all hate of course if i did black up i would be subject to immense censoring and under the current law potentially be charged with a race offence The law should protect the human as nature created it, not as we wish to modify and/or adapt it for our whims

Question 9:

Question 10: The wrongly persumed lack of disability? OK, so little Jimmy steals a car not knowing the owner is disabled or not. It turns out the owner was disabled, but little Jimmy neither knew, nor cared. Should Little Jimmy get a stiffer sentance. In fact who's to say that had Little Jimmy known the owner was disabled he might have taken a differnet car as Little Jimmy has a disable mum and is aware of disability and does not go out to cause loss or difficultly to disabled persons.

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: If one is protecting sex then one must protect sex, full stop If one selects for one sex one selects against the other and therefore one is discriminatory.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: This assumes that women cannot commit hate crime against men Obviously you have never suffered from premature ejaculation

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex and gender are one and the same. One has either male or female characteristics by nature. Your personal choice for fashion or whim is not your sex nor your gender

Question 15: We already have a useless age discrimination law. There is no need for further non enforceable legislation. I am too old to run 100 metres in 15 seconds, but I have the wisdom of age to realise this

Question 16: Again the law must never be a tool of discrimination. Age is age.

Question 17: No, there should be less not more categories. And why focus on sex workers, how about other occupations which we all loath yet accept are essential, such as civil servants, lawyers and politicians?

Question 18: If one is going to look at alternative subcultures, how about protecting white, heterosexual middle aged tax paying couples who have never divorced?

Question 19: What a quaint turn of phrase, people experiencing homelessness. The answer though is no

Question 20: Again no, if i wish to say your beliefs are not as my own I have a right to do so. I should not be in fear that PC Plod will feel my collar because I say something you don't believe in

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand: If I stab you I stab you, irrespective of your colour, religion, sex or whatever, I have committed a grievous bodily assault and the penalty should be that of GBH. Using a definition of hate to make it a more serious crime is only a small step from thought control

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand: If it is burdensome to prove hate then hate should not be considered a part of the offence

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: If a characteristic cannot be proven at law then did it exist? At all times we must remember that one is innocent until proven guilty and not assume guilt unless proven otherwise

Question 33:

Question 34: If one is prosecuting on the basis of an aggravated offence then one must as a bare minimum provide the initial offence, it cannot be assumed to have happened

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: The use of 'likely to' is too dangerous. For an offence to take place there must have been a definite not a potential

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand: Clauses 2 & 4 are too wide and open to interpretation by a police officer This would lead to superfluous prosecutions and be against natural justice

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2: Consider carefully whether the world will be a better place or worse if you stop scientists and academics from having clear, open and frank discussions. If you consider Darwin's Theory of Evolution. Back in the mid 19th century this could easily have been seen as blasphemous and a hate crime against one of the core principles of Christianity. Please ensure that you do not stifle debate by your desire to legislate

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: Currently there is a massed demonstration of marxist policies under the guise of Black Lives Matter. This is not from the fans but from the FA and leagues imposing it on the game. This is as offensive to those of us who believe that politics have no place in sport and that All Lives Matter. However we recognise it as misguided and accept it with contempt. Stop trying to victimise everyone and allow chanting to carry on.

Question 58: No

Question 59: No

Question 60: No

Question 61:

Question 62: No, we have seen police commissioners fail terribly, we do not need someone to commission hate crime. Do you remember the wonderfully entitled Drugs Tsar, a waste of time and money

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Crime is crime regardless of intent. ALL hate crime legislation should be repealed. It's too subjective and based on feelings. White heterosexual men have become marginalized in our society. I note that adverts on the tv are overly biased towards ethnic minorities and mixed relationships.

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: Anyone who comes to this country should respect our laws and culture and importantly speak English.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 7: Heterosexuality is the natural orientation. We must protect children and yp in this country who are becoming more confused about differing orientations.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Yes it should be retained.

Question 10: There are too many considerations for the police to cope with. They need to be enabled and supported to deal with crime. Crime is crime regardless of who or what the person wishes to describe themselves as. A crime needs to be identified and the perpetrator judged on the act, their orientation and what they feel has nothing to do with it and hinders the justice system.

Question 11: No

Expand: This focus on hate crime has just stirred up resentment.

Question 11 Part 2: NO

Question 12: BOTH

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Not sure

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: Not sure

Question 15: There is age discrimination but pointless including it as a protected characteristic as its so hard to define and prove.

Question 16: Time and effort should be spent on other issues rather than navel gazing. We need to focus on the relevant issues like supporting this country to get back on its feet post covid.

Question 17: NO

Question 18: How many more subgroups are going to be looked at Heterosexual men should not be discriminated against. It's clear for example in Transport for London that some ethnic minorities are promoted above white heterosexual men This has to stop all promotions must be based on ABILITY regardless of anything else.

Question 19: NO I have every sympathy for homeless people, especially those who have contributed in society but fallen on hard times I try to support charities for these people

Question 20: There should be freedom of speech for all.

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: It doesn't matter why it was motivated the crime needs to be dealt with

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30: Yes

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 32: No

Question 33: Unsure

Question 34: Unsure of question

Question 35: No

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: This all just feels like creating more work and jobs for lawyers

Question 37: No

Expand: Sentencing will be unnecessarily protracted

Question 38 Part 1: No

Question 38 Part 2: Unnecessary

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: They should be criminally liable. Also search engines like google should be criminally liable for allowing fraudulent advertisers onto their sites They can delay removing such fraudsters and allow customers to be vulnerable to fraud and abuse.

Question 43 Part 2: Yes

Question 44: Unnecessary

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: People should be free to have freedom of speech. At the moment we are being attacked by a culture of wokeness and prohibition of free speech THIS HAS TO STOP

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: No

Question 48: No

Expand: People may find transgender issues distasteful and that is their right. They aren't stirring up hatred just because they find it distasteful. We have to avoid the path to a Kafkaesque society at all costs.

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: No

Question 51: No

Expand: Not at all! Monitoring what people say in their own homes is outrageous.

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: No. This is just looking for work and extra protections. We must live in a free mutually respectful society. Instead of trying to protect people all this will do is increase mistrust and dislike.

Question 53: No.

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: Unsure. Do not have any knowledge to make a judgement.

Question 55 Part 2: No

Question 56: No

Expand: Footballers should stop "taking the knee" as that indicates that one group is subservient to another. England fought to free slaves and many lives were lost in the process. People need to know their unbiased history.

Question 57: No

Expand: People should be free to chant and sing what they like. It's a free country. Violence of course is unacceptable however.

Question 57 Part 2: No. Are all crowds going to be monitored for what they sing?

Question 58: Yes. Gestures like "taking the knee" is an offence to British culture and our history. Nothing else.

Question 59: No. This is all BIG BROTHER!

Question 60: No

Question 61: Yes - leave as is.

Question 62: No absolute waste of money and unnecessary appointment that will incite hate crime and not stop it

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The existing two-stage test for the offence helps ensure that only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught, and the crucial freedom of a democratic society to be able to discuss controversial and unpopular views is protected.

Question 46: No

Expand: Without the requirement for proof of the intent to stir up hatred it would be unacceptably easy for complainants to shut down discussion and debate about controversial issues.

Question 47: No

Expand: All protected characteristics should not be treated alike as there is a significant difference between race, which is an inherited physical trait, and religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are beliefs and behaviours which are open to change. In view of this the latter characteristics should be open to debate and discussion. Free speech for such discussions should not be restricted by the law

Question 47 Part 2: No, because what constitutes "abusive" is subjective. This could lead to politically motivated complainants being able to close down discussions about controversial issues

Question 48: No

Expand: Transgender identity and disability are completely different issues and should not be put together as if they are equal. Transgender identity is a highly controversial issue which must be able to be discussed freely. Any law which prevented this from happening would do so to the detriment of women seeking to protect single-sex spaces and those who have had 'sex changes', which they now regret, and what to speak out against them.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Hate crime laws should not cover private conversations held in people's own homes. To remove the freedom for people to speak as they wish in their own homes would be extremely oppressive and have a very damaging effect on freedom of expression.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: The current protections in the Public Order Act must be retained in order to protect our freedom to discuss and debate controversial issues like same-sex marriage and transgender identity.

Question 52 Part 2: Similar protections should be given with respect to all of these characteristics. In particular, people must be free to use a person's birth name and pronoun and to refuse to use 'preferred pronouns'. They should be free to say that a natal female cannot become a male, and vice versa, and that there are only two sexes. People must also be free to discuss and oppose gender reassignment and transition.

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Because of the serious consequences which can result from prosecutions regarding stirring up hatred offences, and the serious infringements of human rights that may flow from such laws, it is important that the consent of the Attorney General is retained. Maintaining this position sends out a clear signal regarding the importance we place on freedom of speech.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand: In theory the number of specific protected characteristics could be endless.

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Where do the number of categories end?

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Yes Surely either sex could be a targeted

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: This should not be limited to just women

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: Where will the list of protected characteristics end? Where ever hatred is found it is wrong, not just to a selected groups

Question 16: Why not include all ages?

Question 17: No, but if hatred is demonstrated that should be punished

Question 18: no What if a subculture is missed out? If one is not listed or recognised it will not be seen as important.

Question 19: no

Question 20: There are already problems with people and groups trying to prevent discussion on sensitive issues. there is a move to silence opponents. Freedom of speech must include the ability to strongly disagree

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand: People must not be frightened into silence instead of having open and honest discussions where there is a disagreement. Unless there is a demonstration of hostility then it is in the eye of the beholder if a hate crime has been committed. they are the judge and jury

Question 23: How will some one know what motivated someone else? It could easily be a lie which could not be disproved! a person is innocent until proved guilty, so a crime must be demonstrated.

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: How can someone know beyond a shadow of doubt that some comment is "likely to" be a racial hatred offence? This is opinion and therefore subjective. Crime needs to be demonstrated.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Again how can someone know beyond a shadow of doubt that some comment is "likely to" be racial hatred offence? The same needs to be said about "intended to" stir up hatred. This is opinion and therefore subjective. Crime needs to be demonstrated.

Question 46: No

Expand: Today, sadly, disagreement is already seen as abuse, and people called bigots simply because they disagree. We read of speakers being banned from engagements, eg from universities, because their mainstream views do not agree with that of a vocal group who do not see the point of debate.

The term "abusive behaviour" is subjective, so a person can bully by being the jury, the judge and the executioner! hence silencing someone who has committed no hate crime

Freedom of speech must be protected, especially in the area of contentious issues

Question 47: No

Expand: "Likely to" is subjective. It must be demonstrated that a hate crime has been committed. "Likely to" is too wide and as already stated can be used to silence opposing views, so no

Question 47 Part 2: No I am not in favour. It is again subjective in the eye of the beholder. A hate crime must be demonstrated to have taken place.

At present there is a good distinction between the characteristics of race compared with religion and sexual orientation in law. Race is not about a particular set of beliefs or behaviours, which the others are. They should not all be 'lumped' together in this subjective term.

Question 48: No

Expand: How do these two sit side by side? The topic of transgender identity is controversial, whereas disability is in a different category all together. Transgender identity needs discussion and strong views are held on both sides, including the medics and the specialist clinic and some of its former staff involved on the front line. All views must be heard and considered, as an important aspect of freedom of speech. Disability does not fit into the same category.

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: no. Again where is the number of protected characteristics going to end? Which group is to be left out? Some months ago, Christians were identified as the most persecuted group worldwide. Should these be specifically named and included?

Question 51: No

Expand: Free and open discussions reflecting different and opposing opinions should be normal in homes issues are debated. We do not want thought police or spies. Our son and family live and work in Hungary, a former communist country where they have had first hand experience of this. There has been strong criticism of the Scottish Government for trying to bring in similar offences.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on issues like trans identity, sexual orientation and religion need protection so debate is not stifled.

Question 52 Part 2: Yes. It should not be a hate crime for someone to say for example that there are only two sexes. In an area of increasing polarisation, freedom of speech needs strong protection.

Question 53: yes

Question 54: No

Expand: The Attorney General has greater independence than the Director of Public Prosecutions because he is accountable to Parliament. This should be maintained as stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand: What about other types of chanting? eg religious because someone is a Sikh, a Muslim, a Christian etc

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: no

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: They should be repealed and freedom of speech be restored

Your proposals will continue the assault on our freedoms.

Question 2: No

Expand: Repeal the hate speech law

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: No

You are suggesting changes which will inevitably create yet more divisions in society.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: I agree it should not be extended but I believe it should be narrowed or scrapped

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: If they already protected, what is the point of the question?

Question 7: More identity definitions = more divisions! Have you ever visited Twitter?

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Please stop this constant salami slicing of society. It is so unhelpful and very divisive, causing more problems than it helps resolve.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Throw out all of this socially divisive language. You are causing so many problems.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Hate crime legislation should be repealed. It is divisive and distracts police from dealing with real crime NB The police seem to enjoy policing this hate law as it is easy and they are unlikely to be put in danger or have to get up off their derrières and chase after anyone

Question 13: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 14: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please - not add to it

Question 15: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 16: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 17: Repeal this hateful legislation please - not add to it

Question 18: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 19: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 20: So now ideas need to be protected do they????? Are we living in a free society or not. This hate law is madness and the protection of beliefs is the final

straw

The only people who will benefit from this law And these changes will be of course lawyers as cases generate business for them. Society meanwhile will become more divided and petty

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 23: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 24: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please - not add to it

Question 25: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 26: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 27: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please - not add to it

Question 28: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 29: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

For heavens sake surely you have to hate somebody to poison them, why make one type of hate more important than another? Oh that's right to divide society and create more work for lawyers

Question 30: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 32: Repeal this hateful legislation please - not add to it

Question 33: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 34: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 35: Repeal this hateful legislation please - not add to it

Question 36: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 37: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 38 Part 1: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 38 Part 2: Repeal this hateful legislation please - not add to it

Question 39: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 40: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Have you read 1984?

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 43 Part 1: Treat them as a platform and leave them alone other than to make sure that they do not censor people based on political or other views.

Repeal the hate law and enforce slander/libel

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 46: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 47: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 49: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 50: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 53: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 54: No

Expand: Repeal this hateful legislation please not add to it

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand: For heavens sake, why the preoccupation with football? It feels like you are singling out a working class pastime.

Have you ever heard the discussion in a hunt or a gentleman's club or newspaper office or a boardroom. Why not go after that?

How about rap music much of which is pretty hateful? Why not go after that?

Question 57: No

Expand: For heavens sake, why the preoccupation with football? It feels like you are singling out a working class pastime

Have you ever heard the discussion in a hunt or a gentleman's club or newspaper office or a boardroom Why not go after that?

How about rap music much of which is pretty hateful? Why not go after that?

Question 57 Part 2: For heavens sake, why the preoccupation with football? It feels like you are singling out a working class pastime

Have you ever heard the discussion in a hunt or a gentleman's club or newspaper office or a boardroom. Why not go after that?

How about rap music much of which is pretty hateful? Why not go after that?

Question 58: For heavens sake, why the preoccupation with football? It feels like you are singling out a working class pastime.

Have you ever heard the discussion in a hunt or a gentleman's club or newspaper office or a boardroom. Why not go after that?

How about rap music much of which is pretty hateful? Why not go after that?

Question 59: For heavens sake, why the preoccupation with football? It feels like you are singling out a working class pastime.

Have you ever heard the discussion in a hunt or a gentleman's club or newspaper office or a boardroom Why not go after that?

How about rap music much of which is pretty hateful? Why not go after that?

Question 60: For heavens sake, why the preoccupation with football? It feels like you are singling out a working class pastime

Have you ever heard the discussion in a hunt or a gentleman's club or newspaper office or a boardroom. Why not go after that?

How about rap music much of which is pretty hateful? Why not go after that?

Question 61: For heavens sake, why the preoccupation with football? It feels like you are singling out a working class pastime.

Have you ever heard the discussion in a hunt or a gentleman's club or newspaper office or a boardroom. Why not go after that?

How about rap music much of which is pretty hateful? Why not go after that?

Question 62: No Just repeal the hate crime laws They are so divisive

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: From my perspective as someone who happens to be classified into multiple protected groups specifically: race, transgender identity, disability, and sexual orientation I am completely confident that the existing legislature is sufficient. Any further measures would lead to an escalating unfair legal advantage being given to those of us categorised into protected groups, which in turn would trigger an understandable resentment and backlash against us, and generate disharmony in our society.

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: Disagree

It is true that, as a grandson of people who had successfully sought asylum in another country, and as a son of an immigrant, I am very sympathetic to the plight of migrants, asylum seekers, and those for whom English is not their first language.

It is also true that those characteristics are separate from race, and any hostility towards people with those characteristics must therefore be coming from a different place

To conflate all these characteristics under one umbrella would be a grave disservice to all parties.

Let's be honest: the vast majority of the concern surrounding the levels of inbound migration that I have read online from members of the public is rooted not in xenophobia or racism, but instead in a critique of the government's policy of making taxpayer-funded benefits far more accessible to newcomers than the majority of other governments worldwide, causing existing citizens, expats and asylum seekers to face ever-longer waiting lists for housing, schools, and medical appointments. Such a concern is perhaps most focused on asylum seekers who, due to the unavoidable situation where in an effort to escape untenable situations with their lives, are not able to collect their identification and professional certifications, and are therefore unable to commence work and be a net contributor once arriving in the UK

If you choose to blend migration and asylum status under the race umbrella, you will fail to track the true root causes of any hostility, and fail to do right by your populace, and in turn, fail to resolve these for a harmonious and happy society. This would be a miscarriage of justice for both recipient and perpetrator of any hostilities, which will destroy the trust that the population holds in your office and in the rule of law.

Question 5: Yes

Expand: Agree, the current hate crime laws are working well

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Disagree. Asexuality is the lack of sexual orientation, and should not be included under that umbrella, in much the same way as a brick should not be included under the umbrella of "things that float"

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: As someone who transitioned gender a decade ago, I have seen this recent social broadening of the definition of transgender to include the new concept of "non-binary", as more people found an affinity with the idea of living outside "gender norms" and the "masculine / feminine dichotomy".

This broadening is driven by ideology, academia, and Tumblr, not science

Trans is not a response to the social constructs of masculinity and femininity it is about knowing that you are a man or a woman

There's a reason why the classic trans experience is knowing from the age of 2 or 3 that you are a boy or a girl: at that age, you do not grasp the nuances of what is masculine and feminine, but you know soul to soul from your first interactions with other kids, that you are a boy like the other boys - or that you are a girl like the other girls.

To be a transman is to still be a man, and to be a transwoman is to still be a woman, irrespective of the gender norms imposed by that society

Choosing to challenge conventional fashions and gender norms is just that - a choice. It is not trans.

Please do not diminish the experience of the trans community by watering down our identity You cannot protect us if you don't know who we are.

Moving on to intersex people, they deserve a separate category protecting them. They've undoubtedly got substantial and very different challenges to the trans community, and are currently far more marginalised than we are... they deserve our fullest support.

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: If we have to proceed with this unsuitable umbrella (see previous comment) then yes, we must separately identify.

Question 8 Part 3: See my first response to Q8

Question 9: Agree to retain

Question 10: This question appears to be missing its commas, rendering it confusing. Are you asking: "should criminal conduct, where the perpetrator wrongfully thinks the victim is not disabled, fall under a disability hate crime?" If that is your question, then the answer is a firm NO. A perpetrator can't hate someone for a disability that they don't know they have. To suggest otherwise would be ludicrous

Question 11: No

Expand: Either we must protect both men and women, or we protect neither.

I'd be happy for everyone to be protected I've seen sexism on both sides

But know this: if we protect both, then almost the entire planet would be covered great, but then we will also be called to cover all other identities that people suddenly find an affinity for Have you heard of stargender?

Once everyone is protected, what's the point of a special hate crime law? Every crime committed will surely be read as a hate crime, in one way or another, rendering the whole concept moot. You would then need to scrap the whole thing, and just treat crimes as crimes.

Question 11 Part 2: No, there's existing legislation for that, under both national and international law.

Question 12: Per my response to Q11, if you insist on including gender, then you must include both genders.

Imagine only including women and trans (to include transmen) but not men. How can you only get to be protected as a man if you happened to be born as a woman, but you can be protected as a woman irrespective of your sex at birth? The unfairness would be unconscionable, unethical, and unacceptable.

Limiting to the female sex or gender would make this hate crime legislation the ultimate systemic purveyor of hate crime against men. Appalling.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Limiting to the female sex or gender would make this hate crime legislation the ultimate systemic purveyor of hate crime against men. Appalling.

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15: No opinion

Question 16: Surely all ages.

Question 17: No. Being a sex worker is not an immutable characteristic, it's a job that can be changed. If you include sex workers as a protected characteristic, then you must include all other job categories. A lot of people hate call centre workers, calling them at dinnertime. Perhaps they deserve protection? Or what about business owners who recently are bearing the brunt of anti-capitalist sentiment and associated looting? Surely a hate crime against their perceived wealth? Not to mention pilots who are getting it in the neck about their carbon footprint. Need I go on?

Question 18: You're thinking steampunk, goth, cosplay, medieval reenactors, and so forth, right? Who on earth has a go at those guys, honestly? And if they are in receipt of any hassle, how does it strike to the heart of their very being, in perpetuity?

Protected characteristics are something that cannot be changed. For people in those groups, any attacks strike to the core of who you are, and set you up for a lifetime of future attacks as you cannot change who you are.

It's why hate crime laws exist.

Alternative subcultures are not tied to any immutable characteristic of race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender itself (man and woman).

So why treat them as if they are?

And why treat them any differently to a victim of crime who was attacked because they wore glasses, or was too beautiful and smart (inspiring the attacker's envy), or was not beautiful or

smart enough (inspiring the attacker's disdain), or was simply not strong enough and an easy target?

Question 19: Yes, 100% Having slept rough a few times in my late teens and early twenties, I have been very afraid for my life. One time, a group of adults in their late twenties tried to set me alight while I was sleeping. I was woken by their laughter. It is my firm belief that they saw me as less than human and that is very much what hate crime laws are designed to protect against. From the testimonies of other homeless people which can be found online and on YouTube, it's a common strand that they feel dehumanised, and they are at extreme risk I mention at the start that I fall within multiple protected groups My few nights on the streets were more vulnerable than my membership of those groups ever made me

Question 20: No It is true that political and ideological differences have encouraged some of our less ethical members of society to destroy their opponents' livelihoods. The people doing the destroying must be held accountable. However, this should be handled under non hate crime legislation If we police the protection of philosophical beliefs, we set a precedent for silencing all debate and critical thought. I would much rather have my philosophy challenged, and be made to feel uncomfortable, than to suppress someone else's right to say their peace. We must not police thought.

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: No opinion at this time due to insufficient knowledge

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: Yes, we must not assume that a crime against a person with a protected characteristic was committed due to that characteristic. It must be fairly and independently ascertained. Otherwise, a perpetrator may receive an unjustifiable sentence. This would be a miscarriage of justice, and would sow greater societal divisions

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: I am not familiar with this model, so cannot provide an informed opinion

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: I am not familiar with this model, so cannot provide an informed opinion.

Question 26: No

Expand: Someone's hate towards another shouldn't be sentenced based on how many different people also share that hate. To the victims, it's the same pain. Do not cheat some victims out of their justice because not enough people similar to them have suffered, and do not cheat perpetrators out of their justice because too many people hate in the same way

Question 27: No

Expand: Per the old adage, "sticks and stones fan break my bones, but words will never hurt me"

Freedom of speech must be protected.

I know many people speak negatively about people like me, but you know what? I don't have to be comfortable. I don't have to like them.

But I do have to respect their freedom of speech - so that I may expect the same.

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: No, certainly not given that these are lesser crimes than those listed in Q29

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: No personal experience to draw from, and so I cannot propose an informed comment

Question 32: Agree. As someone who happens to be a member of four different protected groups, I still see myself as one person, and certainly no more deserving of extra justice compared to someone else who is a member of just one protected group

Question 33: No knowledge of the CDA 1998 and therefore unable to provide informed comment

Question 34: I would suggest to maintain the existing legislation on this issue I'm satisfied with the carriage of justice on hate crime laws as it stands, and would hesitate to make changes in case it tips the balance too far in either the victim's or the defendant's favour

Question 35: No awareness of the Sussex Report, no comment.

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand: Transparency is necessary to maintain public confidence in the application of the law, so yes, the nature of the offence must continue to be announced in open court.

Question 38 Part 1: No. The rules must be crystal clear so that everyone knows where they stand and what rules to follow. There can be no room for misinterpretation.

Question 38 Part 2: I would suggest you do not seriously follow answers to this question if they come from individuals or entities without an impartial legal background, or with a vested interest (and I include human rights lawyers who stand to gain by a flexible approach and lengthy process) We need clear and lawful justice

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: They should hold some liability if they can be demonstrated as censoring certain content, meaning that they have given the green light for this unlawful material to be published. For example, if a social media platform censored hate against one group, but allowed hate of another group, to be published, then they should be held liable. The main liability of course rests with the individual/entity who originally posted that material on the platform, and those who reposted it along with demonstrations of support.

Question 43 Part 2: Yes, that only seems fair.

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: No, because this cannot be proven beyond doubt, and because enshrining this in law will open this legislation to abuse. We're already seeing certain people in society doxxing others for their alleged views and demanding that those people are fired by their employers. Often, these accusers are drawing their own conclusions about the intent of the defendants. Just imagine how many more innocents will be caught up in the mix and unfairly imprisoned if this new proposal becomes law. How will you protect them from people seeking spite and vengeance?

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: No opinion.

Question 48: Yes

Expand: Would suggest that all protected groups under the hate crime laws be equally protected in this measure.

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: If sex/gender is added to the next iteration of hate crime law, then yes. However, my vote is for this not to be included: this would necessarily include 100% of the population, rendering hate crime legislation worthless: if all groups are protected, none require special protections above and beyond the rest.

Question 50: Yes.

Question 51: No

Expand: I have family living in Communist China. If your proposal goes ahead, UK citizens will have fewer freedoms of speech in private life than they do. Our ancestors fought and died for a free and democratic society not for the opening scene of Nineteen Eighty Four

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand: No opinion

Question 52 Part 2: No opinion.

Question 53: No opinion.

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand: No opinion

Question 55 Part 1: Yes, I would say consistency is only fair.

Question 55 Part 2: Yes, I would suggest any dispassionate descriptions should be allowed across all publications

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand: Hate is hate, the victims feel the same pain, so they deserve the same justice.

Question 57 Part 2: Yes, would agree to extend to cover all protected characteristics, per rationale in my previous response.

Question 58: Yes - the hatred is clear from those acts, and the recipient will feel the same hurt.

Question 59: Yes, if the offence is publicly witnessed. If the offence is in a private vehicle and not witnessed in public, I would say no. We need to maintain a balance between minimising pain and preserving freedom of expression; limiting (authorising) hatred to private dwellings and private vehicles would be a good start.

Question 60: Tough one to call: I can see both sides. Recommend deferring to the majority view

Question 61: Surely this should be brought in line with whatever the penalty is for the offence if it were committed in the streets? A football stadium is still a public place.

Question 62: No. I've worked with the police on a suspected hate crime situation before (that had happened to me - it ended up not constituting a hate crime under existing law). Although the ruling did not go the way I had felt it should, I was satisfied they had the capacity, resource, and objectivity to handle it appropriately, and I support their decision. I do not see any need to add a new role into the mix. Moreover, adding a new commissioner may force more resources to be shifted to hate crime at the expense of other causes which may have equal or more merit. Let's keep the structure as is.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is “abusive” is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had ‘sex changes’ but now regret it. These ‘detransitioners’ could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused’s children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA

of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. • Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: • using a person’s birth name and pronoun, •

saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies The Attorney General can provide a more robust check The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: A concerned citizen

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I work for the ministry of defence and as such like to keep information on myself and my opinions to a minimum

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: The acts should not exist at all , but whilst they do exist (hopefully not for long) they should be as simple as possible

But no hate crime commissioner should be introduced

Question 2: No

Expand: No more need to be added It has gone too far already and we will reach the stage where so many different protected classes exist that practically every group will then need to be covered by the act so as to not be excluded

At that point , the act has lost all meaning

There is also the issue that hatred is a perfectly moral emotion when exposed to things one finds immoral , and it is not up to the government to decide what is and isn't moral. For example, if we expand to include 'sex workers ' , will we then be arresting everyone who hates prostitution because of its harm to women ?

Not to mention that adding groups to the hate crime list does not actually stop the hatred it just breeds resentment from those who do not get this extra protection / extra rights from the government and exposes and 'Others ' us from the rest of society , we should be reducing it , let alone expanding it

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: No characteristics should be added , so the point is mute.

Question 4: No Because asylum seekers and immigrants are not a race , so how could it make logical or legal sense to include them in the definition of race ?

There is also the point that it is the right of every British person to oppose immigration and asylum , and hold any views they like about these things Trying to take away this right would just breed more resentment and make immigration debates even more controversial and emotional

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No. This would be insulting to the gay people who have actually suffered for their sexuality .

And not having a sexuality is no more a sexuality than turning the tv off is a tv channel

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Cross dressing is a hobby , not who a person is in the same way as their religion , sexual orientation and race

The concept of 'non binary ' is so vague as to almost be a quasi-religion , and it has concerning implications with regards to gender stereotypes being pathologised and treated as innate (you will often hear someone claim that a tomboyish woman is non binary , or that they knew their boy was non binary when he wore dresses) . It would be dangerous to legalise this term as it does not actually have a solid definition , and therefore could be said to cover literally anyone

There is also a concern that , due to the definition being ' someone who does not identify with their gender ' that by definition it would legally mean that the government believes that

women feel comfortable with their gender (ie the stereotypes thrust upon them since birth) and that therefore we choose our own oppression in the eyes of the law.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Non binary does not even have a solid , non circulatory definition . And unlike the other two terms is not scientifically observed . It is essentially a quasi religion in its lack of scientific evidence

Question 8 Part 3: There should be no revised definition . The classes currently covered has caused enough resentment , social discord and suppression of free belief and thought already , without adding even more terms (especially vaguely defined ones) on top

Question 9: Yes.

Question 10: No

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Gender is the stereotypes associated with sex . To have these protected by law would imply that the government is suggesting that gender is innate and therefore women choose their own oppression .

Question 11 Part 2: Yes , those things should be punished more severely .

Question 12: To include only one would show a lack of equal treatment under the law which is a human right.

It would also breed resentment from men and a feeling of being oppressed and treated as second class citizens under the law , which might in turn exacerbate the already low reporting levels of rape and domestic abuse towards men and boys .

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: Gender does not exist as a meaningful category in the same way sex does . It is not an observable , definable concept Even proponents of gender theory cannot give a meaningful definition of what gender is that doesn't fall back on gender stereotypes or a quasi belief system rhetoric .

To include gender in law (to mean something separate from sex) would cause even more confusion than there is already.

Question 15: Extra punishment should be given to anyone who attacks the elderly

Question 16: It should only include old people (and maybe young children) as these are the groups particularly vulnerable.

Question 17: No . We should not criminalise (or appear to be criminalising) criticism of prostitution

Question 18: No. If we start adding such nebulous concepts into law then it would be impossible to meaningfully distinguish who should be protected and who shouldn't

Question 19: Yes , although this should not be in the form of hate crime legislation, as hate crime legislation should not exist .

Question 20: No

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: Just because someone is hostile towards the characteristic in general , it does not mean that it was their motivation for the crime they committed For example , someone may be homophobic , but not attack me for being gay.

This inherently relies on an assumption that if someone disapproves / dislikes a certain type of person , that this comes up in every interaction they are in and is their main motivation in engaging with that person in any way which is obviously absurd.

Question 23: No. We should not be criminalising prejudice , as it implies that having a prejudice is wrong However everyone has prejudices , and it is a human right to believe what we want to believe and think what we want to think .

It is not the business of the state whether someone is prejudiced or not, they should be punished for the crime and leave the psychological speculation to psychologists not court rooms.

It is also dangerous to start speculating in law about someone's motivations , as people are not that simple.

It also breeds resentment and division between different social groups.

Question 24: No

Expand: The hate crime punishment should be scrapped completely .citizens should be punished for the crime they committed , anything more creates a legal inequality between groups that are protected and those that aren't

There's also the issue that hate crime laws are not applied equally already - with many hate crimes against straight people, white people or men not being taken as seriously as hate crimes against other groups (for example , the rapists in the nationwide grooming gang scandal not being charged with hate crimes despite targeting the victims for their race) , continuing this trend even though it's already being applied badly and creating more hatred , resentment and societal discord would be irresponsible and reckless

It is clear that the prejudices of the people within the legal system itself has already lead to hate crime legislation not being applied correctly and equally , so continuing this legislation would only make it worse

Question 25: No

Expand: Hate crime legislation has already been applied unequally , and so expanding this even more would be irresponsible and reckless

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand: This would (as seen. By previous trends) be applied unequally .

In the past we have seen that the prejudices of the people within the legal system itself have lead to double standards in the appication of hate crime legislation (for example , the grooming gang rapists not being charged with hate crimes despite admitting to targeting their victims based upon race , and Christian men facing hate crime legislation for putting bacon on a mosque where similarly bigoted adherents of other religions committing similar crimes faced no such hate charge)

It is clear to conclude that adding onto these punishments would just exacerbate the issue already seen of anti white , anti Christian and anti male and straight inequality within hate crime legislation , and therefore increase prejudice and inequality

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand: It makes no sense to extend arson and grievous bodily harm , but exclude poisoning and threats of murder They are all equally abhorrent

Question 30: No These would be difficult to prove

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: This would just continue to exacerbate the inherent issue within hate crime legislation ie that it proposes some people are more equal and valuable than others.

This would mean that for example a black trans lesbian is inherently more valuable in the eyes of the state than a straight white Woman , and that harming the first would get you a longer sentence than the latter , despite both women being just as harmed as each other .

It's abhorrent to treat people so unequally

Question 33: No, they should be reduced .

Question 34: Yes

Question 35: None seem particularly great

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Yes . We should avoid the legal double standard we have now where some groups are more protected than others , even when both are covered by the law

Question 38 Part 2: A set of criteria , in order to minimise the impact of a judges prejudice

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: There should be no offences relating to ' stirring up '

Question 41: No

Expand: It should be scrapped altogether . The legislation has lead to too much of a limit on freedom of speech and belief , and has not been applied equally The government cannot be trusted to apply these laws equally for all groups.

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: None. The government should not limit freedom of speech or belief .

Question 43 Part 2: Yes.

Question 44: Yes , it is too vague and has exacerbated the issues related to legal double standards with regards to hate crime offences .

Though it would be better for human rights if it were removed altogether , if it has to stay , it should be clarified

Though it is inherently impossible to set an adequate standard based on what may or may not happen in people's minds in response to someone else's words , and so it is inherently reductive on human rights , as it makes individuals responsible for how someone else takes their words.

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Yes, offence is too subjective

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability yes , transgender identity no.

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: No

Question 51: No

Expand: It is not the states business what people talk about in their own homes , that's beyond protecting victims that's totalitarianism , and the government deciding for themselves what beliefs are acceptable and which aren't

If no crime had been committed and no one has been harmed , what business is it of the courts?

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: No

Question 53: No

Question 54: No

Expand: The attorney general should be kept as a neutral external validator, rather than keeping all the power for criminalising belief and speech within the CPS

Question 55 Part 1: Yes

Question 55 Part 2: All of the above .

All should be covered , but science journals and reports of government meetings especially

Question 56: No

Expand: The cps has shown that it cannot apply the definition of racism equally across all races , and therefore cannot be trusted to apply this act.

It's also ridiculous that one sport has an entire criminal offence , separate from others Why football , and not hockey or basketball or cricket ?

Question 57: No

Expand: All chanting should be allowed by law If clubs don't like it , they should remove people themselves , but it is not the business of the government .

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: No.

Question 59: No.

Question 60: No

Question 61: No, it should be reduced or removed completely .

Question 62: No , that is too much power for one individual to have . How can the public justify the cost , and who could be chosen that would be so free of prejudice themselves that they could be trusted to apply the law equally and decide what words and beliefs are ok and which aren't ?

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: I think people should be equal before the law.

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: That would be mad and would lead to many miscarriages of justice

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: It should include everybody or nobody.

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: No

Question 16:

Question 17: no

Question 18: No

Question 19: No

Question 20: No

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: No

Question 33:

Question 34: No, they should be charged with the base offence or the aggravated one, not a scattergun approach

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: No, defendants should know what they are being charged with and what they may be sentenced to at the beginning.

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: I agree with 1 and 2 but disagree with 3

Question 43 Part 1: On every occasion

Question 43 Part 2: They should have actual knowledge of the content or they should not host it

Question 44: No

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This is an appalling proposal.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: Yes. Parliament should be a place where anything can be said.

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: No, race is already a protected characteristic. Migration and asylum status are other legal issues and are recognised in that way. It would water down what race means as a protected characteristic. Migration and asylum are legal issues brought about by choices; you cannot choose your race (which is a large part of the reason it is a protected characteristic).

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7: In the rare occasion that it is not wholly inappropriate and unnecessary to disclose your sexuality to anyone who is not family or a friend (eg your employer) someone who is asexual should not be discriminated against, but asexuality does not merit becoming a protected characteristic due to it not having any documented history of being discriminated against in the first place, it being a relatively "new" sexuality at least in terms of how common its usage is now compared to any other time period and because by definition it is a lack of sexual orientation.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Besides "presumed to be transgender" sounding discriminatory in itself, transgender people have long fought to be seen as distinct from cross dressers, and vice versa (due to cross dressing most often being an act performed by heterosexual men for the

purposes of sexual gratification) - if this is added it will not only be a slap in the face to trans people who believe their identity goes deeper than their outward presentation, but also to women, who apparently aren't a protected group for some reason, by saying that "their" clothing gives someone protection from discrimination but not women themselves. Intersex people should not be discriminated against for their medical condition, but most do not appear to align with transgender people or think of themselves as trans. They are an entirely separate entity. Non binary people by and large think of themselves as neither male nor female, so they do not quite fit neatly into the box of transgender. If they are deemed necessary of protections under hate crime laws it should be as just that, non binary people

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: See above

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Yes.

Question 10: No. If a person commits a crime against a disabled person *without realising or being aware of their disability* it cannot and should not fall under hate crime. The purpose of hate crime laws is to protect from people who purposely victimise based entirely on protected characteristics. A crime happening to someone who happens to be disabled or falls under another protected class is awful, of course, but by definition not a hate crime.

Question 11: Yes

Expand: Sex should be a protected characteristic. The current discourse around gender suggests anything from it being a societal boogeyman to it being something you can change at whim, even as your mood changes throughout the day. None of which is for me to say how valid it is, but until there is a better, cohesive, cultural understanding of gender it should be left. Biological sex is immutable and should therefore be protected.

Question 11 Part 2: Yes, they are needed. These crimes are based on biological sex most often women and girls and should therefore be considered hate crimes if sex/gender is protected.

Question 12: Crime happens to both men and women, but often the crimes more committed against women (sexual offences, FGM, forced marriage, etc) are committed specifically because of the victims biological sex. Therefore it should be limited to women.

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: As I answered in Q12 and as doubtless others will have said, violence and crimes against women more often than not occur because of their biological sex, not their gender. Anyone can claim a gender, that does not mean we should insult women by including gender in sex based discrimination.

Question 15: Age should be a protected characteristic.

Question 16: It should be limited to "older people". There are not, as far as I'm aware, anywhere near enough instances of younger people being discriminated against to make them qualify as protected. Older people on the other hand are not only discriminated against

but their age is used as a defining factor in crimes committed against them. They warrant protection.

Question 17: Sex worker, which is the accepted term right now in society, should be a protected category, to ensure they are not discriminated against for having participated in sex work. The level of violence sex workers face is not by accident but by design, and as a result anyone seeking out a sex worker in order to do harm to them should be considered a hate crime. Biology and the protection of women come up here too.

Question 18: No. They should not be discriminated against by professionals in a working environment or when seeking medical treatment but there is no real basis to place "alternative subcultures" into a hate crime category.

Question 19: No, it should not

Question 20: People's philosophical beliefs should be protected and recognized as a hate crime category. No one should ever be attacked, slandered, or suffer abuse for holding philosophical beliefs

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: Hostility on its own should not be considered a hate crime.

Question 23: Yes someone should only ever be convicted of a hate crime if it can be proved beyond a doubt, or admitted by the offender, that what they did was purely borne of prejudice towards the victim.

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: Yes, that sounds fair

Question 33: Yes

Question 34: It should be on a case-by-case basis

Question 35: No, not at all

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: I don't think so, no

Question 38 Part 2: As above

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: "stirring up" charges already teeter dangerously close to infringing on free speech. As Humza Yousaf said for Scotland, intent should be the most important part. I do not have faith that stirring up offences will be levelled fairly or without affecting free speech, especially when the scope goes beyond "written" material

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: Under some circumstances, but they never are. See Pornhub for an overseas but still relevant recent example. As a side note, unlawful material in this regard should never include words or comments from an individual expressing their opinion, regardless of if its well received or in good taste. They should be criminally liable with regards to the proliferation of CSAM found on major social media platforms like Twitter and WhatsApp, but never personal opinions

Question 43 Part 2: Yes. If no intent can be proven or found, it stops becoming a hate crime issue

Question 44: I don't think it should be. I am not even sure if it can be.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Again, this encroaches on free speech

Question 46: No

Expand: As above, this wades into the waters of speech issues. If intent to stir up hatred cannot be proven, the rest does not matter

Question 47: No

Expand: It should be on a case by case basis

Question 47 Part 2: That would be the most just way to do it if you were, yes

Question 48: No

Expand: No - as this would merely stifle debate on both sides around a relevant issue. Someone who does not agree with a Trans Radical Activist stance, simply has questions, or has philosophical beliefs that differ should not be punished for that

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50: It should be more nuanced but generally, yes

Question 51: Yes

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: Missile throwing yes, gestures no

Question 59: No

Question 60: No

Question 61: Yes

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: There is a convincing case that women are subjected to hate crime as set out within your consultation document and the criteria of 'demonstrable need', 'additional harm' and 'suitability' from question 3 are met.

Sex and gender are not interchangeable terms. Sex is a biological determination and immutable (in our genes) Gender is a social construct Using sex and gender as interchangeable or using them without adequate and accurate definitions causes confusion. Sex is the protected characteristic in the Equality Act 2010 is the appropriate term.

There is no case in your consultation document that people who are subject to hate crimes for gender expression are not already protected by current legislation and by your possible additional proposals in the transgender area.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex and gender are not interchangeable terms. Sex is a biological determination and immutable (in our genes) Gender is a social construct and 'gender expression' changes with time. Using sex and gender as interchangeable or using them without adequate and accurate definitions causes confusion. Sex as the protected characteristic in the Equality Act 2010 is a more appropriate term

Sex is the term that should be used.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: Please do not publish my responses publicly.

Thankyou

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand: I disagree.Adding more characteristics would create more inequality before the law among victims.

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Adding more sub categories to an existing protected characteristic would only further problems (see response to question 2)

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: No.

Sex workers is a progressive term for prostitutes

Prostitution is not a permanent characteristic of a person ; it is an activity.

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: These proposals would seriously erode free speech and freedom of expression in England and Wales

Question 41: No

Expand: The Public Order Act should not be used to diminish freedom of speech. The term ' inflammatory' is subjective and therefore defining it in law would erode free speech.

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: These proposals mean that there would be no need to prove actual stirring up of hatred had happened.

Question 46: No

Expand: Not requiring intent to stir up hatred to be proven makes it far too easy for complainers to shut down all kinds of discussion, debate and disagreement.

Question 47: No

Expand: Not all characteristics are the same and therefore should not be treated alike Race is innate and inherited. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity are different; they are beliefs, behaviours and social identities that can be adopted and relinquished by individuals. Free speech about them should not be restricted by law.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: The available evidence shows that transgender identity may be sought out and relinquished by individuals.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: The Public Order Act should not be extended to cover private dwellings.

This proposal would seriously erode free speech for people working from home and online.

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand: I agree that the current protections in the Public Order Act must remain.

Question 52 Part 2: Free speech protections must be given with respect for all these characteristics

People must be free to use a person's name given at birth and pronoun corresponding to their biological sex

People must be free to say that girls are women and cannot become boys and men.

Also that boys cannot become girls or women.

People must be free to say which things they think are morally wrong without risk of arrest or prosecution

People must be free to say that there are only two sexes.

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: "Hate Crime" is an abhorrent concept to English justice. A crime is a crime irrespective of the subjective idea that a person was experiencing the emotion of "hate" at that time. They should be abolished entirely and not brought together.

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: This is far too subjective, and the definition of "hate" is always changing. It is now being used to attack political opponents. Even former leader of the opposition, The Right Honourable Jeremy Corbyn, was not immune from a viscous legal and extra legal attack based on "anti-Semitism".

The solution is to abolish the concept of "hate crimes" entirely and to remove this dangerous subjective and subject to abuse element from our law

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: The idea of "protected characteristics" is absurd and makes English law read like a Dungeons and Dragons rules. Either a crime is committed, and this requires a victim to prove damage. We already have laws around physical assault, slander and defamation. I would propose that we encourage the use of existing law and not further expand it into dangerous subjective opinions which are easily subject to abuse.

As a person from an extended Jewish Family, I could quite easily take offence on a "characteristic" and frame this as an "anti Semitic" attack - a potentially career ending allegation - that is trivial to make and hard to disprove since it is based on my "subjective" experience. Note the case of a Scottish Comedian who faced 2 years in prison over a John Cleese style joke made about the third Reich.

As an aside, I feel that the raising legislation around hate speech is making people dislike each other more and actually increases real anti-Semitism as "non protected" groups and "characteristics" feel censored and discriminated by the so called "protected" group.

Question 4: No - the concept of hate speech is simply "speech control". Without representation you cannot have representative government, and the laws have no standing. Immigration and asylum are political concepts and ideas, it is absurd that this concept requires some sort of legal protection.

For example, asylum used to amount to a few 100 people per year from the ex-Soviet Union. Currently the system is being abused to import 1000s of people. I am against this. We need rigorous rules since not everyone is suitable for life within an advanced Western democracy. Thus are people who are illiterate, even in their own language, with no skills or education suitable for living in a complex society such as the UK? Will the educational status, or IQ of the immigrant be a "protected characteristic"? Thus it will be a "crime" simply to point out facts about a person?

Cicero famously said, the more numerous the laws, the more corrupt the state. These laws and proposed upgrades are abhorrent to a free society, I suggest that the consultation recommend that the concept of "hate speech" be outlawed at the constitutional level and replaced with something like the First Amendment of the United States.

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Worms are asexual. If a human wishes to identify sexually as a worm then that is their prerogative. However, under no circumstances should a sexual orientation be a "protected characteristic" and the idea of protected characteristics should be dropped altogether as outlined earlier.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Humans can identify as whatever gender they please. However, people cannot demand that other humans accept these subjective identities. Forcing people into your frame or to accept your ideas is one of the definitions of slavery. Thus any proposal to punish people who simply do not accept an idea or frame is likely in breach of anti-slavery laws. Forcing ideas onto people and slavery are vile practices still carried out in

parts of the world, please do not bring these vile practices into English law under the pretext of hate speech.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: These definitions are up to the people that want to identify as those things. However, any attempt to impose those definitions on other people would be a breach of anti Slavery laws since one of the definitions of slavery is forcing your ideas onto other people

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Yes

Question 10: No since people cannot make moral choices when they lack the information on which to make the choice.

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: No I have outlined reasons against both "protected characteristic" and hate speech as a concept previously.

Question 11 Part 2: Law already exists against violation of consent, abuse, slander, and defamation, these apply irrespective of gender. "Carve Outs" are therefore redundant.

FGM is mentioned but not MGM (Male Genital Mutilation). Toddlers cannot possibly consent to having their foreskin removed Provision should be made to ensure males are as protected as females.

Question 12: The question shows a degree of prejudice. Why ask about transgender issues in this consultation and then frame a question in a binary manner? ALL genders should be equally protected under the law, non-binary, trans, male and female.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Given that it is asserted that men and women are equal, why do women as opposed to men (or trans) deserve "hate crime" protection? Exclusionary laws such as proposed are likely to justifiably incur the anger of excluded groups and likely make things worse

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: No I have previously commented that "protected characteristics" are not a good idea.

Question 16: No. I have previously commented that "protected characteristics" are not a good idea

Question 17: No. Humans are free to engage in sex work if they choose. Sex workers cannot control what other people think of them, to do so is to break slavery laws, in that they are trying to force other humans into a frame of reference or idea

Question 18: No. Hate crime categories should be diminished and then eliminated altogether

Question 19: No Hate crime categories should be diminished and then eliminated altogether.

Question 20: No. Hate crime categories should be diminished and then eliminated altogether.

Question 21: No

Expand: A crime is a crime. There should not be the concept of "enhanced sentencing" based on the subjective emotion alleged to be in a human at the time of committing a crime

Moreover, these "hate crime" laws are subject to abuse for political purposes, with the current political ethos able to determine what subjective words, phrases, gestures, emotions or even perceived emotions are designated as hate. If these hate-speech laws are expanded further I cannot see the UK being considered seriously as a democracy or Constitutional Monarchy. Moreover, it could lead to the people calling for an act of lawful rebellion based on the fact that the laws have no standing given that they cannot reasonably represent their views and moreover are subject to a form of slavery by being forced into frames of reference by transgender hate speech legislation.

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hate speech is a concept that has only garnered favour in the last decade. It is opposed to the very idea of representative government, breaks slavery laws as outlined elsewhere, and causes other laws to have no standing on account of the people no longer being able to reasonably represent their views in a so called "representative" government.

Question 23: Emotion is subjective, and the current "perceived hate" wording needs to be removed let alone expanded since it is clearly subject to abuse by political interests or bad actors. I have also outlined the need to drop the concept of "protected characteristic" elsewhere.

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: It should be as "burdensome" as possible since as outlined elsewhere hate speech as concept undermines the very idea of representative government and breaks slavery laws by forcing humans into a frame of reference, for example with respect to agreeing to a trans non binary definition which breaks epistemological reality.

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: No We have already seen this as open to abuse with fake swastikas and faked graffiti being produced for the purposes of political, and financial gain by suing

innocent 3rd parties. The burden of proof of hate speech is so low, being subjective, that it encourages malicious litigation.

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: Having intersectional people double dip on multiple characteristics would be ripe for abuse. For example, I may identify as a male presenting transexual lesbian. The more attributes I can append the more "hate" I experience. The concept of protected characteristic should be abandoned as I have already outlined elsewhere.

Question 33: Please simplify the system by having appropriate sentences, there is no need to further complicate matters by using "aggravated" offences.

Question 34: No. If it was decided to prosecute on the aggravated offence and the defendant was found not guilty then that should stand. It is up to the prosecutor to determine if they want to prosecute under the aggravated charge in the first instance.

Question 35: No "hate crime" approach is preferable. This concept, only introduced less than 2 decades ago, needs to be abandoned entirely as a risk to representational government and as human rights abuse in that many "hate speech" concepts try to force humans into a frame of reference at odds with their experience.

If implemented these laws would likely be in breach of slavery laws, since forcing people into a frame or to believe certain things is one of the definitions of slavery. Moreover, it will eventually cause a constitutional crisis or act of lawful rebellion as the laws have no standing since people cannot represent their views.

Question 36: No

Expand: Sentencing on the idea of the subjective emotion being experienced by a human being while committing a crime is clearly open to abuse, and this practice should be ended.

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: The concept of protected characteristics needs to be abandoned as outlined earlier.

Question 38 Part 2: The concept of protected characteristics needs to be abandoned as outlined earlier.

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: It should not be possible to prosecute under "characteristic" system being proposed, only for specific crimes against a person with provable damages. Hate speech as a concept needs to be abandoned as outlined previously, therefore the "enhanced sentence" is moot.

Question 40: No

Expand: Clearly this is a danger to the representative form of government. What is needed is 1st Amendment like that of the United States of America. This should extend to all material. Poland has introduced fines for companies that censor free speech. Therefore companies that interfere with free speech of citizens by implementation of wide-ranging abusive "hate

speech" policies should be fined. This should of course extend to the government organizations.

Any proposal for "stirring up offences" should be abandoned in favour of a sound 1st Amendment type right that has been in successful operation for more than 200 years.

Question 41: No

Expand: The concept of inflammatory material needs to be abandoned in favour of a US style 1st Amendment right. Vague definitions such as inflammatory material (to whom? in what way? is it subjective?) needs to be discouraged as good Juris prudence. It is absurd that the Law Commission should be using terms reminiscent of the Catholic Church of the middle ages.

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: This puts the BBFC in too powerful of a position in that it becomes the complete arbiter of what is offensive and what is not in effect it acts like a ministry of truth. What is offensive is clearly subjective

For example the word Gypsy does not have the same connotation in Welsh as in English There are some Welsh folk songs that use the word in a different context. However, if the BBFC denotes it as "offensive" then this denies Welsh people access to their culture and folk songs, which in itself becomes another "offense" since it likely breaches a "protected category". This opens the door for a spaghetti of litigation. Moreover, these laws pit different protected groups and categories against one another As a person of Welsh decent there is no way I would accept any decision by the BBFC which I would see as racist and discriminatory, however other parties may feel just as strongly against the use of the word.

In the long term these "hate speech" laws are going to become unworkable, the more I read this consultation the more ridiculous it seems. I strongly urge the Law Commission to recommend abandoning the concept.

Question 43 Part 1: We already have the Mens Rea defence successfully used by the Post Office and Telephone companies. There is no a priori reason that this does not extend to an internet platform. Any extension of prosecution can only be seen in a political frame, Mens Rea has served for 100s of years and well into the modern era, why do we suddenly need to put extra burdens on businesses.

Question 43 Part 2: The concept of Stir up hatred and inflammatory material are too broad and not good Juris Prudence A US style 1st Amendment needs to be implemented, this would greatly simplify the law as well as increasing the standing of the law. Hate speech actually undermines the standing of the law and is not workable long term for a representative form of government

Question 44: Use of the term "likely to" is not good Juris Prudence. It is far to subjective and open to abuse for political and other purposes

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: Hatred is simply a human emotional state, why should a natural human state be made illegal? Did the person commit a physical crime or not should be the standard, not subjective tests of emotion that are bad Juris Prudence and clearly open to abuse for political and other purposes. .

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: The concept of protected characteristics and stirring up hatred needs to be abandoned as outlined previously.

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand: Do not create yet another new "offence" of stirring up hatred

Question 52 Part 2: Do not create yet another new "offence" of stirring up hatred.

Question 53: Ensure offences are at least treated equally. Make it an offence for a government officer or Police to treat , Welsh, Scottish or Irish differently from Black or Asian people Thus it would be an offence to treat BLM protestors differently from a Welsh Nationalist protest.

Where it could be proven that BLM protestors were treated more lightly than an Irish Nationalist protest for example, those Police and holders of office should be liable to prosecution under the concept of Anarcho Tyranny as outlined by American Sociologist Samuel T Francis

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: There should be no new "offence" thus everyone would be exempt

Question 55 Part 2: Everyone should be exempt. These new laws are going to prove to be unworkable in the long term, and undermine the concept of representative government.

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Yes This sounds Orwellian and would likely evoke a negative response from the public.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed – and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up – is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more unce

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar

offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA

of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. • Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: No

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7: No

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: No

Question 18: No

Question 19: No

Question 20: No

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: Yes

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: No

Question 43 Part 2: No

Question 44: No

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: No

Question 58: No

Question 59: No

Question 60: No

Question 61: No

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed – and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up – is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity – which are contentious issues – should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA

of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. • Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public

Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: There should not be any hate crime laws as they do nothing to reduce hateful behaviour

Question 2: No

Expand: Everyone should be treated equally under the law. This proposal is highly dangerous and protects certain groups of people from criticism. The Law Commission should be ashamed of itself for proposing it.

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: No.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: We should not be protecting any religion or religious people from criticism nor treating them differently from anyone else.

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: No Criminal conduct should be punished if anyone is physically threatened but not if the recipient is merely offended by it.

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: No.

Question 16:

Question 17: No.

Question 18: No.

Question 19: No

Question 20: No.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: No

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This is totalitarianism and I am staggered that this is being considered

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic

discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing

two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit

newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is

subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes.

The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to

something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. • Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a

woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The

Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1 threatening words or behaviour; 2 intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up

hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with

freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA

of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. • Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: I do not believe there is any necessity for further legislative changes in this area

Question 2: No

Expand: Existing legislation goes too far. Designating certain sectors of society as 'protected' directly infringes the right to free speech which this country has long held dear. Free speech can sometimes be offensive, but legislation that seeks to regulate who may or may not be offended is a slippery slope, inevitably stifling debate and the free exchange of views.

Question 3: No

Expand: I do not support the idea of protected characteristics

Question 4: I see no purpose or benefit in treating migration/asylum status or language as protected characteristics. This simply invites many more spurious/baseless hate crime claims.

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Isn't that a non sequitur? Surely asexual implies no sexual interest or orientation?

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Are you serious? Which sex do you propose will need to be protected? Male or female, or both?

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: Attempting to treat age as a protected characteristic is nonsensical. It is much too broad a category and would be meaningless.

Question 16:

Question 17: No they should not. Why should it be a hate crime to express a moral disapproval of prostitution?

Question 18: No they should not

Question 19: Good grief, on what logical basis?

Question 20: People are entitled to their 'philosophical beliefs'. Others should equally be entitled to disagree with them without being accused of a hate crime.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: 'Likely to' is a subjective rather than objective test. There should be a clear and provable intention before any hate crime offence can be determined

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: See previous comment. I do not consider that 'likely to' is a valid basis for determining an offence Intention must be shown

Question 46: No

Expand: If intent cannot be proven then the prosecution should not be pursued.

Question 47: No

Expand: See earlier comments

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: It is unconscionable that comments made privately in one's own home should be subject to prosecution. This proposal is extremely worrying as it destroys any distinction between what is public and what is private. It is sanctioning a Stasi-like approach, redolent of a totalitarian state.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: This would be a complete waste of money. Given the government's current trashing of the economy, it is a cost we can do without.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: I am personally unaware of any inconsistencies or problems deriving from the existing statutory provisions and am therefore unable to comment on the need for consolidation

Question 2: Yes

Expand: If Britain is to be considered a free society it is very important that freedom to reason, criticise, warn, persuade non-maliciously and put forward alternative ideas is preserved. In particular, the Holy Bible has had an important place in the shaping of British society over the centuries and it is important that those who still sincerely believe in its truth and authority should continue to be able to draw attention to its contents without fear of contravening the law.

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: I cannot answer this question without knowing what is meant by "crime" and "harm "

Question 4: I fully believe that all legal provisions, if they are to be understood and followed, should be kept as simple as possible. I consider the definition in "the Concise Oxford English Dictionary" (2002) quite adequate: "each of the major divisions of humankind, having distinct physical characteristics."

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: "Assexuality" is not in my dictionaries and, again, I would warn against making the law too complicated.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: My view is that "criminal conduct" should be related to injurious or threatening behaviour with as little reference as possible to what the perpetrator perceived about the victim, otherwise interminable argument could take place and costly proceedings, from which the lawyers would be the main beneficiaries!

Question 11: No

Expand: Young people today are drenched with a vast array of ideas and vulnerable to peer pressure. They are prone in consequence to take actions which they may later bitterly regret. I am very concerned (my wife and I having nine grandchildren) that well-meant parental or grandparental advice offered to them by those who know them best should not be construed as hate crime because it offends against some current notion. Further, I am aware that there are people who are just waiting for the moment when they can have the

simple statement of what the Holy Bible says about human relationships classified as hate crime.

Question 11 Part 2: Great care will be needed if necessary action is to be taken against gross actions such as forced marriage while preserving freedom to live in accordance with genuine religious beliefs. For example, those holding to the biblical teaching that a husband is head of his wife and of the household should not be criminalised

Question 12: Surely it should be sufficient that a crime was committed on the basis of the victim's gender without reference to male or female.

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15: My wife and I being in our seventies, we are tempted to claim any available protections, especially when rowdy youngsters are pushing past us at bus-stops! But in all good sense, I am, again, convinced that the focus of the law should be on the nature of the action rather than on the perpetrator's view of the victim.

Question 16:

Question 17: I see no objection to this, provided that it does not thereby become a "hate crime" to counsel such people into a better way of life. After all, Christ dealt compassionately with an adulteress but told her to "go, and sin no more "

Question 18: I cannot understand this question.

Question 19: I would have thought, again, that abusive or threatening behaviour itself would constitute the crime, irrespective of the situation of the recipient

Question 20: Do you mean the philosophical belief of the perpetrator, or of the recipient? I would be concerned lest simply holding a view that does not conform to current social norms is rendered actionable

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: The action itself should constitute the crime, not someone's perception of the motive

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: In my view, the problem here (as for other categories of people to be protected) is that because the "perpetrator's" own beliefs are known to be different, he or she may be argued to be motivated by hatred when none existed.

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The emphasis should be on actions taken or words used rather than on what may have been the motivation of the writer or speaker. In other words, the test should always be objective as far as possible, not subjective. The latter course would surely open up a minefield. If, for example, someone reads aloud a portion of Holy Scripture stating that certain behaviour is unacceptable with God, who is then to decide if there was a hateful motivation in the speaker's heart? It would be a great departure from the religious heritage of our nation if the simple reading itself came to be taken as synonymous with hate crime!

Question 46: No

Expand: Here again, the problem lies with subjective assessment. If I warn someone sincerely as to what I perceive will be the likely outcome of a course of action, is that threatening? If I declare my conviction that the Bible is right when it says that God made the heavens and the earth, do I open myself up to a charge that I should have known that atheists present might be incensed at such a suggestion?

Question 47: No

Expand: Again, the offence should consist of the threatening or abusive conduct itself, not on an assessment of how likely it was that certain people, having their own various viewpoints, would be upset at being presented with a view that diverged from theirs. What is provisionally proposed could easily encroach on freedom of debate on topics where there is a wide variety of opinion.

Question 47 Part 2: I agree that "threatening or abusive" is more objective than "insulting;" a person who holds a theory or philosophy as dear to him may claim he is being insulted if doubt is cast upon it in acceptable discussion.

Question 48: No

Expand: The danger here is that debate is stifled on matters about which a wide range of views are held. If we are not careful, we will end up in a society in which one is allowed to express only views that conform to current social norms; this is incompatible with freedom of speech and religion – more in the nature of totalitarian regimes.

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: We really will be getting into a police state if we cannot freely exchange our views within the privacy of our own homes. Would the next step be members of a family informing against one another?

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The seriousness of the alleged crimes and possible penalties is such that as high a safeguard as possible be applied to such proceedings.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2: I would like to see reading from the Holy Bible - both privately and publicly specifically excluded from the scope of the offence. There have previously been cases of arrests by over zealous law officers for such public reading but I understand that so far these cases have been corrected.

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I do not see the need for this Cannot the existing legal structure adequately handle all these matters?

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: How would it be established that someone intended to stir up hatred? On the basis of the emotional response of the other party, presumably. At present an offence is committed where there are both threatening words or behaviour and intention to stir up hatred. Abandoning one of these makes it much easier for certain groups and / or individuals to bring vexatious lawsuits against others speaking from a purely academic or even expressing a Biblical point of view

Ordinary conversation where no ill will or threat is intended can be perceived by ultra-sensitive individuals as 'hate speech'. In the present era it seems all too easy for some to concoct outrage and present themselves as victims. Freedom of speech is being put at great risk.

Question 46: No

Expand: To disagree violently with another on controversial matters like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity even to the extent of using strong language is not the same as threatening behaviour that is intended to stir up hatred. The law will simply become a means to shut down religious or political discussion. Many have been the opponents of Christianity or other world views who have expressed themselves forcefully. Long may we all continue to have the freedom to do so

Question 47: No

Expand: Only threatening behaviour intended to stir up hatred should be relevant. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way that race, for example, cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour while race is an inherited physical characteristic.

Question 47 Part 2: What is "abusive" is highly subjective, and strong disagreement can too easily be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. The freedom to share and discuss beliefs will be severely affected. Only threatening

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different matters! Why on earth are these presented together? Transgender ideology is controversial so why clamp down on a subject of major political debate? Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by 'stirring up' offences. We note that the strongest critics of the transgender movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. Such people could be prosecuted for speaking out

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: In God's name where is our society headed? I read regularly of Christians in Pakistan or other Islamic countries who languish in prison for years before even getting to a hearing, on the unsupported testimony of a neighbour who holds a grudge. But even that palls in the shadow of China and North Korea. Shall our children or grandchildren really be called to bear witness against us? Shall we be permitted to read aloud from the Bible? Will we be allowed to pray aloud in our own homes?

Question 52: Yes

Expand: In controversial matters such as religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity strong protection must be ensured for free speech to take place

Question 52 Part 2: Existing protections must remain and we believe that in respect of offences concerning transgender identity there must be explicit protection regarding use of a person's birth name and pronoun, saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and saying that there are only two sexes

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Given the importance we attach to free speech and human rights in our democracy, and the severe penalty attaching to guilty verdicts should proposals be adopted in legislation, it is only right that safeguards should be present at the highest level the Attorney General.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Introduction of a Hate crime commissioner, is to create a president to prosecute. If no processions were made then the position is not doing their job. Hate is by its very nature nebulous, abstract & intangible. Therefore a commissioner would simply round up a batch of low hanging fruit to prove that his position is of value and importance, while never actually achieving anything. We could end up in the perverse situation where an innocent party is

baited into or accused of hate without ever have committing a tangible offence. They will be then forced to prove that they did not hate, which is absurd.

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous

Question 46: No

Expand: A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately.

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: The home is a sacred place where ppl should feel safe to express themselves freely.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: NO

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous The

existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words

or behaviour; 2 intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it

would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the

accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from

the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic

discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence

would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild

statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding

that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'.

This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing

two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is

caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up

hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean

the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender

identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to

accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be

committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to

shut down religious or political discussion In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit

newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales

should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual

orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive

conduct Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening

conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction

between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a

neutral, inherited physical trait Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated

in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that

disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is

subjective If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and

discuss beliefs

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this

question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be

extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws

covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to

protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring

up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender

ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans

movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could

be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society

people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government

has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence.

Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form

part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive

move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to

something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the

accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender

identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the

Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA

of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the

stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation • Any offence covering transgender identity

must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a

woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The

Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: Yes to the first 2, however if a crime arose that didn't fit, it should still be treated as seriously as one that does

Question 4: Yes as many are often targeted for speaking foreign languages, which I find disgusting. Take for example those speaking arabic, who are often given abuse for it, due to islamophobic beliefs about terrorism being directly linked to Islam and arabic

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Yes, as it is still what someone thinks of themselves in terms of sexuality.

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: Any and a people who are trans, non-binary or intersex should be protected from hate crimes.

Question 9: I do not know enough about this act to answer

Question 10: Any actions or words meant to demean someone based on the belief of the person being disabled, even if said person isn't, should still be considered hate crimes.

Question 11: Yes

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: Yes.

Question 12: Men and women, all should be protected

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15: Yes.

Question 16: All ages.

Question 17: Yes, they are people too.

Question 18: Yes

Question 19: Yes.

Question 20: Yes.

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: Yes.

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33: I do not know the current sentencing.

Question 34: Any offence, whether aggregated or not should be punishable.

Question 35: I do not know about this hybrid approach

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Yes.

Question 38 Part 2: A combination

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: A social media company should try to stop hateful material, however you can't blame a company for not blocking a piece of material, just like you can't blame air for allowing hateful views to be passed on

Question 43 Part 2: Yes

Question 44: Yes.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Yes

Question 48: Yes

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50: Yes.

Question 51: Yes

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Yes.

Question 53: Yes.

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: No.

Question 55 Part 2: Yes.

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: Just because one is chanting at a football player, it doesn't make it ok.

Question 58: Yes, if there is evidence that the gestures and/or missile throwing were intended in a racist and/or any other way deemed suitable by the law

Question 59: Yes.

Question 60: Yes

Question 61: More than fines.

Question 62: Yes, it may aid in stopping hate crimes.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: n/a

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I would prefer confidentiality where possible, as I am female, and often women are aggressively harassed for contributing to discussions around sexism, sexual harassment, sexual offences and gender identity

Question 1: Yes

Expand: I believe it is important to be cautious when laws restrict speech and opinion, and I think it is essential to be completely clear about what is restricted and why, and I think one revised law covering all would probably be more effective in achieving that.

I would like to see a world with a reduction in hate, BUT an increase in discussion and civil productive debate on all topics

I personally think in the interests of free speech that hate incidents need much clearer and more precise definition to ensure that they quantify across the board how hate is classified and considered. In general I don't agree with policing speech, except where there is actual incitement to specific action, or deliberate harassment that goes further than hurt feelings.

I think it is important to recognise when a crime arises from an irrational hatred, or is exacerbated by it, but I think it's also important not to over-legislate against speech, publication and thought unless it genuinely incites, intends to incite or results in action.

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: If characteristics are to be specified I would want to see sex and sexuality among them

People can hate irrationally for many different reasons (unfortunately) so I think if we're going to legislate against it we need to include as many potential incidents as possible, on an equal basis

I believe harrasment should continue to be a crime with the emphasis on the continuation rather than one off incidents alone which I think really need to fall outside the scope of law enforcement

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: Point (1) "crime based on hostility or prejudice towards the group is prevalent" I would want the word "prejudice" very clearly defined, and possibly quantified further

I would suggest something like unjustified prejudice or unfair or untrue or malicious, because prejudice alone seems a very low bar. I have concerns that prejudice could be interpreted as simple dislike and that feels too low

I feel "prevalence" must include historic prevalence too for example whilst homophobia and sexism are better than they have been in the past, that is in part due to previous legislation and could easily return to previous levels.

I feel one way to look at prevalence in a measureable way would be to look at the statistics on victims of crime in the UK looking first at which groups are most affected by violent crimes.

Bullying exists in all walks of life and that's what harrasment law is for. Hate crime should relate to actual crime and current danger faced because of it

Point (3) - "consistent with the rights of others" is particularly important to me as I feel there are large significant conflicts between sex-discrimination and gender identity, and between religion and atheism, at the very least

Females face descrimination and hate, both on the basis of their biology (pregnancy/abortion, sex trafficking, FGM, rape threats) but also on the basis of traditional gender stereotypes ("The weaker sex", "get back in the kitchen" "women, know your limits" etc) which is a known conflict with Gender identity which promotes definition by traditional gender stereotypes (girls like pink and are caring and boys like blue and are tough etc), and encourages biology to be seen as less important (for example transwomen competing in women's sport despite proven biological advantages).

I wouldn't want debate on the above issues to be policed as hate incidents. I know that reasonable debates and discussions are exceptions already and I would want those strongly maintained.

The same with religion, it's not ok to target someone because of their religion but it must be ok to question the validity of all religion, and it must allow for civil debate between religions

Question 4: Where a crime was a physical attack on property or person, motivated by a hate of either characteristic, then it would obviously need to be included as hostility to these groups could be very accurately described as prevalent.

However, discussion and debate around these topics must not be impeded as this would limit discussions to one-way conversations particularly migration, which would not encourage healthy debate and would push prejudices underground, possibly making them more volatile.

Sunlight is the best disinfectant and it's important not to push dangerous narratives underground where they can fester

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand: I think it is fair as it's inclusive of all.

Question 7: I don't think there is any prevalence of hatred towards people who are not especially attracted to anyone (which is my understanding of asexuality).

Surely it would be easier to simply protect all sexualities that involve consenting adults. I am unsure of how it is currently defined but as long as it describes attraction to another adult human (and specifies adult and human) then I believe most reasonable people would be happy.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: This would be very confusing since many people consider themselves and most other people as non-binary (because man and woman are gender-neutral terms unless you attach gender stereotypes to them)

Similarly using the term "transgender" which has evolved as a word in everyday use to encompass a wide range of self-designated identities including gender-fluid, pangender etc so I really would like again a very clear legal definition of the word transgender and who that would include because I don't think it would be a good idea to include too many variables without serious consideration of the impact.

I have concerns it would be allowing self ID by stealth to not be able to question someone's chosen way to identify.

As someone with a family history of autism I have concerns that autistic people may be particularly impacted by vague terms because they find words with no clear meaning very hard to understand.

I personally struggle to understand how gender can be both non binary and have opposites (as in "identifies as the opposite gender") I am a woman but I have no personality traits in common with every other woman on the planet and I feel identities that are based in stereotypes do not benefit the wider community. That doesn't mean I wouldn't fully support someone's right to be themselves without harrassment or unfair prejudice, but definition of where the lines are is important where this kind of conflict exists.

I have always understood "intersex" to be the medical term for people with a disparity between development of internal and external sex organs I don't understand why this would be lumped in with gender identity and perceived gender non-conformity I would think intersex people would be a separate characteristic as it's a physical medical diagnosis rather than a psychological diagnosis or self perception If anything it would be better aligned with sexism as it relates to physical development.

If my understanding of this is wrong then that further demonstrates the need for absolute definition of terms and clarity.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: I believe the term "Gender-Non-Conforming" better describes the characteristic that reasonable people would want to be protected i.e. the right not to conform to expected gender stereotypes

It is so important to adequately define and protect all potential targets of the hostility that the majority of people who define themselves under those terms experience, and I think "transgender, non binary or intersex" leaves out many people who also experience it (such as 'butch' women or 'effeminate' men) who it is also very important to protect as not everyone who is GNC wants to transition

Again "non-binary" is hard to objectively assess, since most people consider themselves and others non-binary (because man and woman are gender-neutral terms unless you attach stereotypical personality traits to them) Also, as above intersex is an unconnected physical medical diagnosis of development of organs.

Question 8 Part 3: "Gender non-conformity". Personally I think that the best descriptor for the characteristic that receives a prevalence of hostility is "gender non-conformity" i.e. the perception that someone doesn't match the stereotypes wrongly associated with being male or female.

This would cover lots of prevalent hostility in one go because it would defend anyone who doesn't conform to sex-stereotypes, any way of dressing and presenting and all gender identities. This would protect men, women, gay, bi and straight, cis and trans people alike.

Question 9: Yes, any physical or mental impairment but again, with regards to what is recorded as hate incidents, debate needs to remain very open on loosely defined conditions based on a collection of symptoms that are constantly evolving as more is discovered about them such as IBS, dyslexia, autism

For example discussions on what constitutes a condition should not be considered prejudice or hate even if they are perceived to be, as it's important, especially to people on a spectrum to be able to discuss their own experience of the condition and compare that to others to understand their own.

Question 10: I think this would make it difficult for some disabled people to question people's legitimate use of disabled facilities unless there was a very clear definition for the level of hostility. i.e. question politely is fine, but abusing someone and humiliating them should be unacceptable, but it should be any polite society

It is my experience that many people with hidden disabilities do face discrimination and hostility but to me the best way to protect them would be some form of physical identifier (like the blue badge scheme but expanded) rather than hate crime law

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: As per the EA 2010 the protected characteristic is currently "sex" and needs to remain a distinct protected characteristic and as such should be included in any hate crime law.

Sexism hasn't gone away, you only have to look at how many female MPs receive horrific regular rape threats, where male MPs do not

As a female I believe the sexist view that females are lesser is prevalent and contributes hugely to the levels and volume of violent sexual offences against them. The recent #MeToo movement showed the prevalence of harassment females face based purely on their sex.

Sex is a protected characteristic under the EA2010 because there is a large prevalence of unfair prejudice against females, as historically they have been considered weaker or lesser than males in society, discriminated against as we were perceived to contribute less effectively because we fall pregnant, give birth, breastfeed and menstruate and are comparatively physically unable to compete on brute strength alone

Females need specific protection against sexist hate crimes such as rape threats, FGM and any violence directed at females for being female, which considering at least two women are murdered by partners (or their ex) every week in the UK, the prevalence is sickening

Just to be clear, whilst this type of murder is labelled as "domestic violence" it is in fact a one-way street, lethal violence against females by males whilst it does happen to males by males, and even very rarely to males by females it happens with far, far greater prevalence to females due to circumstances dictated by their biological sex and a common perception that they are of lower value and disposable. Females are physically more vulnerable both by less muscle-mass, smaller skeletal frame, smaller average size, far less upper body-strength, not to mention vulnerability during pregnancy, and this physical vulnerability is often seized upon

I would never want to see "gender" and "sex" conflated as for many people these now have two different meanings.

"Sex" means biological sex (male or female) i.e. whether you have the kind of body that would produce eggs or sperm (regardless of whether it produces them or not) and can be medically identified as male or female even after death and before birth.

"Gender" is a word where the meaning has evolved in everyday use to mean different things to different people - to some (usually older) people it still indicates biological sex (male or female), to some it indicates gender identity (feminine, masculine, non-binary, transgender, third gender, neutral, gender fluid etc) also some people use it to indicate stereotypical gender roles as shorthand, (or even sexuality which also needs to be a distinct protected characteristic).

For this reason I think it is important to state "sex" where birth sex is meant, "gender role identity" where the gender role identified with is meant, and "sexuality" when referring to sexuality

Question 11 Part 2: I think this is sexist nonsense "it would cost more to deal with, it happens more, it happens to that group anyway, it already has heavy sentences, how could we possibly cope with it all?"

I appreciate the costs of including these crimes against females might be better spent supporting victims of VAWG but that could be said of ALL hate crime it seems spurious at best to suggest the group that faces the largest amount of crime should not be included because it will cost the most it makes me absolutely livid. Either protect the people hate crime is actually happening to and who are most vulnerable to it or scrap the lot.

(Gender) Sex is not incidental to crime that happens almost exclusively to that sex and by excluding very prevalent crime we would be demoting it to lesser by comparison, once again. Are we excluding racism because it will cost too much? No we are not.

Question 12: I think sex based hate crime protection should apply to both females and males in the interests of equality, though I believe it will be needed more for females.

I think gender-non-conformity based hate crime protection should apply to everyone regardless of how they identify, again for equality.

I think the most important thing is to clearly define the characteristic that is protected and why I think it is important to retain sex as a protected characteristic If "gender-based" were to be also included it is important to define what that means very clearly in a way that people whose first language isn't English and those with literal conditions such as Autism could understand, because it isn't clear to me

Question 13: No

Expand: "Women" without clear definition of would be unclear now that a female with a GRC is legally considered to be a man, so I would prefer "females" if a change from using the term "misogyny" was warranted.

For example if a female who identified as a man was the victim of FGM or forced marriage because his parents still saw him as female would they still be covered by the term "women"?

People can still be the victim of misogynistic crime whether they still identify as women or not, so further clarity is needed.

I believe the current legal definition of the word "women" is adult human females, this excludes "girls" who would also need protecting from misogyny (but obviously I would not want juveniles included in the definition of women for obvious reasons).

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex (Gender does not clearly define sex anymore as many people consider it to mean gender identity or gender roles).

Females face prejudice and hostility based on their sex on a daily basis, sexual harrasment, sexual violence, missing out on promotions in fertile years, being considered lesser because of biological functions interrupting working lives (pregnancy, birth, maternity, menstruation, menopause). The list goes on and on, but this hostility is based on sex not appearance, it is not possible to identify out of sexism, pregnant transgender men face the same hostility albeit with additional prejudices against perceived gender-non-conformity.

I would not want to see gender and sex conflated as for many people these have two very different meanings

"Sex" clearly reflects sex at birth (male or female) and relates to physical attributes, i.e. whether you have reproductive system that would usually support production of eggs or sperm

Gender is a word where the meaning has evolved in everyday use to mean different things to different people to some (usually older) people it still indicates birth sex (male or female), to some it indicates gender identity (feminine, masculine, non binary, transgender, third gender, neutral, gender-fluid etc) also some people use it to indicate stereotypical gender roles as shorthand, or even sexuality

For this reason I think it is important to state "sex" where birth sex is meant, "gender identity" where the gender role identified with is meant, and "sexuality" when referring to sexuality.

I personally think this could be solved by protecting both "sex" and "perceived gender-non-conformity" as this would cover all vulnerabilities who may be targets.

The reason I think it is important to protect "sex" as a characteristic is because whilst females do face prejudice based on gender stereotypes they also face prejudice based purely on sex (FGM, sex-selected abortion, pregnancy, hormonal issues, menopause, menstruation)

Question 15: Old people and very young people are more vulnerable and may be targeted for violent robbery or torment for exactly this characteristic I think this is an important factor for vulnerable people to feel safe so this should be protected and considered an aggravating factor where applicable.

I really do think this new law should target help at those most affected by crimes (rather than simply hate alone) and I think the inherent vulnerability of the old and young does warrant that.

Question 16: Old people and very young people are more vulnerable and may be targeted for violent robbery for exactly this characteristic I think this is an important factor for vulnerable people to feel safe.

I think where infirmity of mind is a factor due to age for example if an elderly person or child is tormented as part of a crime and deliberately caused extra distress because the perpetrator considers them as of lesser value it should be considered hate.

Question 17: I think they are another vulnerable group as their own activity is illegal leaving them at a disadvantage and I think there is a prevalence of discrimination against them when often it is something they do out of necessity and fear.

I think along with homeless people they are attacked because they are vulnerable to attack more regularly than many other parts of society. I think crimes are committed against both because they are perceived as lesser and disposable by some people and that is wrong.

Question 18: I think being attacked for being part of a group should be classed a hate crime category provided it is more than words (as this would limit all discussion of everything including football teams).

I think the most important thing is to look at the aims of the legislation to deter senseless harm and escalated violence. After all there is rarely a good reason for attacking anyone.

Question 19: Yes, as above

Question 20: Yes if they are the reason someone consistently harrasses or commits crime against someone else.

I would think they could be grouped in with religion though

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: I think "perception" needs quantifying in an assessable format. Where there are conflicts of rights, for example religion versus a different religion what is perceived will be relative to the perspective held by the perceiver.

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: No. Unless further qualified as unfair prejudice and a level set - at least for the sake of the public understanding the law.

I think the definition of prejudice would need to be solid and clear and would need to be shown to be more than a one-off insult and should never involve assumptions, guilt by association or the phrase "dog whistle".

Many people use phrases like "they once attended a talk by" or "spoke to" or "were in the same group as" and I don't think listening to a wide range of people should be considered proof of a view held or proof of prejudiced motivation.

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: I think sex is an important relevant characteristic, as protected under the equality act. Three females a week are killed by males in the UK, and I think a discriminatory perceived lack of value of females by society is involved. I think hate crimes are committed against people because of their sex more often than for any of the above categories

Sexual orientation or sexuality is also very important as I often see homophobia in society, and discrimination based on all the EA2010 protected characteristics

Again, I think a better descriptor for any gender identity (transgender, non binary etc) would be "gender-non-conformity" as this would cover a wider range of vulnerable groups, including anyone who doesn't present themselves within expected gender stereotypes

I am gender-non-conforming myself and whilst I feel much progress has been made since my childhood this still seems the root cause of the discrimination faced.

Question 26: Yes

Expand: I would comment that it is important to put greater weight on the volume of hate crime offending that involves actual serious crime that goes beyond insults and words.

Question 27: No

Expand: I think the communications offences are adequately covered in the CA2003.

I have general concerns around criminalisation of communication but I think the CA2003 adequately deters indecent, obscene or menacing threats

Where threats of or hints at violence have been made, they may be a prelude to a more serious offence, but I believe these are adequately covered by the CA2003.

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand: These seem just as serious as GBH and arson with intent

Question 30: Criminal damage to property should still be included because vandalism may often be hate-based (e.g racist symbols and slogans)

Question 31: No

Expand: I think if a sexual offence is a targeted hate crime based on a protected characteristic which most often will be age, sex or sexuality it should be considered an aggravated version if other violent crimes are there is no good version of rape but also no good version of GBH. I feel this has previously been overlooked because many victims are female and many crimes are under-reported.

Question 32: Yes I think if the aim is to deter irrational crimes against people based on prejudiced perceptions of others then I think the criteria to prove one or more would achieve that aim

Question 33:

Question 34: Yes - it would be wrong if a crime was dismissed simply based on not being able to prove the aggravating factor

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: I feel more definition is important rather than a flexible approach. If something is a crime or an aggravating factor in a crime everyone needs clarity on what constitutes an offence against a protected characteristic or how will it deter anyone from committing such offences?

Question 38 Part 2: I would want to see a set of criteria for judges to consider, combined with clear measurements to quantify and define residual categories.

If we can't define a characteristic clearly, it would make it very difficult to prove motivation or even involvement.

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Other (please expand)

Expand: I do if the bar remains high and the exceptions around legitimate discussion remain. I wouldn't want to see genuine debate accidentally precluded from any setting

Sometimes truth can stir up hatred but if it is true there should be no barrier to writing it. e.g. Rotherham sex gangs publication of the crimes did stir up racial tensions but they should not have been kept quiet either

Another example would be the conflict in ideology that exists as gender-identity proponents often consider man and woman to be gender-identities with stereotypical personality attributes, whereas others see man and woman as representative of nothing more than birth sex and lived experience. Those are both only two points on a broad spectrum of opinion, including the societal expectations and their cause and effect, and require respectful disagreement.

Similarly one religion will not agree with another and will contradict each other and there will be a certain amount of inherent hostility

Similarly debate is essential around freedom from religious doctrine for those who are not religious. It should not be seen as hostile to disagree about religion or lack of religion as again, both are opinion

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: Yes but again my emphasis would be on making sure conflicting opinions were not considered inflammatory

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: I see this as near impossible to police due to the nature of the self published content. It is akin to trying to ask landlords to police conversations in a large public house

With larger problems such as dissemination of violent videos, extreme pornography and predatory criminal behavior still unresolved on most platforms I think this is an impossible ask

It would be fabulous obviously but the more likely outcome would be closure of the sites and they would be replaced by more sinister less detectable platforms for the same stuff.

Question 43 Part 2: I don't think it should be an offence unless incitement to action, or deliberate harrasment of an individual based on their protected characteristic is shown.

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: I do not see how it could be shown that a speaker intended to stir up hatred if neither their words or behaviour were threatening, abusive or insulting.

It might look like an attempt to criminalise thought, or worse, perceived thought

I suppose if the information was factually incorrect and sensationalist but then that would need to be defined and measureable to avoid the above.

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand: Mostly agree but I still have concerns about what constitutes stirring up hatred because especially in emotive discussions around religion or ideology that could include a lot of innocuous speech and essential debate I think it would also need to be shown to be untrue as truth should never be a problem.

Question 47: Yes

Expand: I would want the threshold for behaviour to be reasonably high but I would want it higher still for words only, to prevent stifling any legitimate debate.

Question 47 Part 2: As above, I would want the threshold for behaviour to be reasonably high but I would want it higher still for words only, to prevent stifling any legitimate debate

I think insults should not be criminalised except at the level where they constitute harrasment or defamation

Question 48: Other (please expand)

Expand: Yes to disability.

I do not understand the term "transgender identity" so without further definition of it I wouldn't know whether to agree or not

If you were asking whether I think stirring up hatred against people who don't conform to society's traditional gender stereotypes should be covered then it would be a yes

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: Yes to "sex".

As per all previous answers "gender" is now a vague term and I would not want it included without clear definition I personally believe these are two separate characteristics:

Sex = female or male

Gender-non-conformity = behaviour against assumed stereotypes for a person's sex

I would like to see both these characteristics protected but as they are totally different things I would not want them conflated.

Question 50: I believe the "hatred" should count whether it relates to one characteristic or more, if that is what is being asked?

Question 51: No

Expand: I think private homes need to remain outside the scope of the law where practical, to avoid issues of state surveillance.

I really think criminalising words or behaviour inside private spaces is against personal freedom (unless physical harm to another is occurring)

Question 52: Yes

Expand: I have assumed this means:

"Nothing in this Part shall be read or given effect in a way which prohibits or restricts discussion, criticism or expressions of antipathy, dislike, ridicule, insult or abuse of particular religions or the beliefs or practices of their adherents, or of any other belief system or the beliefs or practices of its adherents, or proselytising or urging adherents of a different religion or belief system to cease practising their religion or belief system"

Question 52 Part 2: As above yes, except I would want "Sex" and "Gender-non-conformity" as separate characteristics because they are, and I would want a clear definition of "transgender identity" to make sure it was inclusive of anyone targeted for perceived gender-non conformity

Again assuming it confirms that nothing in the Act " prohibits or restricts discussion, criticism or expressions of antipathy, dislike, ridicule, insult, or abuse of particular religions, or the beliefs or practices of its adherents "

Question 53: Yes

Again assuming it confirms that nothing in the Act "... prohibits or restricts discussion, criticism or expressions of antipathy, dislike, ridicule, insult, or abuse of particular religions, or the beliefs or practices of its adherents "

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2: Yes to fair and accurate reports of local government meetings or peer reviewed material in a scientific or academic journal.

Question 56: Yes

Expand: Anything that can be done to stop this wholesale racist bullying needs to be done

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: Surely if someone throws an object at someone it would be assault but yes it should be included, and gestures if they relate to protected characteristics

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Yes if their priority was to make sure the laws were used to reduce hate but encourage debate, and to keep an eye on whether the new law helped or increased tensions

The additional monitoring and prevention of crimes motivated by and exasperated by hate needs to be cost effective and workable I believe someone needs to be in charge of checking that the aim of having these laws has been met effectively

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic

discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'

This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed – and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up – is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit

newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity – which are contentious issues – should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that

disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can

be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender

ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence.

Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. • Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a

woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown.

Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: There often seems to be a blurred distinction, or no distinction at all, made between the individual and the individual's behaviour. Race, for example, is not behaviour based, it is a consequence of birth. All human beings, irrespective of race, ethnic origin, birth sex, first language or place of birth, are of equal status, carry equal dignity and deserve equal respect. Disability is also not a voluntary behaviour. However, sexual activity for example (as distinct from orientation) and the decision to transition to the opposite gender are personal

behavioural choices. Disapproval or questioning of such behaviours does not amount to hatred of the individual. As a parent (and now a grandparent) I know from experience that there were occasions when I strongly disapproved of my children's behaviour. But did I hate my children because I expressed disapproval of what they were doing? Never!! For justice to be served, it is essential that any changes to the law recognise that fundamental distinction. Otherwise we will have sacrificed free speech on the altar of contemporary moral fashion and political correctness.

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Restricting protection to women only does not seem to sit comfortably with equality. If women can be protected, why discriminate against men by excluding them from protection.

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23: I have a concern for which there does not appear to be a specific question in this Consultation

I was very concerned to read that Labour's Shadow Equalities Minister for Faith, Janet Daby MP, had to resign following comments regarding same sex marriage which she allegedly made during a briefing in early December 2020. She is reported to have said, "There needs to be something in place that protects people of faith as well as those who think the other way. It is an issue of conscience. It is like people having a choice who for reasons of conscience cannot participate in conducting an abortion." This is further evidence that tolerance has become a one-way street, and is in my view a direct attack on free speech. Such actions at best have a chilling effect, making people fearful of saying what they really think. The preservation of free speech is fundamental to our democracy, and that freedom must be maintained even though it means people will disagree fundamentally with what it said. I will defend to the hilt the right of people to express views which are different from mine, but I must also be free, without fear of accusations of hatred, to express mine. I sincerely hope any legislation resulting from this Consultation will overtly protect that basic freedom. Please don't let us down.

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: We have created a society where it has become fashionable to object to people who express views different from our own, particularly on moral and ethical issues. Sadly, the expression of views is taken by those who disagree with them as hatred. Nothing should be done which weakens the position of those who are wanting to engage in informed debate. A charge of hatred is serious, and the right to speak honestly and freely must not be chilled by making a charge of hatred easier when the accuser just doesn't like the view expressed.

Question 46: No

Expand: What does "stir up hatred" mean? It sounds very subjective and unclear. I refer you to my answer to Q45.

Question 47: No

Expand: I refer you to my answer to Q45

Question 47 Part 2: No

Question 48: No

Expand: Extending to cover transgender identity is not advisable. This is a topic of significant moral and social significance, and nothing must be done which will stifle debate and research into this subject. It is disturbing to hear that (if my information is correct) one university rejected an application from a prospective student who wanted to conduct post graduate research into transgender people who subsequently regretted their decision, and that the application was refused on the grounds that such a study would be politically incorrect! What is happening to our freedom to search for truth and knowledge?

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: I strongly disagree with this proposal. It would set a most unwelcome and dangerous precedent. It's a frightening idea. People must be at liberty, and without fear, to express their own opinions in their own homes. A private home is not the public sphere and such a move would be oppressive, the kind of thing that marks a totalitarian state. Who would police such a law? Are we starting down the road to a North Korea where friends and neighbours spy on each other? That might sound far-fetched and ridiculous, but big trees grow out of small acorns. Don't go there.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: It's the free speech argument again, and the protection of informed debate.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the consent of the Attorney General, as independent from the Crown Prosecution Service, is an important safeguard to mitigate the possibility of malicious or misguided prosecutions.

Question 55 Part 1: Yes

Question 55 Part 2: Yes

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: I have the right to express my views without fear.

That includes the right to say things which offend some whilst accepting that others may say things I find offensive

It is not for the law to limit the right to freedom of speech.

Question 2: No

Expand: The law should not interfere with the freedom of speech.

Question 3: No

Expand: The law should not be involved in censoring thought and freedom of speech

Sticks and stones may break my bones but words can never hurt me!

Question 4: Comments on migration and asylum are legitimate topics for discussion especially as different political parties have different approaches

Question 5: No

Expand: Comments on religion are personal views and not a matter for the law.

Blasphemy is no longer an offence

Question 6: Yes

Expand: Religion is a personal choice but also a legitimate topic for discussion and comment

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: People have the right to live as they wish but cannot deny or challenge the binary biological split of male / female.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: Maybe an apology for an honest mistake not requiring the intervention of the law?

Question 11: Yes

Expand: Provided there are only two biological sexes.

Question 11 Part 2: Forced marriages, polygamous marriages, FMG, under age marriages are already illegal under existing legislation

Question 12: What is a gender based hate crime that is not covered by existing law.

Question 13: Yes

Expand: Women is the correct description for members of the biological female

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: What 'hate crimes', beyond saying something someone is offended by, are not covered under existing laws?

Question 15: The law currently differentiates by age any additional laws should adhere to current legislation

Question 16: Laws should apply consistently.

What age based hate crimes are not already covered by existing laws?

Question 17: All citizens should have the same rights and protections under the law

Question 18: All citizens should have the same rights and protections under the law

Question 19: All citizens should have the same rights and protections under the law

Question 20: People are entitled to hold their personal beliefs as others are free to voice opinions regarding those beliefs under freedom of speech without interference from the law.

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: He said, she said is regarded as hearsay evidence and fails the test in criminal law. The same should apply to any new offences

An individual must not be able to cause the conviction of another based on their claim to be offended.

Question 23: Incitement to violence is already an offence and this should suffice

Freedom of speech includes the right to offend and be offended.

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: Without impacting Freedom of Speech

Question 26: No

Expand: What crimes not covered by existing laws and compatible with Freedom of Speech would these be?

Question 27: No

Expand: Existing laws, including covering freedom of speech, cover incitement to violence which should be the only protection required

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: Having just served on a jury charged with determining if the defendant was guilty of GBH or GBH with intent that took 2 days trying to determine the difference, I see no benefit in an additional category, especially as the current maximum tariff is a life sentence

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: These are not hate crimes, they are criminal actions already covered by existing laws.

Question 30: Covered by existing criminal law

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: Criminal acts, not hate crimes

Question 32: Any offences must be clear and obvious resulting actual damage, other than offence, supported by irrefutable, physical evidence

Question 33:

Question 34: Causing offence is not a criminal act. Any charge must be supported by testable evidence

Question 35: Only approaches which respect the right to freedom of speech are acceptable.

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: Any changes must not impact existing freedom of speech rights

Question 37: Other (please expand)

Expand: The basis of all sentences should be clear to all parties and subject to the right of appeal

Question 38 Part 1: The basis of all sentences should be clear to all parties and subject to the right of appeal

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand: The basis of all sentences should be consistent and clear to all parties and subject to the right of appeal

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand: Already covered by laws relating to incitement no new offences required

Question 41: No

Expand: Covered by existing incitement legislation - people offended by others free speech cannot determine what is inflammatory.

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: Written and spoken words and performances should be permitted free speech unless falling foul of existing incitement legislation

Question 43 Part 1: Hosting criminal or terrorist posts should be reported to the legal authorities who could sanction removal and pursue any criminal charges. This should not impede freedom of speech

Question 43 Part 2: The existing rules of evidence should be applied in all criminal cases

Question 44: 'Likely to' is subjective and as such cannot be subject to the rules of evidence. This would imply any resulting convictions would be challenged being based only on subjective opinion

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: Intent must be proved beyond reasonable doubt with evidence. An individual claiming to have taken offence does not constitute evidence.

Question 46: Yes

Expand: Existing incitement and evidence laws should apply

Question 47: No

Expand: Freedom of speech must include the right to offend and be offended. Incitement laws already provide required criminal sanctions

Question 47 Part 2: Incitement laws should provide adequate protection against criminal acts. Exercising freedom of speech should not result in prosecutions.

Question 48: No

Expand: Incitement laws should provide adequate protection against criminal acts. Exercising freedom of speech should not result in prosecutions.

Question 49: No

Expand: Incitement laws should provide adequate protection against criminal acts. Exercising freedom of speech should not result in prosecutions.

Question 50: Incitement laws should provide adequate protection against criminal acts. Exercising freedom of speech should not result in prosecutions.

Question 51: No

Expand: Incitement laws should provide adequate protection against criminal acts. Exercising freedom of speech should not result in prosecutions especially in a private dwelling..

Question 52: No

Expand: Incitement laws should provide adequate protection against criminal acts. Exercising freedom of speech should not result in prosecutions

Question 52 Part 2: Incitement laws should provide adequate protection against criminal acts. Exercising freedom of speech should not result in prosecutions.

Question 53: Incitement laws should provide adequate protection against criminal acts
Exercising freedom of speech should not result in prosecutions.

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand: Incitement laws should provide adequate protection against criminal acts
Exercising freedom of speech should not result in prosecutions.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2: Freedom of speech should allow for factual reporting, whether through main stream media or social media, of all events of public interest, parliamentary, local government, quango, charities, political parties etc

Question 56: No

Expand: Why is it distinct from other public order offences?

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand: Why is it distinct from other public order offences?

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: Public order offences.

Question 59: Existing public order offences should apply.

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: We need to get rid of the idea of Hate Crime. Incitement to commit violence should remain a crime but Hate Crime is a flawed idea, leading to malicious special interests being able to bully perfectly reasonable and (otherwise) law-abiding citizens into silence about values and ideas they hold dear

Question 2: No

Expand: If there's so hate crime there's no need to specify protected characteristics.
Everyone enjoys the protection of the law equally, in all areas

Question 3: No

Expand: No need, as with question 2.

Question 4: Doesn't apply if there is no Hate Crime law. Racism is repugnant but the law cannot excise it from the human heart, where it exists, not coerce a person into altruistic love for all. We should pretend it can. But incitement to commit violence, whoever the target may be, should be a crime.

Question 5: No

Expand: No need if there is no Hate Crime. This has a valuable side-effect of the state not getting into value judgments about religion at all

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Is there any evidence that any person has been persecuted for being "asexual"? The law should not be getting involved, unless there is clear incitement to violence and that applies to everyone.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: There are massive problems with definitions in this area. There's no need for the courts to wade in if only incitement to commit violence is a crime, with no fear of favour applying to the victim or perpetrator

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: There are massive problems with definitions in this area. Don't make a mockery of the law as an institution

Question 8 Part 3: Scrap the idea of Hate Crime. Don't be drawn into making definitions that will fail.

Question 9:

Question 10: Beyond my ability to understand. And, I assume, the person who wrote it. Make the law easier to understand, please, for all citizens (subjects of Her Majesty).

Question 11: No

Expand: Don't ever confuse gender with sex, which is immutable. But the concept of Hate Crime should not exist, including hurtful words said to be based on a person's sex

Question 11 Part 2: Incitement to commit violence can cover all these areas, which are vital ones in which women and girls need to be protected.

Question 12: Neither.

Question 13: No

Expand: No need to grapple with such terms.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex is binary and immutable and this should be recognised in law. It always has been.

Question 15: No need. Incitement to commit violence is a terrible thing when the very young or very old are the targets. That should of course be covered but not by 'hate crime'

Question 16:

Question 17: No, because there should be no hate crime categories.

Question 18: No, because there should be no hate crime categories

Question 19: No, because there should be no hate crime categories.

Question 20: No, because there should be no hate crime categories.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand: Don't understand.

Question 22: No

Expand: Hostility is bad, whatever But the law cannot and should not try to change people's hearts. Incitement to violence is the place the law has and should step in.

Question 23: Interesting word salad. But don't make a mockery of the law by getting into it.

Question 24: No

Expand: The law should apply equally to all.

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand: I can think of a hundred other characteristics But none of them should be included, nor these ones. Hate Crime itself should be removed.

Question 26: No

Expand: No. See previous 25 answers.

Question 27: No

Expand: No See previous 26 answers

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand: No. See previous 27 answers.

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand: No. See previous 28 answers.

Question 30: Property or fraud offences are already offences, quite rightly. They don't need this

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: Don't get into intersectionality Leave that to the academics The law can be both simpler and fairer without introducing such highly complex and disputed ideas.

Question 33: No, if they are based on the flawed concept of hate crime.

Question 34: No

Question 35: I'm not familiar with the Sussex Report.

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2: Plain English please. Start again with this in mind.

Question 39: No

Expand: Treat everyone equally. That was and should be the basis of English law.

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hatred being stirred up should not be a crime.

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: Only clear incitement to violence should be a crime Leave the rest alone.

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand: "the defendant's words or behaviour were threatening "

That is getting close incitement to violence and other illegal acts. They should be illegal.

Question 47: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred shouldn't be a crime. Incitement to violence should be.

Question 49: No

Expand: Don't confuse sex, which is binary and immutable, and gender, which is used in many other ways, many of them unintelligible.

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Also, do not include words that appear unbidden inside someone's head. Get a grip.

Question 52: No

Expand: As above.

Question 52 Part 2: No protection from 'hate crime' should exist. For anyone. Only from incitement to violence and that should apply to all people equally

Question 53: As above.

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand: Neither Stirring up hatred should not be an offence

Question 55 Part 1: The exemption should be maintained and should be extended to every UK subject in any place

Question 55 Part 2: As above

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: I've heard Spurs supporters proudly chant that they are Yid Army. I may well have joined in. No law can delve effectively into such subtleties. Public Order offences are enough.

Question 58: Not familiar enough with the Act but throwing of some forms of missile can clearly be dangerous and this must be covered by other laws.

Question 59: Doubt it.

Question 60: Not familiar enough with the Act

Question 61: Not familiar enough with the Act.

Question 62: No, unless it was his remit to dismantle all hate crime legislation.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: If the proposed were to be adopted into law it would be extremely damaging to freedom of speech! We already live in a society where the words "You can't say that" are said often in response to the voicing of an idea that someone else opposes. Statements such as these show that generally society is intolerant of certain ideas. If you do not hold mainstream values, you will be criticised. The idea that certain language could be outlawed because people presume it to intentionally stir up hatred is dangerous.

The current laws are sufficient to ensure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught, we do not need to extend this as it will undoubtedly encroach on freedom of speech!

Question 46: No

Expand: Abusive behaviour is a much more subjective standard than stirring up hatred and we already have sufficient laws in place to deal with such behaviour.

Points 2,3 and 4 of question 46 seem more to me as though you are trying to police crime before it happens. This is not possible and can lead to very erroneous measures. The idea that these wishy washy guidelines will then be applied to "offences" surrounding religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity, which are all very contentious issues, is alarming! I can see that if such measures, as are being proposed, were put in place they could very easily be misused and weaponised against people who hold opinions that differ from mainstream/popular thinking. This once again squashes freedom of speech.

Question 47: No

Expand: Current law makes careful distinctions between characteristics of race and characteristics of religion or ideology. Characteristics such as race are inherited physical traits. However religion and sexual orientation/transgender identity can be debated in a way that race cannot be debated. This is because religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity are based on beliefs and behaviours. The proposed may well fuel attack on freedom of speech by politically motivated people. We would certainly see people with strongly held beliefs reporting others with opposing beliefs as "haters". This may shut up people who hold beliefs that are opposed by the mainstream media and popular thinking but is this really what we want to do? Aren't the freedoms we have experienced as a nation, to debate beliefs freely, worth protecting? Hasn't good come from being able to challenge the norm and that which is widely acceptable? If freedom of speech is closed down we will not progress as a nation because where there is censorship ideas cannot be fully explored or developed.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different things. They cannot and should not be grouped together as though they were the same. Transgender identity is currently a very controversial issue and one that needs room to be discussed and debated freely and without fear of criminalisation.

If we were to introduce sanctions around the topic of transgender identity this would affect many hotly contested issues including women wanting to protect same sex spaces, people who have "detransitioned" from their sex change not to mention important discussions that are currently being had surrounding child protection issues concerning the Travistock gender clinic. These are just a few examples that highlight the controversial nature of transgender identity.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: If people cannot comfortably express or discuss views within their own homes then where can these conversations be had? If the answer is "no where" then certainly freedom of speech has been removed altogether! From history we know this is extremely dangerous and regressive. For the government to do what is being proposed here in question 51 would be an oppressive move.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Strong protections need to be put in place for protecting freedom of speech, freedom of expression and freedom to share information on all subjects.

Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion.

Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: It is extremely important that the consent requirement is not downgraded from Attorney General to the director. The reason being that a person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. A penalty as serious as this needs strong safeguards of the highest level! Not least because stirring up hatred laws have high potential for infringements on human rights

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand: Adding more characteristics would create more inequality before the law and more and more minority groups would argue for 'protected' status to advance their own agenda

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4: Not necessary

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: No. It is purely a personal preference and not verifiable.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Adding more sub-categories to this protected characteristic would simply lead to an ever-increasing list of sexual fetishes.

Making cross-dressing a protected characteristic could criminalise organisations which prescribe specific dress codes for males and females.

Please note that intersex is not a version of transgenderism. It refers to physical defects of sexual development, mainly detected at birth. Including it with transgenderism would be confusing. It belongs with disability.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Everyone is either male or female.

A very tiny percentage of people are born whose sex is not instantly observable because of a physical defect of sexual development but they are either male or female. There is no third gamete, so there is no third sex.

As mentioned above, intersex is not a version of transgenderism

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Protected characteristic should be sex. Sex is verifiable as it is a physical characteristic. Gender is a social construct and unverifiable

Question 11 Part 2: All the examples you give are sex specific

Question 12: Sex-based hate crime is usually committed against women.

Question 13: No

Expand: Sex-based hate crime can only be committed against women.

Question 14: No

Expand: Protected characteristic should be sex. Women suffer hate crime because of their biological sex.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: No.

'Sex worker' is a euphemism for 'prostitute' which is used to normalise prostitution as 'work'. Prostitution is not a permanent characteristic of a person. It is an occupation. Treating it as a protected characteristic makes as little sense as recognising librarians as a hate crime category.

Such a measure would create stigma around charitable work opposing prostitution and pornography and helping women to exit the sex industry. Given the effect hate crime legislation has had on the police, such a measure could mean that opposition to prostitution and pornography could be reported as hate crime. This would impact on work by Churches and other agencies in this field and cause confusion in the field of safeguarding.

Question 18: No. Where would the list end?

Question 19: No

A temporary state. Not a permanent characteristic.

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: 'Non-binary' is purely subjective. Human beings are sexually dimorphic and hence either male or female

As already explained, intersex is not a version of transgenderism. A very tiny percentage of people are born whose sex is not instantly observable due to a disorder of sexual development but they are either male or female. There is no third gamete, so there is no third sex

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Such proposals would erode free speech and freedom of expression in England and Wales and would make it more difficult to publish material critical of, for example, Islam or transgenderism

Question 41: No

Expand: The Public Order Act should not be used to diminish freedom of speech. The term 'inflammatory' is subjective and defining it in law could erode free speech

Material critical of, or opposed to, Islam could be deemed 'inflammatory' and hence criminalised. This would in effect create a blasphemy law protecting Islamic beliefs from criticism, causing a negative impact on Christian work in apologetics, outreach and education

It could similarly inhibit legitimate criticism of gender theory and transgenderism which are highly controversial concepts

It could criminalise works such as Catechism of the Catholic Church which makes clear, for example, that homosexual acts cannot be approved, and other works which enunciate positions deemed not to be politically correct

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The suggestion that intention alone should be sufficient for an offence to have been committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1 Threatening words or behaviour 2 Intention to stir up hatred. If proof of only one of these elements is required it would be easier to claim an offence had been committed.

An intention requirement does not guarantee that a person intended to stir up hatred

The existing two-stage test helps to ensure only genuinely criminal behaviour is picked up. Outlawing moderate language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed, and regardless of whether hatred is in fact stirred up, could mean the criminalisation of trivial comments solely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Not requiring intent to stir up hatred to be proven makes it far too easy for activists to shut down all kinds of discussion, debate and disagreement. This applies both to religious and non-religious beliefs

Defining words as 'threatening' or 'abusive' is extremely difficult. People routinely describe opinions they disagree with as abusive. It is equally difficult to presume that defendants 'ought to have known' that their words or behaviour counted as such

In Scotland the Justice Minister has agreed to limit new stirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech

Question 47: No

Expand: The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristic of religion or sexual orientation

Not all protected characteristics are equivalent and therefore should not be treated the same. Race is innate and an inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and gender identity are beliefs, behaviours and lifestyles that individuals may adopt and relinquish. This means it is legitimate to discuss and debate them. The law must not restrict such discussion. There is a serious risk that disagreement on these issues could be labelled 'hatred' by politically-motivated complainants.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and gender identity are completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer.

Gender identity should not be susceptible to stirring up offences. Gender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws would have the potential to close down debate.

Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be affected if gender identity is included in stirring up offences

Available evidence shows that transgender identity may be assumed and relinquished by individuals, in some cases on a capricious basis (for example Pips Bunce). Transgender ideology is highly controversial, particularly in relation to children and young adults. The history of debates on this topic demonstrates how fragile freedom of speech has become and how much it is needed. Professionals and society in general need the freedom to discuss the issues without fear of being reported for hate crime

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: It should cover sex only. Sex is verifiable. Gender is a social construct with no scientific basis. The law would lose all credibility if it could be applied to pure fiction

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: The Public Order Act should not be extended to cover private dwellings. Removing the dwelling defence would destroy free speech and religious freedom in England and Wales

The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence.

Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It would be inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere

Question 52: Yes

Expand: I agree that the current protections, including the protection for views about marriage (Section 29JA), in the Public Order Act must remain.

Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds such as religion, sexual orientation and transgenderism must have strong protection for free speech to protect debate.

Any offence covering transgenderism must explicitly protect:

Using a person's birth name and pronouns

Saying that human beings cannot change sex

Saying that human beings are dimorphic and that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2: Free speech protections must be given with respect to all these characteristics. People must be free to use a person's name as given at birth, use pronouns corresponding to their biological sex and refuse to use 'preferred pronouns'. People must be free to say that the human species is dimorphic and human beings cannot change sex. People must be free to say that gender reassignment and transgenderism are morally wrong without fear of arrest or prosecution

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights.

Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signals regarding the importance of free speech.

The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP and is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: It could be viewed that someone of faith for example who is commanded to speak what the Bible views as truth is intentionally stirring up hate. While it is entirely possible to hide behind faith to speak hatred, the mere act of sharing a faith based view point is not and should never be viewed as an act of hatred.

Question 46: No

Expand: Again, as someone of faith, we know that some elements of teaching could be viewed as being hateful towards others, but this would be to misunderstand and misrepresent the meaning and purpose of such teaching.

Therefore this proposal would seek to prevent people of faith speaking from a biblical view point or acting on conscience.

Question 47: No

Expand: It is impossible to judge all words and actions through a single lens, there must be provision made for people to speak out of faith or conscience even if it is possible that someone could find such words or actions offensive. To do so goes against the very nature of free speech. Any words could be deemed offensive by someone if taken out of context or the hearer simply disagrees with what was said. This would make the law easily abused, manipulated and the law itself could become a weapon of hate and or abusive.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: While it is important that everyone is respected and does not feel threatened, the government cannot legislate against every possible action or word that may cause offence to

some group or another. The laws of free speech are foundational to this country and must be protected at all costs.

It is entirely wrong to label disability and transgender as the same issue when they are not. It is in no way scientifically proven that transgender is a disability or a biological issue. Transgender issues also affect biological women who could feel threatened or women who have gone through reassignment and regretted their decision.

Question 49: No

Expand: Issues of race are neutral issues however Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour.

If we lose this ability to express our opinions, or the freedom to debate the science behind and the moral effect of all beliefs or behaviours then we no longer have a free and democratic society that teaches tolerance but encourages healthy free thinking debate.

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: If a person cannot express their own views and thoughts in their own home without fear of prosecution then we are on the verge of a dystopia society where our thoughts and opinions are monitored and free speech and healthy debate are curtailed. We cannot operate a society that seeks to bring freedom to the oppressed while oppressing anyone who might have an opinion or belief that may cause offence to someone else.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: These protections must be kept in order to protect the right to free speech and for healthy debate to continue.

Question 52 Part 2: When talking about sexual orientation and gender issues the current protections of free speech and religious beliefs must be upheld.

- Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly

protect:

- using a person's birth name and pronoun,
- saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and
- saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand: It is essential to the protection of free speech that the attorney General be kept as the check and balance for prosecutions relating to offences of stirring up hate. Downgrading this would send a message that people do not have a right to hold an opposing opinion and cause fear that free speech will more certainly end up with criminal prosecution. The maximum sentence is 7 years which is a very serious consequence for the act of speaking.

words. Words can hurt people but over zealous or even malicious prosecution will destroy people and ultimately erode our society

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Many people can be offended if someone doesn't agree with their own opinions but that does not mean that having differing views is hateful or is hate speech. It is also difficult to prove whether it has been said to deliberately be hateful. This would be damaging to free speech and people would be easily penalised for having different views

even if they respect the person and don't share their view in a malicious or hateful way to the person/people.

Question 46: No

Expand: It should be extremely clear that a person has intended to stir up hatred. It would be very damaging for that person going forward in life if they were accused of hate speech and were not deliberately stirring up hatred. Sometimes people can feel someone is being hateful to them if they disagree with their opinions/beliefs. This would also give a lot less freedom to share religious or political views.

Question 47: No

Expand: Definitely not. This would have a massive impact on people being able to share their own beliefs and disagreement could easily be said to be hatred.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: These are two very different issues. There have been many people who have regretted changing gender and this would stop them from sharing their experiences and views with others, even if they have the very best intentions of the individual at heart.

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Everyone should be able to be themselves and to talk about their own views and opinions, especially within their own home. Everyone should be free to express themselves.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: They have good and strong protection and this enables people to share their views and beliefs and to be able to debate.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: A person could share their views, even in good intention and get a very serious prosecution for their speech. It also doesn't reflect well on freedom of speech.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Is it necessary for a concept of "hate crime" to exist at all? If a crime has been committed, the motive of the perpetrator doesn't need to be relevant; a crime is a crime, regardless

Question 2: No

Expand: I disagree with this too. The current list of protected characteristics seems adequate; in addition, the consultation paper states that legislating specifically against hate crimes has made no difference to the number of such crimes committed!

Finally, the very existence of protected characteristics is in itself divisive. As I inferred in my answer to Question 1, a crime is a crime; the characteristic or characteristics of the victim should not be important.

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: I am not in favour of adding any new protected characteristics (see paragraph 2 of my response to Question 2)

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: As I stated in paragraph 2 of my response to Question 2, I do not see the need for protected characteristics at all; I therefore oppose any additions to the list.

I am particularly concerned by the provision for those considering themselves non-binary. This is on practical grounds; inclusion of this category as a protected characteristic would pose major problems involving the alteration of official forms (e.g. Census), and is also likely to make border security more difficult to enforce.

As regards intersex, this is a physical characteristic whereas the other categories on the list are choices; therefore this category should not be included

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: As already stated in the Commission's consultation document, the availability of hate crime laws has had no effect on the number of such crimes committed. This being so, the addition of these characteristics is unlikely to be of use.

Question 11 Part 2: These changes are unlikely to prove effective. While I certainly oppose such practices as FGM and forced marriage, our legal authorities' response to them so far does not make me confident! If gender or sex do become protected characteristics, it will be difficult to use this legislation against these activities as they are often carried out by women on women and so would not be covered

Question 12:

Question 13: Yes

Expand: As stated above, I would not like to see any additions to the list of protected characteristics. However, if such a change were to be made, I would prefer the category of "women" rather than "misogyny". Again as I referred to above, crimes such as FGM are often perpetrated against women by other women and so cannot be defined as misogynistic

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: I do not agree to this change. While I certainly condemn violence against anyone (including prostitutes), bringing in this category would risk criminalising those who oppose prostitution (such as charities and support groups). This would be particularly likely considering the amount of profit prostitution and related occupations (such as pornography) bring in. In addition, prostitution is an activity and not an identity

I am particularly concerned that the Commission seems to have regarded Peter Sutcliffe's views on prostitutes as being typical of all those people and groups who oppose the activity; this is patently untrue and urgently needs clarification!

Question 18: Please see paragraph 2 of my answer to Question 2.

Question 19: As last.

Question 20: I disagree very strongly; see my answer to Question 2. I am particularly concerned that both the police and the Crown Prosecution Service have a strong tendency to favour the claimed victim in reported "hate crimes"; if "philosophical beliefs" were added as a protected characteristic it would make the situation worse! It could also add to the potential for violence between opposing political or philosophical groups

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: I disagree, for the reason given in my answer to Question 2.

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand: The current law on malicious communications is adequate as it stands.

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: I strongly disagree with this proposal, which would seriously curtail free speech

I am particularly concerned by the Law Commission's apparent bias in favour of multiculturalism generally, and particularly of Islam. While I oppose any form of discrimination against Muslims, any law which prevents the non-violent criticism of any religion or philosophy would be a denial of the free speech for which this country has been justly famed

Question 41: No

Expand: Again, I disagree. The proposed change could be a "catch all" charter for anyone who feels offended to bring the perpetrator to the courts

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand: It is important to differentiate between innate characteristics (such as race) and those (such as religion) which are chosen and can be changed. The imposition of a single threshold here would muddy the waters.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: I strongly disagree. The definition "stirring up hatred" has been used far too freely recently, particularly in the realm of transgender identity. The whole subject of transgender identity is very much open to debate and is understandably very emotive. If the proposal mentioned goes through, then this debate is likely to be stifled; there would be very worrying implications for a wide variety of freedoms, examples being children's rights and freedom of speech. The rights of individuals who have transitioned and subsequently regret it, and the rights of professionals in this field who have misgivings about the current transgender ideology, are likely to be especially at risk.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: I disagree strongly with this proposal. The Public Order Act , by definition, deals with words or behaviour used in public. If this exclusion is removed, it would be a major blow to free speech. The law already provides protection from assault, abuse and similar in a dwelling, so there is no need for the proposed change. As our society is becoming increasingly polarised, I can foresee an increase in prosecutions resulting from deliberate provocation if this change is carried out; examples include the fomenting of family feuds such as at Christmas (Covid permitting!) and possibly children taking their parents to court following reprimanding

Question 52: Yes

Expand: These sections of the Public Order Act should remain, in order to safeguard free speech

Question 52 Part 2: Yes, similar protections should be given in respect of these characteristics. People wishing to identify as transgender should be allowed to do so, as should those who identify as a gender different from their biological sex. However, people who disagree with these positions (or indeed any position) must be free to express their dissent without fear of prosecution as long as their views are expressed in a polite manner

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The Attorney General is answerable to Parliament, whereas the Director of Public Prosecutions is not. This provides for at least some checks and balances; to remove these safeguards would be a dangerous erosion of freedom of speech.

Question 55 Part 1: I agree that these exemptions should be maintained

Question 55 Part 2: I also agree that full exemption should be granted to these categories.

It is tragic that, increasingly, free speech (including the dissemination of ideas by any means) is becoming limited to certain official bodies such as Parliament. If speech is indeed to be free, it needs to be available to all.

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I would not support this proposal.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I want to remain confidential because free thought and free speech is already under threat in the UK, which your proposal makes far worse. I already fear putting my opinions forward

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand: Stifles free thought and speech, which are the hallmarks of all progress of mankind
This is totalitarian

Question 4: No Subjective and stifling of free debate and ability to challenge authority

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 7: No

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Stifling speech and ability to tell the truth

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Totalitarian suppression

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: Totalitarian overreach

Question 11: No

Expand: This will have the effect of CAUSING further friction. The UK has got a good society and genders and sexes get on very well

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: All this is total totalitarian overreach

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15: Hate crimes are subjective and are over-policed

Question 16: This is crazy to think of adding this in

Question 17: No

Question 18: No

Question 19: No

Question 20: No

This would stifle debate Galileo was executed for stating that the earth went round the sun

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: Totalitarian overreach

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23: Scary overreach of the state

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: Already, hate speech laws reach too far This is an unacceptable attack on free speech.

Question 26: No

Expand: Hate crime is already over policed and subjective

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32: Absolutely not. Intersectionality is a poisonous and divisive philosophy.

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Chilling effect on human right to free speech and open debate

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: Hate speech laws should be wound back, not increased It is chilling

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand: All expansion of hate speech laws should be scrapped

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand: Chilling effect on real debate

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Why is the state trying to turn perfectly normal families against each other. Child versus child, parent vs child, child versus parent What depravity of philosophy leads you to want to turn families against each other?

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: No

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No. Its totalitarian. Regarding this whole proposal, I beg you all to consider a future where your precious sons or daughters, your brother or sisters, or your parents, could find themselves prosecuted, harrassed by overzealous police, or effectively unable to find work, for so called "hate offences", much of which is subjective. We live in a very tolerant and happy society, which only survives through free speech and open debate, where the galileos of today are able to say that the earth goes round the sun without being executed for it. I have rarely been more frightened for the future of this country than when i saw your heinous, dangerous proposals I truly fear for my child, and your children and grandchildren, who may through some momentary indiscretion, or even through common sense speech, be criminalised and effectively ostracised from society or being able to work. What you propose is totalitarianism, plain and simple And we have seen where that led other societies with their stasi

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: If there are already legal provisions to address hate crime why would another piece of legislation prove to be necessary?

The suggestion, especially that of having a "Hate Crime Commissioner" with powers (and how exactly be defined and who will police the fairness of discharge of the Commissioner's duties?), is that we have a major issue in the country with hate crime. I would dispute this, especially in the light of having worked abroad in other countries and cultural contexts

While I would never deny hate crime exists, I have seen it rise against the Jewish community over the last few years, I know how tough it can be for those who have a disability and I was married to a black African man who had to be circumspect around police officers, surely the way to address this is through individuals and communities coming up with their own solutions, such as mediation and education?

Imposition of law which is vague and open to misinterpretation is going to lead to the very opposite of what is intended. i.e . the further dividing of societal differences and resentments.

Sledge hammer to crack nut springs to mind!

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4: I worked as a community nurse in the most culturally diverse area of Manchester for over 7 years and dealt with many people who had unclear immigration status, my own husband had to deal with uncertainty over his immigration status for over 2 years until he was granted leave to remain in the UK.

However, it is not unreasonable for people working with migrants/asylum seekers to have to ask questions in relation to this, people like police officers and health personnel Could asking questions about status, leave to remain etc potentially get us into trouble if someone dislikes us asking the questions of them? I can see that the fear of this could significantly hamper the work public sector workers have to do

In respect of language there is no way that should be associated with the definition of race in hate crime laws. It is reasonable for British citizens to expect all those living here, no matter what their status, to attempt to speak the predominant language of society outside of the home environment. This is a key building block for social cohesion.

Having worked in an area where 84 languages were spoken in 2 square miles I can tell from experience that people, especially vulnerable women, are put at risk by not being able to speak English. To have that situation almost sanctified by the threat of potential legal action against those who, again have to ask the questions about language or who actively encourage the uptake of TEFL, could have serious unforeseen circumstances in relation to domestic abuse and/or trafficking.

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: Surely asexuality by definition is not a sexual orientation!

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: If you have the definition as you propose above then why would you need to give it a broader title??

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: I

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: I have worked with sex workers in the past and I would agree that they are not as protected by the police as they should be that is a somewhat different issue

There is provision legally for them to be protected in respect of rape for example, just as there is for anyone else in the general population, but they are often let down by the police or blamed for their own predicament

What should happen is not that there is an additional hate crime category but that the police, social services and other public sector personnel are educated and trained to work effectively with/for sex workers

Question 18: Straight away there is a problem with this category...what do you actually mean by "alternative subcultures"? How are they to be defined and by who? Could I, for example, living without a television and dressing like a hippy be defined as having as being part of an "alternative subculture"? Can you see the difficulty right there?

What if a group of people living as new age travellers decide to occupy a piece of land belonging to someone else, that person objects, could the landowner be charged under the proposed hate crime legislation if he calls them new age hippies? The potential is there for such an action

Question 19: I have worked with many homeless people in the past and I would agree that they are not as protected by the police as they should be that is a somewhat different issue.

There is provision legally for them to be protected in respect of assault for example, just as there is for anyone else in the general population, but they are often let down by the police or blamed for their own predicament.

What should happen is not that there is an additional hate crime category but that the police, social services and other public sector personnel are educated and trained to work effectively with/for people who are experiencing homelessness.

Question 20: How do you propose this will work in reality?

Every person has their own views and beliefs, some are informed and some less so but that's not for the law to judge. All this proposal will do is stifle debate. Could some academic use this to argue they have been the victim of a hate crime when actually all that happened was that they were asked to justify a position/argument?

In a free and open democracy all points of view have to be open for scrutiny and comment not shut down with spurious arguments about "philosophical beliefs".

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: With the exception of disability what is proposed is going down a road which invites many individuals and groups who identify with certain characteristics to feel the sense of being aggrieved and increases the actuality of offence being taken when none was probably intended.

What you are proposing is incredibly divisive in a country known for its toleration towards difference. We have always been a nation that has welcomed immigrants, left people to do what they do sexually behind closed doors, lived with the abiding concept of fair play and equality before the law and now you propose to alter the landscape of this country socially by encouraging the identification of people with a group rather than a society.

It will seriously impair the freedom of speech this country has been a bastion of. I don't deny there are some people who target others, or people who make some group the butt of their jokes as a Scouser how often have I had someone talking about stolen hubcaps around me!..but dealing with that is part of building character and resilience in individuals.

We have to be free from fear that what we say, sometimes in unguarded moments, will lead to court. There are views expressed about the Holocaust I find deeply distasteful but I would defend the right of people to say them because in a democracy that is what people do. Fear constrains democracy and what you are proposing will do just that.

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: There is a total difference in being threatening, abusive or insulting to being polite but disagreeing with someone else's point of view

We have recently had cases in the UK of pastors being jailed, and then subsequently receiving apologies from police for these actions, because they have been reading from scripture and someone has not liked what they heard of has been challenged by it. In none of these cases have the pastors being impolite or rude, never mind threatening etc. Will they now have no protection in law?

For example could someone for who is gay claim a pastor is stirring up hatred because they have read a scripture that clearly states marriage is between a man and a woman. It is a pastor's duty to state the truth as they see it from their holy book but what you propose has the potential to see that pastor prosecuted for doing what they are called to do even though they are not threatening anyone. This is the start of a slippery slope that sees Christians, and others, persecuted for their beliefs and faith

Free speech will always offend someone because it IS free, that's just something that we have to accept if we are to continue to be allowed free expression of thought and belief

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand: Surely the of each individual context needs to be considered if law is to be delivered fairly.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Other (please expand)

Expand: Yes to disability, no to transgender

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Absolutely not!

What people say in their own homes is not for others to police. Freedom of expression helps to create a society in which debate is reasoned and fair. Having discussions around a table in a dwelling helps people formulate ideas, be challenged and think through their points of view.

I had the privilege of growing up in a home where debate was encouraged despite significant religious and political differences between family members. It helped me become who I am today and have always encouraged younger folk in my orbit to challenge me and my views when we are in a dwelling together

To have dwellings included is going to cause not only a huge amount of resentment but will have the consequence of people being less willing to engage with others of differing views, if anything it will reinforce divisions in society and be detrimental to cohesion

What are you trying to do to this country....make us fearful of others in our immediate vicinity, for goodness sake that's what they do in dictatorships, not in the country of the Magna Carta Having stayed in communist controlled countries in the past I have to say what you are proposing smacks very much of the form of control the Stasi would have welcomed.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No.

Why do we need one in a country that is tolerant and fair? My African husband believes the UK to be a welcoming hospitable country where he has been given opportunities he would never have had back home. He cannot understand why we allow people to suggest that this country is anything else and I could not agree more having lived abroad in other countries and cultural contexts.

To have a HCC gives the impression that hate pervades our society which it does not...what it also does is allow every person who feels aggrieved to defer the responsibility they have to deal with issues and build resilience by facilitating legal redress in situations where education and mediation would be quite sufficient.

I want to know how such a person would be appointed, how their office would function and to whom they would be accountable. Where is the detail about that? Noticeable by its absence!

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4: No these are two very different attributes

Race is an unchangeable, inherited physical trait over which an individual has no decision or control.

The decision to migrate is a personal choice Languages can be learned The decision to enter a country illegally is a deliberate decision to break the law.

It is incongruous to suggest that a status based on personal choice (and even a decision to break the law) should gain the same protection as race.

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: The current definition in law rightly places the emphasis on the person's objective legal status

The definitions proposed (except intersex) have no means of objective proof. The "identity and personhood of the individual" (as expressed in 11.76 of the consultation document) is a very vague definition and depends entirely on a person's subjective feelings

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: 'Transgender' already has a clear legal definition in relation to a defined process of gender reassignment

'Non-binary' implies the existence of additional genders other than male and female. While a person may feel that they do not match the typical assumption of how a 'male' or 'female' should think or behave, these additional 'genders' are based on subjective feelings and have no objective basis.

In the context of this review, the topic of transgender is clearly a contentious issue in the public arena Transgender lobbying groups are among the most vociferous in portraying any reasoned disagreement with their position as 'hatred'. Broadening the definition to include

any imagined 'gender' (and therefore restricting freedom to criticise increasingly radical ideas in this area) will only serve to stifle public debate on these important topics.

'Intersex' on the other hand is an objective biological status although point 11 82 notes that there is very limited evidence for targeted crime against the very small number of people who fit this category.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: It is understandable and regrettable that people with 'hidden' disabilities would be made to feel uncomfortable if challenged when using disabled facilities (for example) However, it seems reasonable that in most cases the intention of the other party would be to ensure that those facilities are reserved for disabled people

This proposal brings the potential to criminalise someone who thought that they were doing the right thing in going out of their way to act in support of disabled people. On balance it does not seem right to do this

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: The law should treat both sexes equally.

Furthermore, it is likely that many attacks against men (especially by other men) may not have happened had they been female and in these cases men are at a disadvantage

My own perception and understanding (no direct experience!) is that in the more violent quarters of society, men are seen as 'fair game' for violence or aggression in an altercation whereas the attacking of a woman by a man carries a certain stigma. Consequently women are in some way protected and men are at a disadvantage in this context.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: The law should treat both sexes equally

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex has an objective definition in biology (12 13) and can be clearly proven

Gender (if such a separate category exists) is by definition subjective, especially if the new definition proposed earlier in the consultation is adopted.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: Until a year ago this would seem reasonable, but in light of the actions and approach of the BLM movement this should be reconsidered

While racism as conventionally defined is of course abhorrent, the BLM movement goes much further in setting out radical alternative principles on which society should be built that go much further than the topic of race. It then wraps all these things together under the banner of race and consequently labels any disagreement with their position as racial hatred. Consequently any reasoned disagreement with any of their policies (including extremely radical ones like de-funding the police) could be criminalised as hate speech.

While it is right that the law should protect against intentional racist attacks, it is imperative that the freedom to discuss and debate ideas is maintained and it seems highly likely that this freedom would be severely impaired by the proposed change.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: In the current climate that often equates reasoned disagreement or criticism of an idea with 'hatred', it is very easy to meet the test of 'likely to' stir up hatred when discussing contentious topics.

A few years ago, words like 'transphobic' or 'Islamophobic' were used to label attacks on individuals. Now we see plenty of examples where these labels of 'hatred' are used to describe intellectual criticism of ideas. Even the direct quoting of linguistic or scientific definitions and statements of logical and objective observations have been recently been labelled as 'hate speech'. This is a very dangerous trajectory.

In a free and democratic society, ideas should be open to reasoned criticism, robust debate and even ridicule without fear of prosecution. The alternative is a situation like China or North Korea where only state-sanctioned opinions are allowed.

The law as it currently stands rightly protects against people behaving in a threatening or abusive way, and if we want to live in a tolerant and equal society this is where the remit of the law should end.

Nobody should have the legal right not to be offended, or to be protected by law from hearing ideas or points of view that they find disagreeable or challenging. However, this is what some groups now seem to be seeking on the grounds that disagreement with their position constitutes 'hatred'.

As Justices Bean and Warby recently ruled: "free speech encompasses the right to offend, and indeed to abuse another", and: "Freedom only to speak inoffensively is not worth having"

Ironically, it is only because of this robust freedom of speech and expression that minority groups have been able to achieve the level of protection that they have now.

The proposal will effectively shut down debate on contentious issues and silence those who hold less popular views - if not by incrimination then by self-censorship for fear of the consequences of speaking out.

The way out of society's current tensions and divisions has to be reasoned, open debate
This proposal is the complete opposite to that.

Question 46: No

Expand: Some activist groups make claims to objective truth or morality that contradict conventional understanding, and then label any criticism of their ideas as hatred or abuse.

Within this context, the proposal would effectively incriminate people for engaging in reasoned criticism or debate on several contentious issues

Consider a case where a speaker makes a reasoned criticism of a principle on which the identity of a protected group is based. For example this could be expressing disagreement with certain religious claims or a discussion on the latest ideas on gender and sexuality. A person in that protected group could easily claim to feel abused by this criticism.

It would be far too easy for the prosecution to prove these four points and create an offence out of a reasoned discussion.

People who challenge the 'progressive' position on a number of topics are already being 'no-platformed', socially ostracized or dismissed from their jobs for simply speaking their mind

Given that the tide is already shifting so clearly towards shutting down reasoned debate on contentious issues, any change to the law in this area should serve to preserve the right to freedom of speech rather than moving towards state censorship where only one 'correct' opinion is allowed.

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Other (please expand)

Expand: There are two questions here. Disability and transgender are not comparable.

Disability is an issue over which there is no significant public debate and it seems reasonable to cover disabled people in this legislation.

Transgender is an extremely contentious topic, and the scope of the word itself is not clear. There is active public debate on the issue, and recent examples like the case of JK Rowling demonstrate how a straightforward expression of opinion can become grounds for being publicly demonised.

It is vital that free and open debate is allowed to continue on the issue of transgender. It represents a redefinition of one of the most fundamental principles of society and has far reaching consequences in areas as varied as women's rights, sporting competitions and freedom of speech.

Given that this is one of the most common areas for reasoned disagreement to be labelled as 'hatred', this is a topic on which the proposed legislation would be particularly effective in giving legal power to shut down one side of the debate

The effect would be to severely restrict public debate on this very important topic. Given the implications, it is imperative that freedom of speech for both sides is robustly defended and people on both sides of the argument feel free to speak their mind

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Conversations that take place in a private dwelling should not be the concern of the law.

Someone who enters a private dwelling does so voluntarily and almost certainly knows the people who will be there and has some expectation of the topics that might be discussed

The 'propagation of hatred' mentioned in 18 254 is a subjective notion; one person's deeply held and logically reasoned opinion might be construed as 'hatred' by another.

The proposal effectively means that the discussion of certain ideas in a private dwelling could be an offence. It should not be the role of the law to police discussions that take place between people who voluntarily meet in a private dwelling.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: The single biggest risk of the proposals is to restrict freedom of expression and shut down debate on important topic.

Robust protection for freedom of expression must be included as part of any new legislation

Question 52 Part 2: There should be protection for expression of any of the historically conventional principles on these topics, especially in the areas of transgender identity and gender

The should include, but not necessarily be limited to, discussing the following points:

The existence of two sexes (male and female) and no more

Sex and gender being one and the same, and unchangeable

Whether somebody born male can become female, and vice versa

People of different sexes typically having differing characteristics

Gender reassignment

Treatment of people who have transitioned to some extent but later regret it

Treatment for gender dysphoria, including the option of helping a person come to terms with their natural biological sex, for example through counselling

Provision of and access to single-sex facilities and activities

Furthermore there should be protection against forced speech, so that no offence is committed by someone:

Referring to somebody by the person's birth name

- Pointing out somebody's biological sex

Referring to somebody using the pronoun that corresponds to the person's biological sex

Refusing to use pronouns (including new, invented pronouns) that do not correspond to the person's biological sex

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The offences in question are serious as are the penalties and misapplication of the law has severe consequences for freedom of expression

It is right that the Attorney General should be involved to provide an independent and robust check on cases involving these laws some of which are likely to become high-profile test cases

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Zaimal Azad

Name of Organisation: Nottingham City Council

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand: The current legal framework for hate crime which consists of different pieces of legislation is complex and often inconsistent. It is difficult to communicate and explain to communities which has implications for reporting It also presents challenges for

practitioners and police officers who do not always understand the full extent of legal provisions available. Having a Hate Crime Act that brings legislation together in a simpler, more consistent format will enable officers and practitioners to understand the law better, which in turn should improve service and outcomes for victims. It is also likely to have implications for communications about hate crime and may enable communities to feel more heard in relation to their experiences of hate crime

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Specifying characteristics for the purpose of hate crime laws has practical and symbolic functions. Practically, it enables clearer identification of the problem, facilitates communication about the issue, and provides guidance to practitioners. Symbolically, it speaks more directly to experiences of victims and means that communities which are victimised or targeted feel heard in a way that would not be possible under a generic approach.

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: In our experience of working with communities and of responding to hate crime, we have found that the category of race as currently defined is broad enough to cover migration and asylum status as well as language. It is understood widely to cover both and an amendment to the definition would not necessarily add value.

Question 5: Yes

Expand: The current definition of religion is widely understood and in our experience, has not caused any issues in terms of interpretation or practical implications.

Question 6: Yes

Expand: There is enough provision for sectarianism to be covered under religious based hate crime and inclusion would not add any additional value.

Question 7: We are in favour of the definition of sexual orientation being as inclusive as possible and the addition of 'asexuality' within the definition will enable that.

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1: We are supportive of as inclusive a definition as possible, which is led by and reflects the experiences and identities of the trans community in all its diversity. Hate crime is hugely underreported in the trans community and a broader, more inclusive definition may help increase awareness of the protection available

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand: This must be informed by the communities in questions and relevant charities

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: The current definition of disability provides enough flexibility to cover a range of disabilities and conditions and is practical for the purpose. Some of the issues with the definition are around understanding and need to be dealt with through engagement and awareness raising. A change in definition would not necessarily overcome the challenges around prosecutions and reporting

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: We support the inclusion of women (gender or sex) as a protected characteristic under hate crime law, identifying and recognising misogyny as the prejudice that motivates harmful behaviours towards women.

It is widely understood and recognised that women experience harmful behaviours that are specifically targeted at them because they are women. Additionally, women who experience other forms of hate crime (for example Islamophobia or racism), experience these differently to men and in a way that is obviously gendered. Inclusion of women (or gender or sex) within hate crime legislation allows for both kinds of experiences to be recognised and responded to. Gendered Islamophobia is a key example of this with women who are visibly Muslim (e.g. wearing a Hijab) much more likely to be targeted by abuse and in ways that are explicitly misogynistic as well as Islamophobic. In our experience of developing and consulting on our Nottingham City Hate Crime Strategy, this has overwhelmingly been brought up with a lot of support for Nottinghamshire Police's police of recognising misogyny as a hate crime.

Practically, inclusion of this category provides a frame to understand behaviours towards women which have previously been normalised and invisible. In Nottingham's experience, this policy has enabled women to report behaviours which constitute crimes which they would not have previously reported by bringing them into the public consciousness. By including women in this framework and enabling the everyday, public harassment of women to be reported and made visible in a way not done previously, a symbolic function is also carried out - of making these previously normalised behaviours explicitly unacceptable.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: We are of the view that sex or gender-based hate crime protection should be limited to women only at this time. While we recognise that men do also experience some of these behaviours (including sexual harassment on the street), this is not at a comparable scale as that experienced by women and does not impact men as a group in the same way. The harm caused is specifically to women, even those who are not targeted (as is the case for all hate crime) and it is essential to recognise that. If the category was neutral, it would erase the nature and scale of the problem and nullify the purpose of the policy and law change. Incidents against men because of their gender or sex should still be recorded by police forces as 'Hate Crime - Other'.

Question 13: Yes

Expand: We are supportive of 'women' as the protected characteristic but with the recognition and explicit use of the term 'misogyny' alongside it. This is similar to the recognition of race as the category but racism and racial hatred as the social issue specifically cited in law. Articulating 'misogyny' within the framework enables a recognition of the problem - that of attitudes towards women. It is only by naming the problem that action can be taken to respond to it and parallels can be found in all other forms of prejudice and discrimination. It is through framings of racism, homophobia, ableism, transphobia, Islamophobia, Anti-Semitism and other forms of prejudice, that these issues have taken root in the public consciousness and understanding has developed.

Question 14: Yes

Expand: We are supportive of the protected category of "women" with explicit reference to misogyny. However if a general approach is adopted, we will support 'sex or gender'.

Question 15: Yes. Older people experience a range of behaviour targeted at them seemingly because of their age specially harassment and what would constitute as anti social behaviour. Some of this behaviour is explicitly targeted at their age while other may be linked to vulnerabilities posed by age. From a practical perspective, age as a protected characteristic would enable more support to be put in place and a way for people to receive protection from these behaviours

Question 16: We are of the view that age-based protection should be limited to 'older people' since they are most likely to be targeted for their age. While it can be argued that young people are also victims of crime in different ways and are targeted, this is not necessarily due to prejudice. It can also be argued that certain prejudice experienced by young people (e.g. prejudice and perceptions about young people as 'trouble makers') is often linked to other types of prejudice namely race and class, rather than age specifically. Additionally, protection for young people exists in other parts of the law and children are treated differently by the law, due to which inclusion here would create more complexity

Question 17: There is no doubt about the need for greater protection for sex workers and we also acknowledge and recognise the stigma that sex workers face because of their work. However, at this point we do not support the recognition of "sex workers" as a hate crime category as this is not an identity characteristic of the group in the same way as for other characteristics protected by hate crime law. We do not feel this currently meets the criteria set out by the Law Commission for the inclusion of additional characteristics. However, we would welcome additional research into this and will be happy to feed into it and involve groups supporting sex workers in Nottingham to engage with it.

Question 18: While Nottinghamshire Police does recognise 'alternative subcultures' as a category of hate crime, we have not seen enough use of this to indicate that this meets the criteria set out by the Law Commission. Our extensive consultation on the local Hate Crime Strategy also did not raise any issues relating to this

Question 19: We welcome additional support for people experiencing homelessness but are of the view that this should not come from hate crime legislation. We recognise that people experiencing homelessness and specially rough sleepers experience prejudice. However, it can be argued that experiencing homelessness is about circumstances rather than identity and the protection needs to come from elsewhere in law. We do not feel this currently meets the criteria set out by the Law Commission for the inclusion of additional characteristics. We are concerned about increase in incidents targeting people experiencing homelessness and would encourage further support on this

Question 20: We are not supportive of inclusion of "philosophical beliefs" as a new hate crime category. There is provision elsewhere in law for freedom of opinion and speech, and also to a degree under the 'religion' category of hate crime. We are concerned about the risk this would create of protection being provided to groups with potentially very harmful views and from a practical perspective, this may be too broad to implement and communicate.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand: It is essential that parity is achieved on the protection provided by hate crime legislation and that the law applies equally to all characteristics protected by it. The current hierarchical approach damages confidence in the criminal justice system of the groups not covered and discourages reporting. It also creates an illusion of a hierarchy of oppression or prejudice which is harmful for the cause of equality

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Yes

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: We would be supportive of the introduction of a Hate Crime Commissioner depending on the independence, transparency and authority given to the Commissioner and their office. We would also query where this role would sit alongside the existing Commissioner for Counter-Extremism since hate crime is a policy area which overlaps with the CE agenda. Any such role would need to be linked into front line services and communities across the country to be effective in listening to and raising concerns of those most affected

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: Because current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful' It is not for the government to police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 5: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 6: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful' It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 7: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 8 Part 3: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 9: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 10: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 11: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 24: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 41: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or 'inflammatory' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 42: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful' It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 43 Part 1: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 43 Part 2: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 44: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful' It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 46: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 47: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful' It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 47 Part 2: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 51: No

Expand: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful' It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished

and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 53: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 55 Part 2: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful' It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 59: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible

Question 60: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 61: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful' It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a

bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Question 62: Current hate speech laws make it a crime when someone is offended grossly or otherwise, alarmed, or distressed, or perceive speech to be 'hateful'. It is not for the government to define 'hate' or police speech. All hate speech laws must be abolished and a bill of rights guaranteeing the freedom of speech, free assembly and press freedom must be implemented as soon as possible.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: People sometimes react forcefully against comments that are made without malice due to disparity of opinion. The implication is that someone could be prosecuted for not holding a generally accepted opinion.

Question 46: No

Expand: At the moment difference of opinion is sometimes portrayed as hatred. If intent to generate hatred is presumed in an accusation the law could be wrongfully used to prevent appropriate discourse.

Question 47: No

Expand: Exclusively threatening conduct intending to provoke hate should be covered.

A distinction needs to be maintained in the law between inherited characteristics such as race, and behavioural traits and beliefs; otherwise a limitation will be imposed on the ability to share and discuss personal views.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Transgender identity and disability should not be lumped together as they are entirely different matters

Transgender ideology is not a unanimously accepted viewpoint and therefore debate should not be blocked by giving proponents the legal tool of accusing those of differing opinion of having committed hate crimes

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This suggestion seriously undermines civil liberty. People have a right to voice their opinion unimpeded in their own space. This would raise serious issues concerning misrepresentation as there would potentially be little proof of intent compared with things in the public domain. Do we want a society where discussion, even in private settings, is oppressed through fear of legal repercussions?

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Free speech must be protected to allow debate where stirring up hatred offences relate to polarised issues including sexual orientation, transgender ideology and religion.

Protection for views about traditional marriage must be maintained.

Offences covering transgender identity must specifically protect using birth names and pronouns, affirming that there are only two sexes and stating that someone born male is not female and vice versa.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The Attorney General's consent is needful to thwart disproportionate accusations. Given the potentially long sentences there is need for a check to protect defendants.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Alix Goldring

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I submit this response with the kind request that my response be noted as anonymous and that my name not be published. I request this for the purposes of privacy and also safety due to the extremely aggressive nature of some people who would disagree with my responses. Thank you.

Question 1: No

Expand: Existing Laws provide adequate protection. Whilst I recognise the aim of bringing together piece-meal laws (as noted by Penney Lewis at the Hate Crime webinar on 12th December) under one 'umbrella' law, we already have the Public Order Act 1986 which explains:

Intentional harassment, alarm or distress.

(1) A person is guilty of an offence if, with intent to cause a person harassment, alarm or distress, he—

(a) uses threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour, or disorderly behaviour, or

(b) displays any writing, sign or other visible representation which is threatening, abusive or insulting, thereby causing that or another person harassment, alarm or distress.

In addition, for England, Wales, and Scotland, the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 makes hateful behaviour towards a victim based on the victim's membership (or presumed membership) in a racial group an "aggravating factor" for the purpose of sentencing in respect of specified crimes.

It is also clear in the Criminal Justice Act 2003 that 'hostile motivation' towards disability, sexual orientation or transgender can be treated as an aggravated offence.

Additional laws are not required beyond the above that already exists.

There is, in my view, justified concern, that Hate Crime laws will encroach on free speech. The proposals criminalises sarcasm, disagreement, rudeness and even a difference in opinion. The emphasis on 'additional harm' removes focus from actual harm (violence, damage to property, etc). Definitions of what constitutes 'hate speech' are unclear and as it relies on 'perception' or 'perceived (insert protected characteristic)' result in definitions that are subjective and is open to misuse or even 'abuse'. I refer to the example of Catholic Journalist, Caroline Farrow whose case against her was dropped as she called the child of Mermaids CEO, Susie Green a 'he', another example is that of transexual Miranda Yardley whose case was dropped on the first day as the judge stated "there is no case and never was a case".

It's possible that 'Hate Crime Entrepreneurs', campaigning organisations and activists would be motivated to present those they seek to help or fight for as victims in order to 'victimhood' so to 'prioritise' their status in society, above others, who would fear being accused of a hate crime.

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Protected Characteristics include sex but excludes gender. The protected characteristic of 'Gender Reassignment' is included and 'transgender identity' is excluded.

Protected Characteristics need to be correctly referred to in all laws and this has recently been demonstrated in Scotland, (where hate crime is also proposed) when the Forensic Medical Services Bill had Johann Lamont's "Sex not Gender" amendment passed 113 to 9.

If laws are to be amended we need them to provide clarity not ambiguity and as language changes we need to use terms that can not be interpreted as this will only lead to confusion and difficulties in applying these laws.

As the proposals seek to expand upon existing protected characteristics I would like to know who decides which groups should be protected? As this consultation has engaged with groups prior to opening this up for public response I wondered if other categories should be considered, such as class, or groups within employment such as scientists who experiment on animals, or other minority groups such as redheads or albino people?

I am concerned that there is the possibility that other groups could be excluded and therefore would not benefit from equal protection. Any legislation around hate crime would need to be regularly amended so to include new groups as otherwise it could cause resentment and further social division.

Question 3: Yes

Expand: Broadly speaking yes, I agree.

Suitability is of significant interest to me, specifically the measurements 'prove workable in practice'. Where language is referred to as 'literal violence' it is difficult to understand how criminal justice resources can be efficiently applied if police forces are policing language where the perception is that they have caused harm which is physical. This could be further defined by whether words that state fact or reality are considered a hate crime. Truth is the strongest defence to an allegation of defamation, so if someone 'misgenders' someone else but they are in fact correct in their perception of someone's sex this should be a reasonable position to take. However earlier this year a young man with Aspergers syndrome (a condition which is on a spectrum but where you experience the world in a different way and where you will often consider the world in binary terms) was fined as he was asked of a transgender community policer officer "it is a boy or girl?". That simple question was considered transphobic even though the young man wasn't 'assigning a gender'.

For Demonstrable Need, I am without doubt that there is demonstrable need for certain groups to require protection but I am concerned that hate crime against women is being overlooked by both reporting and in prosecutions. Rape convictions are at an all-time low with in excess of 55,000 reports filed in 2019, only 2,102 led to charges and only 1,439 resulted in a conviction of rape or another crime.

The same would apply, for Additional Harm. As women and girls make up half of the population we may not be considered as a minority or 'targeted group', but as the victim statistics bear out, women and girls are overwhelmingly the targeted group for violent crime

in the form of rape and sexual assault and these crimes are not being considered as a form of hate crime on the basis of sex. I consider rape to be a hate crime, based on the protected characteristic of sex, and should carry an uplift in sentence if only more rapists would be caught and be prosecuted.

Question 4: No, it should not be included in this category.

Your race or ethnic origins and usually indicated or perceived by skin colour cannot change, your citizenship or asylum seeking status can. You can seek asylum and be in the process of applying for citizenship or soon to be receiving citizenship and this cannot be indicated by appearance or speak.

If someone who was seeking asylum was called a xenophobic slur as a result of their perceived citizenship status this could be a hate crime but it is more suited to a different category of 'xenophobic hate crime' than racial hate crime.

It deserves a category on it's own rather than being considered under a broader category where it does not naturally reside.

Question 5: Yes

Expand: Yes. Religion is where you have a faith and you express your faith by your own personal method, whether you attend church, pray or not. A lack of religious belief is not a religion.

All faiths have equal value, there should be no hierarchy and the same freedom of speech should apply if you do not have a faith.

Again this can have it's own category. A lack of religious faith cannot be called a religious faith by it's very definition.

Question 6: Yes

Expand: Minority faiths exist and participants should have the same protection as 'mainstream' religions and this is already covered by the protected characteristic.

The argument against this is if a 'sectarian faith' meets the criteria to call it a 'cult' and whilst followers are within their rights to their religious beliefs, if the doctrine caused harm or concern for harm, then it should be possible to criticise without this criticism being labelled 'hate speech'.

Question 7: As a lack of religious belief is not defined as a religion, asexuality should not be defined as a sexual orientation. Asexuality is a lack of a sexual orientation as it is a lack of interest in sex as it "refers to the experience of not being sexually attracted to others".

Sexual orientation is not outwardly evident, though assumptions can be made, there are very few scenarios in day-to-day life I can imagine where asexuality would be assumed. If an asexual person was under pressure to state their lack of interest in the same or opposite sex, and as a result did so and was called a slur it would not be perceived asexuality, but stated asexuality.

Being called 'frigid' could refer to being asexual as it means being unable to be sexually aroused (typically used of a woman). Example "my ex told everyone I was frigid"

(Being called 'frigid' is not a hate crime in my view, though it should a lack of respect for an individual's personal boundaries and interests and 'bullying' could be used to exert pressure

for someone to have sex which would be coercion and if consent is not freely given it is rape.)

11.67 In our 2014 report we stated that we “had not been provided with evidence to show that individuals suffer hate crime due to being asexual”, and declined to recommend a change to the definition to include this group.⁶⁰ However, since this time, awareness of asexuality, and the challenges asexual people face, has grown.

Since your 2014 report does not provide evidence to show that asexual individuals suffer hate crime due to being asexual and no evidence has been provided in your materials to support the claim "However, since this time, awareness of asexuality, and the challenges asexual people face, has grown" and as I have been unable to find even informal figures in my research I do not think there is a justification for asexuality to be included under 'sexual orientation'.

People have a wide range of sexual interest and sex drives that fluctuate. Asexuality does not always result in celibacy. Adults may be asexual at times of their lives or throughout their lives but truly the only group able to state asexuality as a state or being are children, as they are not sexual beings, until of course they reach puberty so even then asexuality is not permanent.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: No. None of the above terms are defined in law, these are social terms and an assumption of an individual could be justified and not hateful in intent but simply truthful.

A transgender person may be offended by conversations about human biology and biological sex, their own or someone else's, and whilst this may offend them it is not hateful to talk about what is real. Just last month a 19 year old man was beaten and hospitalised for his injuries for saying "You're not a woman – you need a fanny to be a woman."

Someone who considers themselves to be 'non-binary' may experience the same offence when referring to the biology as they see themselves as a neither male nor female, but referring to human biology is not hateful, it is truthful. This appears to be offensive when referring to women, far more so than men, and there is a distinct shift in language that is both derogatory and dehumanising and this could be considered as a hate crime against women as a sex class. So both the erasure of language relevant to women and referring to male or female as a sex binary could be hate crimes.

(It is not hateful to be grammatically correct in language and refer to a person who considers themselves to be neither male or female as 'they' when a person is singular.)

A person who 'cross-dresses' is, I understand, to be someone who wears clothes typically associated with the opposite sex, so a man wearing women's clothing and a woman wearing men's clothing. If you are called a slur whilst in public wearing clothing usually associated with the opposite sex, this could be whilst offensive is not necessarily hateful. Hate crime towards cross-dressers would be recorded under transgender identity already, as transgender people often manage their gender dysphoria by dressing as the opposite sex and this could be a perceived identity that is in receipt of a hate crime. I see no reason for it to be defined as a separate group within this category under legislation.

If an individual chooses to dress as the opposite sex for entertainment, for example, in a Drag Act in a private club, it could be cause offense to audience members but you can choose to

leave. If this is in public then it could be argued that those being made to witness this behaviour are being made to engage with something they perceive to be offensive.

Transgender, Cross-dressers, Drag and 'Non binary' are better suited to be allocated to 'sub culture' as this is defined in relation to a 'collective identity' and appearance. As noted in your definition of a subculture "Those involved usually stand out in the sense their distinctiveness is discernible both to fellow participants and to those outside the group" and whilst this was directed towards goth, punks and emos, it was noted that "this would apply to although this list is not exhaustive".

There is no definition I have seen throughout my research for this submission that doesn't refer to internal feelings of 'gender identity' that are based on make up, clothing and stereotypes (this can refer to Transgender, Cross-dressers, Drag and 'Non binary' as well as goth, punks and emos). Other forms of specific dress in relation to music could be line dancing, mods and rockers, reggae and bollywood.

The number of people who have a gender recognition certificate has been recorded as approximately 5,000 so a tiny minority (though the Office of National Statistics place it between 2,000-5000 I believe) and these individuals would have protection under the protected characteristic of Gender Reassignment under the Equality Act and crimes against them could be prosecuted under existing law.

As with asexuality, I don't know how anyone could be presumed to be intersex as this is a medical condition that is not outwardly clear when we interact in society and are fully clothed.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: As above I disagree, principally as these terms do not exist in law and you do not identify as having a medical condition, you just have it.

'Intersex' is not 'transgender' or 'non binary' and I find it very offensive to suggest these two groups based on an inner sense of self be conflated with a recognised medical conditions that are rare and require specialist medical diagnosis, with treatment in some cases and support.

Question 8 Part 3: If the purpose of wearing clothing typically associated with the opposite sex is due to a sexual fetish then it can be argued that it is offensive and harmful to those who are exposed to this and causes 'additional harm to wider society'. If an individual chooses to dress as the opposite sex for entertainment, for example, in a Drag Act in a private club, it could cause offense to audience members but you can choose to leave. If this is in public then it could be argued that those being made to witness this behaviour are being made to engage with something they perceive to be offensive. I have seen human 'Pups' at pride festivals where children are encouraged to attend and participate and it's arguable that criticising this sexual fetish in public place is the same as 'kink' shaming' cross-dressers. We must be allowed to question whether this aligns with safeguarding and the protection of children as this 'social phenomenon' is becoming more 'mainstream'.

I do not support revision of these definitions as non-binary is one 'gender identity' there are multiple 'identities' as named by Stonewall and other lobby groups that create flags and names for these 'identities' and if one is recognised then they all should be, there should be no hierarchy for hate crime if everyone to have equal value. It's also possible for 'gender identity' to be fluid and changeable and for new identities to be created so it seems impractical to create sub-categories to recognise each and every 'gender identity'. How

regularly would Hate Crime legislation need to be updated in order to recognise groups that require their own sub-category?

As the number of people who have a Disorder of Sexual Development condition are extremely low (as this range of medical conditions is rare), and that these conditions refer to internal reproductive organs and genitals, both of which are not apparent unless in a medical setting (where you should have privacy) and that there are no numbers provided for either the population in the UK of those with DSD conditions or for the number of hate crimes already recorded in recent history when hate crime began to be recorded by police forces as the CSEW, I see no reason why this would need to be added as a subcategory for hate crime, particularly in a category that refers to how someone defines themselves by their internal feelings and clothing (or sexual fetish) preferences when 'intersex' refers to a medical condition. I find the proposal to include 'Intersex' in with 'transgender' offensive in itself.

Question 9: I agree that the definition of a disability should remain as "any physical or mental impairment".

Where a disabled person, or their relative or carer, reports anti-social behaviour and/or harassment the police should act and the sentencing should be 'uplifted' if it is proven that it was an aggravated crime, motivated by a hatred towards disabled people, or that disabled person. Fiona Ann Pilkington, 38, and her 18-year-old disabled daughter Francesca suffered sustained harassment the police failures lead to an inquiry and an apology, there has been an increase in disability hate crime, and with an estimated 14m people in the UK living with a disability where prejudices remain, and as your data shows (Leicester Hate Crime Project) this should be an area for both laws and the police to work on to assist and protect a vulnerable group.

Question 10: I agree that the definition of a disability should remain as "any physical or mental impairment" however it is important to note that this should not be amended in hate crime laws to define a disabled person as "anyone who identifies as a person with a disability".

Trans ableism is a sub-category of self identification and could be termed as an identity disorder.

"Transableism is a term which refers to moving between states of being able and disabled by choice rather than by happenstance. Insofar as this may imply a choice to become dependent, claims upon the healthcare system are likely to result."

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-journal-of-law-in-context/article/abs/transableism-disability-and-paternalism-in-public-health-ethics-taxonomies-identity-disorders-and-persistent-unexplained-physical-symptoms/D91157D6596ED164117D0F1857AB056A>

Where we have detailed systems to assess disability for disability benefit, whereby someone has to prove they are disabled before receiving benefit, it should not be possible to claim to be a victim of a hate crime against someone who is 'perceived to be' disabled, if they are not in fact disabled.

Question 11: No

Expand: No, Sex should be used not Gender. Gender is not used in law, Sex is. New law should be aligned and consistent with existing laws. Gender used to mean biological sex and it no longer is understood to be defined as such in society in general since Gender

Recognition Act reform was proposed and a consultation was conducted by the Law Commission.

Sex has always meant biological sex and remains as that definition and this is the word used in law. We need clear language in law.

12.221 If we were to decide between gender or sex, our provisional view is that the more inclusive term of gender, as opposed to sex, would better capture a wider range of victim experience. This is consistent with the Bracadale review in Scotland, which recommended a statutory aggravation in Scotland on the basis of “gender” rather than “sex”.

This wording would suggest that the Law Commission has already decided that the position of 'inclusivity' is the aim, regardless of who this may exclude which is a worrying position from which to pose questions for a public consultation which is meant to be unbiased. I understand that the Law Commission hold the 'provisional view' that 'gender' is the more inclusive term but we do not need to include people in groups where they simply do not fit for the purposes of law. Transgender individuals will experience hate crime that is entirely different from someone who is not transgender.

The very definition of sex is exclusive by nature as it divides into two binary options by its very category. There is no third sex. The position that 'inclusivity' is the aim and is achieved by removing boundaries that were put in place for protection is deeply concerning. I do not see any evidence that including biological males in a category for rights and protections for biological females will be effective in tackling discrimination and reducing hate crime.

Question 11 Part 2: Female Genital Mutilation refers to females. Circumcision on males could also be included but this could conflict with religious practices which could be considered as a protected characteristic. Both are abhorrent in my view and should have no place in modern society, though it was only last year we saw the first prosecution for FGM in the UK.

However both genital mutilations refer to sex, along with domestic violence, forced marriage and sexual offences, they happen to people because of their sex and so should be considered under Sex, and not 'Gender' (identity).

Question 12: Sex refers to biological sex and both men and boys (males) and women and girls (females) should be protected under this category. It should not be limited to adults.

Women and girls suffer from misogyny in a patriarchal society and the hate crime relating from everything from wolf-whistling and general harassment to sexual assault, sexual abuse exists in daily life and it often begins at a young age.

Men and boys can suffer from misandry though it is far less prevalent in daily life. Men do commit violent crime against each other and this could be motivated by misandry in some cases I imagine. I cannot speak on this as I am female and have not experienced misandry but it's possible that crimes are committed against men for being men, as well as for their skin colour, religion, sexual orientation and disability.

Question 13: No

Expand: Misogyny means 'dislike of, contempt for, or ingrained prejudice against women' so as a hate crime it should be termed correctly and if men are to remain under the category of sex, then a hate crime directed at a man for his sex it should be termed as 'misandry'.

Question 14: No

Expand: No. It is essential that laws be clear, understood by all and leave no room for interpretation.

Sex should be the term used as it refers to biological sex which covers both male/men and female/women, Gender is not the appropriate term to use as previously mentioned but I highlight again that this word no longer means men/male and women/female.

There should be no room for interpretation in law, particularly new laws that are being written in order to encompass or support existing law and to keep up-to-date with modern-day society.

Question 15: Yes, however I imagine it likely to then be possible to 'uplift' a sentencing based on more than one motivating factor, for example age and disability; where an older person was attacked and they are both in advancing age and disabled.

Question 16: Age should include people of all ages.

Question 17: 'Sex work' or 'sex workers' is a broad description of a number of sexual services being offered within the sex trade. From online 'camming' or Only Fans, to lap dancing clubs, to, 'escorts' and prostitutes on the streets. The Sex Trade is a degrading and dangerous place for women and men and criticism of 'sex work' should be normalised and not be a place for accusations of 'kink shaming'.

Prostitutes are an extremely vulnerable 'subgroup' within this group, with high levels of drug use, STIs, STDs, violence, sexual abuse, rape and death. Other forms of 'sex work' such as 'camming' and pornography are just as risky when it comes to exploitation - from stalking to choking (also known as 'breath-play'), it is reasonable to question or criticise this 'profession' and whether it is a choice, and it is not hateful to do so.

I agree with the Nordic Model, where the person seeking sexual services (overwhelmingly these are men) is criminalised and the person offering sexual services (overwhelmingly these are women) be decriminalised. My experience of this has been where I have seen online attacks of women (and men) criticising the practice of paying for sexual services, being ridiculed for being old-fashioned and out of touch with a new liberal sexual movement to the point where commenters were accused of hateful conduct for expressing concern over human trafficking.

If a woman who sells sex is raped and the rapist was motivated to rape due to the fact that the victim was a prostitute then that could be considered a hate crime and receive an uplifted sentence but to criticise the sex industry in online forums/public platforms or in public should not be considered a hate crime.

Question 18: No. This appears to be an 'umbrella' term as a 'catch-all' approach to recognise hate crimes against popular trends which are based on liking a type of music, or a particular way of presenting yourself.

All forms of preferences in music and clothes should be accepted generally in society and no one should be persecuted for their tastes, but we all have different interests and to be critical or questioning of why someone might have lots of tattoos or wear black is not a hate crime. We all should be able to express why we like or dislike something and whilst of course this

should never result in violence or incitement of violence, it is an extreme position to take when considering free speech and how we are all individuals.

Despite this being an area where there are now 11 police forces recording hate crimes based on alternative subcultures, other than the tragic example of Sophie Lancaster, I could find no significant records of this being an issue and particularly not an area where hate crime is increasing. From Freedom of Information Requests, Northamptonshire Police Force who have been recording hate crime since 2014 there has been only one instance of a hate crime against an alternative subculture in 2017. Merseyside Police from 2013 to 2018 recorded 2 and also only 2 for Greater Manchester Police from 23rd June 2015 and 9th October 2016.

Question 19:

Question 20: 14.169 Importantly, Grainger held that the requirement that a protected belief be “worthy of respect in a democratic society and not incompatible with human dignity or in conflict with the fundamental rights of others”,¹⁹⁷ necessarily excludes “objectionable” political philosophies.¹⁹⁸ The ET stated this criterion would exclude protection of “racist or homophobic political philosophy” and more recently, “absolutist” views of sex.

Sex is absolute, it does not change, even when someone has a DSD condition, they do not become a 'third sex', they are either female with a DSD condition or male with a DSD condition.

I do not hold a 'philosophical belief' that in human biology there are two sexes and we reproduce through heterosexual sex, this is simply fact and I recognise this as a reality.

Philosophical beliefs should be protected again with no hierarchy, and recognising reality should also be a protected viewpoint but it is not as a 'philosophical belief'.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: The White Paper on Online Harms will cover 'written material' that is produced and shared online.

Offensive words should be permitted and threats of violence should be managed by the social media companies who are responsible for the platform they provide.

The only written material this should apply to is personal letters or 'hate mail' sent to someone's address (work or home) which is intimidating to the recipient.

Posts, comments or conversations that happen more frequently in written form since the invention of the internet, that can be perceived as offensive still need to happen, so we can aim to find common ground. Otherwise 'cancel culture' will expand further and it will infringe on free speech and our ability to engage as social beings.

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand: I agree that it should cover sex but not gender, for reasons I have already explained.

If the law was to include a reference to 'gender' it should reflect existing Equality law with "gender reassignment" and not "gender identity".

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand: This is already covered by the Football Offences Act of 1991. "Engaging or taking part in indecent or racist chanting at a designated football match is a criminal offence under this Act. Chanting is defined as "the repeated uttering of any words or sounds whether alone or in concert with one or more others". For this offence to be proved, the chanting must have been either due to the race of one of the players or regarded as indecent."

This already exists in law and does not need further amending or including in a new hate crime bill.

Question 57: No

Expand: No. Homophobic chanting is managed within club rules. The Football League's Ground Regulations state that "abuse of a racist, homophobic or discriminatory nature will result in arrest and/or ejection from the ground" and fines can be the consequence of chanting relating to a sexual orientation .

Example, Jason Holmes, was fined under the Football Offences and Disorder Act in 2017 for shouting 'queer' at rival supporters. This was considered a homophobic hate crime and received a higher than usual fine, so my understanding is that this is already managed by existing laws.

I realise that The Offensive Behaviour at Football and Threatening Communications (Scotland) Act 2012 was repealed on 20 April 2018 due to concerns over "unfairly targeting football fans and was called "the most illiberal and counterproductive act passed by our young Parliament to date" Professor Sir Tom Devine.

Question 57 Part 2: Reported incidents at football fixtures by incident type, 2017/18 season to 2019/20 season show it has more than doubled (37 in 18/19 to 78 in 19/20) but race remains the highest likelihood of hate crime at football matches which has also more than doubled (from 94 incidents in 17/18 to 214 in 19/20).

Recent government figures (September 2020) show that racist chanting has more than doubled from 14 in 2018/2019 to 35 in 2019/2020, but it is down from an all-time high at 44 in 2010/2011 and derogatory chanting which is of a sexual orientation in nature has also more than doubled from 37 incidents in 2018/2019 to 78 incidents in 2019/2020.

However chanting relating to 'gender identity' is down from 2 incidents to one incident respectively.

There appears to be an overall increase in hate crime at football matches despite attempts to reduce racism and homophobia by campaign groups such as Kick it Out and Stonewall so it's concerning that none of their campaigns appear to be working and perhaps other solutions need to be sought out.

Question 58: Most clubs ban coin or bottle throwing and these would count as 'missiles', this would be an action with intent to harm, so if that can be proven then it is an act of violence and not hate crime, though there could be an uplift in sentencing if again, it could be proven that the intention to harm was motivated by a hostility or prejudice towards a group or an individual on the basis of a protected characteristic.

Question 59: This is already covered in the 1999 Football Offence and Disorder Act and is managed by the British Transport Police. Additional laws are not required, the application of the law should be effective and result in this anti-social behaviour decreasing.

Question 60: My concern is that racism remains rife in Football and previous and existing campaigns by are not proving to be effective in removing or reducing racism (or homophobia) within the football grounds or in football culture.

It would be better to tackle prevalent hate crime with a view to eradicating that before extending it further to include other characteristics.

Misogyny and disability would be obvious areas to include but I do not think that adding to the issue of hate crime will help to reduce or solve it in the current climate. Football presents a problem like no other and work must be done to get to the root of the issues before expanding upon what can be a hate crime.

Question 61: evidence of prosecutions bans

Question 62: I think there is a danger that another layer of bureaucracy will be added and it will result in a box ticking exercise.

A Victims Commissioner was appointed in 2004 and a new Domestic Abuse Commission was appointed last year, I'm not sure that this doesn't suggest that there is a lack of results since the appointment in 2004, or that Domestic Abuse is at such high levels that a Domestic Abuse Commissioner was required for this area alone.

If a Hate Crime Commissioner is appointed I'm concerned that it would be a supply and demand issue, and for the role to be justified that hate crime will be sought as a reason uplift a sentence or perhaps it will become a stand-alone crime. The Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Police resigned last week for failures of his police force to record up to 200 crimes A DAY, including sexual assault and domestic abuse! In addition to this being reported, six police officers in Hampshire have been found guilty of gross misconduct for racist, sexist and homophobic language. It seems that there are institutional failures surrounding a number of issues within the police (not to mention failures with the Rotherham Grooming Gangs and a fear of accusations of racism concerning perpetrators and misogyny regarding victims) and I am genuinely concerned that hate crime will be an 'easy win' for police forces to hit targets, particularly around 'gender identity' and 'misgendering' and 'deadnaming' being labelled as 'literal violence'. The Scottish Parliament are struggling with defining their same terms regarding gender identity or 'transgender', non-binary and cross dressers and the only definition provided has been "an individual's gender identity where this is different from their sex at birth" which is based on self-identification, a new concept that has already been rejected by UK government.

A conviction under the Communications Act 2003 was recently overturned as the Judge ruled that anti-harassment legislation must be "applied compatibly with the right to freedom of expression". I agree with the Free to Disagree campaign that "there is a risk that these provisions would not protect forthright speech and debate by ordinary people on contentious issues. In order for free speech to be protected, clauses on free speech must make clear that citizens are able to discuss, criticise, and refute ideas, beliefs and practices in robust terms."

Essentially I see Hate Crime as a difficult area to determine, that will restrict free speech and provide little to no progress in addressing the issues of division that are widening. We have laws that protect, we just need the police to enforce them and we have existing Commissioners to assist victims. I do not agree that a Hate Crime Commissioner should be appointed.

Lastly I would like to quote someone who I think makes a good point:

"Stabbing someone because of the colour of their skin, or sexuality...The crime is the stabbing, and that should be what you are punished for."

All violent crime is based upon hatred, it is not based upon friendship, like or love.

Name: Mr J Wilbraham

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: The statement framing this question uses the phrase “This could include:”, with ‘could’ being the operative word meaning that it is far from clear what exactly is being proposed by the Law Commission. If the consultee answers yes, are they then agreeing to all, or some of the proposals or will it include something completely different?

Further, whether a ‘Hate Crime Commissioner’ should be created needs to be treated as a separate question particularly given that to quote the report; “The establishment of such a role is not directly contemplated within the terms of reference of this review”.

Consolidation and simplification of the Law is always welcome. However, for any new Law to be effective it must at the very least; do no harm, do right, be clear and unambiguous. Sadly, I am far from persuaded that the Law Commission’s proposals satisfies these tests

Further, those who seek change should first, do no harm. A simple but worthwhile principle, that the Law Commission might do well to follow.

The Law Commission correctly states that freedom of expression, is a qualified right. It states two examples to support its view. However, a more relevant example is ‘shouting fire in a crowded place’. This is not simply an academic point for discussion by the fashionable Professor class. There are real world consequences of living in a climate of fear and denial, the alarm is not raised, and lives are ruined. This is an uncomfortable truth of the Rotherham grooming gang scandal as reported by Andrew Norfolk of the Times.

It is a sad reflection of our times that the recent statements made by Lord Justice Bean and Mr Justice Warby that: “Freedom only to speak inoffensively is not worth having” is seen as a significant legal judgement. For the avoidance of doubt, Lord Justice Bean and Mr Justice Warby are right. The mere fact that this case had to go to the Court of Appeal is a sad reflection on the Law and the Law Commission’s work on drafting the Law over the past 55 years.

The Law Commission needs to carefully reflect on this before revising its current proposals and showing why it will prevent harm and injustice in the future. Until this report is revised, showing clear objectivity, I cannot, sadly support the Law Commission or its proposals.

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Only characteristics that are immutable should enjoy protected status under the Law. The rationale being that they are not the result of an individual’s choice or action. Race and disability are clearly characteristics that are immutable

It appears the Law Commission has consulted widely particularly with campaigning groups and this is right. However, these campaigning groups may not necessarily be representative of all the views of those impacted by the proposed changes or indeed the wider public.

It is disappointing that the Law Commission has not used this opportunity to consult on whether each specific characteristic group should continue to enjoy protected status. Why has the Law Commission not allowed consultees the choice to agree or not agree on each of the current protected characteristics?

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: As the Law Commission’s states, “a more nuanced approach than immutability might be to focus on characteristics that are considered fundamental to personal identity”. The Law Commission attempts to justify this subjective ‘nuanced approach’, by adding layers of

complexity to narrow the scope and mask the very subjective nature of its proposal. It fails and always will, because at its heart it is nothing more than 'self identification', with all its problems

The report states that a "significant criticism is that the current laws are unnecessarily complicated making them difficult to understand and apply". Further the Law Commission acknowledges that the current Law can create injustice. This is particularly disappointing given that many of the Laws were created during the Law Commissions existence and one of its terms of reference was to simplify the Law. What evidence is offered that this new approach will be any better?

It appears that the Law Commission has consulted widely, particularly concerning special interest groups, this is only right. However, we have no means of verifying if the report and its proposals are objective and not just a reflection of campaigning advocates views. We can, however, observe that the Law Commission invariably sights examples of extremism on the 'far-right', or anti islamophobia to justify its proposals but none from the 'far-left'. If the 'far-left' is not an issue what evidence is there to support this view? Perhaps the Law Commission's report is not as objective as it thinks.

Question 4: Migration and asylum status are matters pertaining to politics

Question 5: No

Expand: Religion is not an immutable characteristic and consequently it should not enjoy protected or privilege status under the Law

The current status quo has been abused by those seeking to deflect criticism of their religion and this has created harm and injustice to the wider community. Religious groups need to take responsibility for their views particularly when they impact the wider community

In Europe and, more recently in France there is real pressure for reform to the Law to protect society from extreme religious views. Why hasn't the Law Commission considered similar reforms as part of its consultation?

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Given the history of the Communications Act 2003 s127 and how it has been manipulated over the last 17 years culminating in a Court of Appeal Judge stating the obvious that: "Freedom only to speak inoffensively is not worth having", I think it is only reasonable that the Law Commission shows beyond any reasonable doubt that any changes it proposes will 'do no harm' It has not shown this, consequently I cannot support this proposal.

I am sure there will be many reasons why this sad state of affairs is not the fault of the Law Commission, but this only happened 17 years ago and consequently those whose job it is to draft the Law need to do so with greater care or not at all.

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: "likely to", by its very nature is highly subjective. The Law Commission needs to show beyond any reasonable doubt that any changes it proposes will 'do no harm'

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The Law Commission needs to show beyond any reasonable doubt that any changes it proposes will 'do no harm' It has not shown this and consequently I cannot support this.

Question 46: No

Expand: The Law Commission needs to show beyond any reasonable doubt that any changes it proposes will 'do no harm'. It has not shown this and consequently I cannot support this

Question 47: No

Expand: The Law Commission needs to show beyond any reasonable doubt that any changes it proposes will 'do no harm' It has not shown this and consequently I cannot support this.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50: The Law Commission needs to show beyond any reasonable doubt that any changes it proposes will 'do no harm'. It has not shown this and consequently I cannot support this

Question 51: No

Expand: It is deeply depressing that the Law Commission considers this a question worthy of any consultees time Has the Law Commission thought any of this through with any due care and attention, particularly given that this proposal extends the remit of the Law into the privacy of people's homes? This is Orwellian, to say the least Has any analysis been undertaken to show beyond any reasonable doubt that no harm will result? Clearly not Perhaps a more useful and relevant question might be to ask if the Law Commission, as it is currently constituted, is 'fit for-purpose', I would have to say not

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Given the past poor performance of the Director of Public Prosecutions, I would have to say clearly, No. Further, the Law Commission has not shown that this proposal will do 'no harm' beyond any reasonable doubt, consequently I cannot support this proposal

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: See answer to question 1

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: On such important issues as hatred it should be quite unacceptable to judge this on intention alone. Who is to say what someone else intended.

This would undermine free speech so essential in debates of any kind

Today many things need to be seriously debated and people might passionately hold views that others misunderstand and charge them with hatred where there was not.

People today react against mild statement just because they do not agree with their own views Therefore this would seriously undermine the freedom we have to disagree

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred on controversial issues such as religion or sexual orientation would be very hard to define as hatred It should therefore be only judged on their threatening behaviour not the words that they speak. People in the heat of the moment often say words they do not mean and people often feel very strongly on points of belief.

We are not perfect people and really disagreements might be misunderstood or taken as hatred for political reasons. It would again cut down debate so essential in a democratic country.

Question 47: No

Expand: No law should come into force for what might be considered "likely to" it is far too serious to be so vague and subjective. The current law is right when it makes distinctions.

There is a serious risk of mistakes being made for all sorts of different reasons, perhaps political. What is abusive is too subjective and may mean different things to different people depending on their views. We find today people are called out and labelled all manner of things that were in no way intended

Question 47 Part 2: I think that the law is going off track when it starts using words like "likely to" making things very difficult to define as being altogether too subjective.

Freedom of speech needs to be considered alongside all these measures as do the rights of people who disagree, such as women seeking to protect single sex spaces if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences

Question 48: No

Expand: This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology in the learning situation

Also women who disagree with and want to protect single sex spaces might come under judgement if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offence.

There are people who wish to speak out against the transgender movement. People who regret their decisions and wish to warn others. Such people could be prosecuted.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private discussions in the home should be kept private We live in a free society and the home is not the place for the State to access private conversations.

Public order is one thing the home is another. It would seriously undermine family life and the freedom we have of expression in it It would affect the community spirit leading to people worrying about what they have said and how it might be construed as all people are different. Very hard to police if not impossible

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Section 29 J of the Public Order Act must be kept for the protection of religious groups

Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept to protect views about marriage and in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: It is important that the Attorney General's consent be kept as a safe guard against those who wish to aggressively prosecute others, not always for the right reasons or for political reasons or ideologies.

That a seven year penalty can be issued for words, which might have been hastily said with no intention is a very harsh law indeed and needs strong safeguards against it.

Free speech is of paramount importance and needs appropriately the consent of the Attorney General who is answerable to the Government making them more accountable than otherwise.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I wish my information to be treated as confidential. This is because as a woman I am already afraid that I cannot talk openly and freely about women's rights in relation to hate crime, without taking into account the consequences of this. I have seen women being subject to online, verbal and physical attacks from men for just trying to express an opinion. It is actually very scary.

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No There is no accurate definition of asexuality In fact it is totally made up and anyone can call themselves asexual. How can this ever be a protected characteristic?

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: "People who are presumed" again nonsense Sex and gender are two different things. Sex is binary Male/Female. Gender can be a spectrum of more or less Masculine/Feminine because it is a social construct. You can have therefore a non binary gender but not a non binary sex In fact we are all non binary(gender) we have some traits regarded as masculine and some traits regarded as feminine no matter what biological sex we are

Intersex is a medical condition It is rare and the individual will be and appear as, either a man or a women, with some genetic variation. These people do not want to lumped in a category with trans people

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Absolutely not: I will repeat my previous answers. You cannot protect something you can't define and you can't lump all these things together

Sex and gender are two different things Sex is binary Male/Female Gender can be a spectrum of more or less Masculine/Feminine because it is a social construct. You can have therefore a non binary gender but not a non binary sex In fact we are all non binary(gender) we have some traits regarded as masculine and some traits regarded as feminine no matter what biological sex we are.

Intersex is a medical condition It is rare and the individual will be and appear as, either a man or a women, with some genetic variation. These people do not want to lumped in a category with trans people.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex is the appropriate term as it can be defined and needs to be separate. So called gender crimes would be covered under the Transgender category. Please do not keep conflating sex and gender Women and men need biological sex to be a protected character with no confusion. This fits with the Equality Act.

Question 11 Part 2: Sex and Gender are not interchangeable. Sex is binary Male/Female. Gender can be a spectrum of more or less Masculine/Feminine because it is a social construct. WE are all non binary having so called feminine and masculine characteristics.

Question 12: Of course it should include women and men based on SEX. Gender would be covered elsewhere Keep SEX a protected characteristic A smaller number of men suffer from abuse but it is equally important that they are protected.

Question 13: No

Expand: Sex based crimes should cover both sexes. Misogyny is just another type of prejudice like homophobia.... it's not an oppressed group or a characteristic.

Question 14: No

Expand: Women are disproportionately the victims of certain crimes and violence against women and girls is strongly linked to their biology. The public have strongly been in favour of SEX over gender in previous consultations. I will keep repeating that SEX is a fact of biology, while gender is a made up social construct.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: No. You can't legislate and protect a group you cannot define.

Question 18: This is getting so over the top. Don't create problems where there are none.

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: Racial and religiously motivated offences are far in excess of anything else in terms of hate crime. There is more of a case for adding age or elder abuse based on reported incidents.

Together trans, non binary and intersex are very low numbers of incidents. Do you even know what intersex actually is? It is very rare and people rarely "look" intersex. They present and actually biologically are either male or female with a variant gene.

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand: Absolutely not. There is a lot of hate on online platforms but it is already dealt with in the Communications Act 2003, or the Malicious Communications Act. We must still have freedom of expression and no one should have the right to not be offended. That is not a human right. It is also not quantifiable or objective. I am hurt if I say I am is no way to legislate.

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand: Sexual offences are very high. There is no justification for proposing to make transgender identity a protected characteristic for aggravated offences yet not include sexual offences.

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Again Free Speech or freedom of expression has to be maintained how will hate be defined? Just having an opposing view to someone else? Take the trans "debate" for instance Women or men should be able to express their views any way they want to, on protecting their hard won rights without being accused of hate crime. See Harry Miller v College of Policing. A judge ruled the police had made disproportionate interference with his right to freedom of expression in the way they handled a complaint about a Tweet

Do not criminalise debate. Women are being silenced in the work place and they need an outlet to get their side of a debate across.

Question 41: No

Expand: How would inflammatory be defined? Who decides? What one person regards as inflammatory another would say is stating a fact. I believe that women and men are defined by biology and that you cannot change sex You can change your gender as many times as you like. I would not intend that to be inflammatory. I believe there is no such thing as god.... any god. I see no evidence for there being any gods. I do not intend for that to be inflammatory I follow the science over opinion and belief

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: No Maintain as is

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Again protect freedom of speech. This would criminalise a far wider range of speech and behavior for no good reason. How would intention be proved? It would come down to someone's opinion. The burden of proof must be on the prosecution to demonstrate the words were threatening, abusive or insulting. Also I don't think anyone has a right to not be insulted or offended. This is particularly important in the trans debate. Trans activists have a very low bar as to what they consider threatening or abusive. Stating biological reality is not abusive. Calling someone the wrong pronoun which can change with the wind is not threatening. Women's Place UK, WPUK set up in 2017 to help get women's voices heard over the reform of the Gender Recognition Act 2004 has repeatedly been called a hate group by trans activists with no evidence at all. They may believe that WPUK are a hate group but looked at rationally and in an unbiased manner they are not. More and more frivolous law suits will be brought.

Question 46: No

Expand: "the defendant ought to have known" "likely to" This is nonsense. It will criminalise people again on a whim and an opinion. Protect free speech, not make everyone afraid to open their mouths or write down any opinion they might have which some unknown person hearing or reading their opinion might be super sensitive and claim it's a hate crime. There is a danger of making any opinion a hate crime. There will be someone out there who is offended.

Question 47: No

Expand: "Likely to" is too low a threshold. As said before it will lead to over criminalisation and frivolous cases with lots of police time wasted. Gender Critical people need to be able to speak out in order to protect their sex based rights. This mainly of course applies to women.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Relevant conduct is already covered by existing offences under enhanced sentencing. It is in the nature of certain trans activists in the current climate to bring cases that they know to be frivolous in order to silence the debate. As mentioned previously for some in the trans community the bar for what they consider to be a hate crime is set very low. I do not want to be criminalised for stating biological facts. Stating biological reality is not abusive. Calling someone the wrong pronoun which can change with the wind is not threatening.

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: As stated before SEX not gender should be added. see your own stats pg 237 247 documented harms against women. Hatred based on sex is at least equal to if not more important than some other characteristics. Far too many women are the target of SEX based offending. Hatred based on SEX clearly separate from gender is important here.

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This is beyond belief that this is even a question here Absolutely NO to this Protect free speech and especially in your own home. What sort of society are you proposing we live in? One where family member "spy on" and report each other?

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: These are serious offenses. The AG should have the power to have regard to the defendants rights to freedom of expression and respect their home, correspondence private and family life.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Retired special needs Teacher

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: I don't feel it should. There are only two biological sexes male and female. I realise that someone can be born with both genders a hermaphrodite; this is very rare

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: Laws to help those in forced marriages should be clearer.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: These proposals would restrict preaching in churches and mosques. These proposals are similar to laws that were in force in Eastern European countries during the cold wars. We are a democratic country with free speech . What is being proposed would criminalise individuals for having different views

You could be discussing or debating issues which you and others disagree on Someone is offended by what you say and declares this is hate speech. I could be stating a personal view with no malice intended; someone may be offended and claim I am stirring up hatred. In eastern communist regimes people were spied upon and reported for their comments.

The existing two stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught As a practising Christian I believe that marriage should be between a man and a woman If these proposals are passed and someone was upset by my beliefs when I air them they could accuse me of hatred against them if they are in a same sex marriage I could be criminalised for stating what I believe Freedom of speech in the UK is precious.

Question 46: No

Expand: We should be free to disagree Disagreement is not hatred Threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred is wrong and if proven should be dealt with by the law If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed the law will be used to stop political and religious discussion

Just because my views differ from another's and they feel hurt by them doesn't make my words abusive

Question 47: No

Expand: Threatening behaviour intended to stir up hatred should be covered.

My disagreement with an individual may be labelled as hatred as they may have a different world view They may be politically motivated and find my views offensive I may find their views offensive. This does not mean they or I am stirring up hatred offences. We need to be tolerant of each other

Disagreement is not hatred

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity should not be lumped together They are very different.

The transgender issues are controversial. Women wanting to use single sex areas and who feel threatened by transgender people sharing those areas will be accused of hatred by expressing legitimate concerns about their privacy

There have been disproportionate amounts of autistic children referred to gender clinics. As a special needs teacher with over forty years experience of working with autistic pupils ; I recognise that many of them are easily led and become obsessed with things Why are there more autistic individuals than others looking at transgender identity. This type of offence would restrict the freedom of teachers and other educational professionals from questioning the impact of transgender identity on young people We are seeing more and more transgender people regretting what they did in their youth. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would prevent political debate

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This is what happened in Eastern Europe communist countries during the Cold War People spying and reporting neighbours We should be free to speak openly in our homes without the threat of prosecution We live in a democratic country and should be able to express our opinions in our own homes without the threat of criminality.

Our homes are private areas it is inappropriate to propose that what we say in our own homes will be criminalised.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: We should be free to say that there are only two sexes

If I believe with my whole heart that is true why can't I voice that.

I can use a persons birth name and pronoun if I wish.

My religious beliefs and upbringing are important to me and I should be free to voice them

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The Attorney Generals consent is a wonderful safeguard on prosecutions. The Attorney General is answerable to Parliament and can be checked up by MP 's

Giving consent to the DPP from the AG is a downgrade move The AG has more independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. It is better placed to deal with over zealous prosecutions

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Zoe Johannes

Name of Organisation: GIRES (Gender Identity Research and Education Society)

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand: Yes, we agree with this proposal. We understand that it will be difficult to remedy the disparity between the protections afforded to different characteristics without consolidating the existing hate crime laws into a single Act. We would support any effort to ensure that all groups currently and prospectively protected by hate crime laws are protected in an equal and consistent way. We would also support including a provision that allows for anonymity for victims of hate crime, as having one's name published in the media can be a deterrent for reporting hate crime for trans people in particular.

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Yes, we agree with this proposal. We agree with your conclusion that it is important to afford protections to specific groups of people who share common characteristics, whose group membership is core to their identity and who are a 'suppressed minority'. Trans and gender diverse people fit this description, and as your evidence shows, they regularly experience violence because of their membership of this group. We think it is important to continue affording them specific protection against hate-based violence.

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: We agree with this proposal, although we note that this is less relevant to our organisation as transgender status is already a protected characteristic. We would suggest if "demonstrable need" is retained as part of these criteria, that you consider not only the overall incidence of hate crime against a group, but the prevalence of hate crime against the group's population. As you have stated, while the overall incidence of violence against trans and gender diverse people is lower than for other groups, there is a substantial degree of under-reporting and even so the prevalence within the trans community is very high. This may also be so regarding other communities with statistically smaller populations.

Question 4: We do not feel it is our place to make detailed comment on this as it is not our area of expertise. However, we are aware that migration and asylum status can and often do present additional problems for trans and gender diverse migrants, including in relation to

hate crime, and are therefore supportive of this suggestion. Of the trans people murdered in Europe in the year to November 2020, 50% were migrants. The intersection with migration and asylum in the marginalisation of trans people mean that protection for trans people will be less effective if migration and asylum is not an included category. This same argument likely applies regarding the efficacy of this law for other categories that intersect with migration and asylum status

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise.

Question 7: We do not have comprehensive expertise in sexual orientation matters, Nonetheless, it is our view that asexuality should be included within the definition of sexual orientation. Anyone who is not or is perceived not to be heterosexual (including some asexual people) may experience hate crime based on their real or perceived sexual orientation and should be protected from this.

Question 8: Other (please expand)

Question 8 Part 1: A very wide range of identities are experienced and expressed among trans and gender diverse people. In preparing to include a question on gender identity in the 2021 census, the Office for National Statistics anticipates that at least 80 different gender identities are likely to be selected by respondents. The law should ensure that, so far as is possible, it is clearly inclusive of all such identities.

We agree with the proposal to broaden the category to include non binary, non-gender and intersex people. We think it is important to ensure that non binary and intersex people are included in the protection afforded to transgender people, as they may also experience violence based on their real or perceived gender identity and/or expression. We acknowledge that language changes over time, and that some gender diverse people may use different terms in future to describe their identities which have not yet been introduced. Individuals using new or unfamiliar terms would still be protected under the gender diverse banner, in the same way as for those gender diverse identities that are already recognised.

We suggest that the category 'transgender' be renamed as 'gender diverse' and that the definition be revised as follows:

- People who are or are presumed to be trans/transgender;
- People who are or are presumed to be non binary
- People who are non-gender/agender or are presumed to be;
- People who cross dress (or are presumed to cross dress)
- People who are, or are presumed to be, intersex;
- People who are, or are presumed to be polygender, pangender, or otherwise gender diverse

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: See our answer above.

Question 8 Part 3: See our answer above.

Question 9: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise.

Question 10: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise

Question 11: Yes

Expand: We think that gender and sex should both be protected characteristics for the purposes of hate crime law. Gender-based violence is extremely prevalent and should attract the same penalties as hate crime against other groups. We also agree with your assessment that different characteristics could be relevant in different situations. For example, a transgender woman could be subject to violence either because she is transgender or because she is a woman. We think it is important to protect people from hate crime based on their gender no matter whether they are trans or not.

We also think it is important that non-binary, intersex and otherwise gender diverse people who do not identify as a man or woman are included in your definition of hate crime based on "gender or sex." For example, a non-binary person who is presumed to be female and victimised because of this should be protected based on their presumed gender. This can be achieved by adding 'presumed' to the definition of "gender or sex."

Question 11 Part 2: We do not agree that gender-specific carve outs for sexual offences or domestic abuse are needed, and in fact we feel that these are limiting as women are not the only victims of these crimes. FGM and forced marriage are prohibited under extant laws prohibiting bodily harm and sexual assault, and requiring mutual consent for marriage. However, there is a need to consider the adequacy of how extant laws in this area are applied, and would encourage the inclusion of guidance to ensure FGM and forced marriage are not overlooked due to the gender, age and/or ethnic background of victims.

Question 12: We think that sex and gender based hate crime protection should not be limited to women. As stated above, we think that this protection should be extended to anyone who is victimised based on their real or perceived gender or sex, which includes people of all genders. This protection should include non-binary and otherwise gender diverse people as well as women and men (including trans women and men).

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: We advocate using female/male to describe sex and boy/man or girl/woman to describe gender. As stated above, we do not think gender-based hate crime protection should be limited to women. If the inclusion of men in these protections presents a problem, we would advocate that nonbinary people (and those perceived as such) should be protected alongside women in this category of protections, too, since they may be victimised due to their sex or gender. We also believe that the term "women" should include those presumed to be women, as some trans men and non-binary people could be targeted based on this presumption. This would also prevent the definition of "woman" being misapplied by excluding trans women. We think that using the term "women", and defining this as including those who identify as or are presumed to be women, is both more inclusive and more accurate than using the term "misogyny."

Question 14: Yes

Expand: We believe the most accurate way of defining this group is “sex or gender”. Sex and gender, while they are sometimes used interchangeably, have different meanings. Using only one of these terms to define the category would risk excluding some hate crime against trans people. If both terms are included, the prosecution will be able to choose which term is most appropriate for the crime committed.

Question 15: We believe that hate crime law should include age-based protections. Although this is not our area of expertise, the intersections with age (both older and younger) in the marginalisation of trans people mean that protection for trans people will be less effective if age is not an included category. This same argument likely applies regarding the efficacy of this law for other categories that intersect with age.

Question 16: As stated above, we believe the efficacy of the proposed protections for transgender/gender diverse people and other categories would be limited by the exclusion of children and young people from this protection.

Question 17: We believe that hate crime law should include sex workers. A significant proportion of trans people are subjected to criminal violence due at least in part to their perceived (or real) sex worker status. Of the trans people murdered worldwide in the year to November 2020, 62% of those whose occupation is known were sex workers. Hate motivated crimes against sex workers by reason of their sex worker status are sadly common in part due to the criminalisation of many subsets of sex workers, for example those who work indoors with other sex workers – a practice which radically improves worker safety – being charged with “brothel-keeping”.

Question 18: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise.

Question 19: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise.

Question 20: We are generally in favour of this, although the “philosophical beliefs” protected should be required to be compatible with the rights and dignity of all groups protected by the proposed statute (in other words, the Grainger criteria need to be retained).

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise.

Question 22: Yes

Expand: We propose that the commission of a hate crime should be satisfied where:

- an offender demonstrates hostility towards a person based on that victim’s actual or perceived characteristic

OR

- The offence was motivated by hostility towards persons or groups who have, or are believed to have the characteristic

Question 23: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise.

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise.

If aggravated offences are retained, we would ask that these be extended to all protected groups.

Question 25: Yes

Expand: Yes, we agree that aggravated offences should be extended to include the characteristics listed, as well as gender diversity, in order to ensure all groups are treated equally. Please see our response to question 8 with regard to the definition of 'transgender'.

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: We understand the need to ensure consistency across the criminal law. However, we do not agree that these criteria should be the only criteria considered when deciding if an aggravated version of an offence should be created. Hate crime against transgender people may not constitute a significant proportion of any offence – for example, the majority of sexual offences may be perpetrated against women who are not transgender. However, the proportion of trans people against whom a given sexual offence is perpetrated is generally higher than against cisgender women. Furthermore, even if hate were a very rare motive for criminal offences, hate motivated crime would remain a significant issue that the criminal law should seek to recognise. It would perhaps be more appropriate to consider what proportion of hate crimes against transgender people are sexual offences, instead of how many sexual offences are against transgender people, and irrespective of how many crimes these amount to in total.

We also believe it is important to signal to the public that hate crimes will be treated more seriously than offences unmotivated by bias, not just from a sentencing perspective but in terms of how they are named and recorded. This will encourage trans and gender diverse victims of hate crime to come forward and report crimes, which will provide more information about the types of crimes committed. We consider this to be more important than whether the existing maximum penalty for the base offence is adequate from a sentencing perspective.

Question 27: Yes

Expand: We agree with this proposal. A considerable amount of online abuse is perpetrated against transgender people and we would like for this to be recognised and punished accordingly. We also believe that aggravated versions of offences related to taking, making and sharing intimate images without consent should be created as, as you suggest, this is a particular issue of concern for LGBT people.

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: We agree that aggravated versions of the offences listed in 16.75 of the consultation document should be created. We also believe, however, that aggravated versions of other offences with life sentences, such as those in 16.69 of the consultation document, should be created to allow for a more coherent set of provisions. We do not believe the only reason for enacting the specific offences is to increase the available sentence; denunciation and fair labelling are also important.

Question 29: No

Expand: We think that aggravated versions of these offences should be created.

Question 30: We agree that aggravated versions of these offences should be created. As you note, blackmail is particularly relevant for LGBT people who do not wish to be "outed" and the severity of this should be recognised.

Question 31: No

Expand: We believe that aggravated versions of sexual offences should be introduced. There is evidence that sexual offences are perpetrated as a means of shaming LGBT (and in particular, trans) people for their sexuality or gender, for example, in the case of “corrective” rape. We think it is important to recognise and document the use of sexual violence in the persecution of trans people

Question 32: We agree to this proposed provision, as it allows flexibility where a victim is targeted based on membership of more than one protected group.

Question 33: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise.

However, we would ask that whatever penalties exist are applied equally to all protected groups

Question 34: We do believe that where only an aggravated offence is prosecuted, the Courts should always be empowered to find a defendant guilty of the base offence in the alternative. This is especially important if more aggravated versions of offences are introduced. It is important for the prosecution to be able to bring a case which they believe is motivated by prejudice, but for the base offence to remain available if there is not enough evidence to convict on the aggravated basis.

Question 35: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise

Question 36: Yes

Expand: We agree with this proposal. While we are most concerned with the equalisation of aggravated offences, we also agree that it is important to retain enhanced sentencing as a method of recognising crime motivated by prejudice.

Question 37: Yes

Expand: We agree with this proposal. We think it is important for the aggravation to be stated in open court so that the public is aware that a hate crime has been committed.

Question 38 Part 1: We are not able to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise.

Question 38 Part 2: We are not able to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not have an opinion on this. However, we would ask that whatever penalties exist are available equally to all protected groups

Question 40: Yes

Expand: We agree. (False) statements made about transgender and gender diverse people in fora that do not constitute written material continue to promote and provoke violence against them. . Furthermore, nonconsensual disclosure of someone’s trans or LGBT status can and does precipitate violence and other crime perpetrated by the receiver of that private information against the individual in question. In this latter case, mens rea (i.e. that the disclosure was made due to prejudice, hostility or a desire to see harm come to the individual) would need to have a very clearly defined evidentiary threshold

Question 41: Yes

Expand: We agree with this proposal as it would consolidate the existing offences so that offences relating to sexual orientation are treated equally to offences relating to race and religion. However, we strongly believe that inflammatory material related to trans or gender diverse identity needs to be included in these offences.

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: We agree with this proposal as it would consolidate the existing offences so that offences relating to sexual orientation are treated equally to offences relating to race and religion. However, we strongly believe that inflammatory material related to trans and gender diverse identity needs to be included in these offences

Question 43 Part 1: We would suggest that where a report of the unlawful material has been made to the platform, and action has not been taken in an appropriate and timely fashion, the company in question should be held criminally liable.

Question 43 Part 2: We would propose that the requirement be waived if a reasonable person with access to the same information as the defendant would not expect the material to stir up hatred.

Question 44: We do not feel it is our place to comment on how “likely to” should be defined, but we would ask that it be applied to other characteristics than just race, and in particular, to sexual orientation and gender identity.

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1: The ability of those who seek to stir up hatred against transgender and gender diverse people to present their words or behaviour in ways that are not demonstrably threatening, abusive or insulting is well documented. We therefore agree, and ask that all provisions apply equally to all protected groups

Question 46: No

Expand: In line with our response to Q43, we would propose that proof of either 1 and 3, or 2 and 4, be sufficient

Question 47: Yes

Expand: Yes, we agree with this proposal as it would mean that the same test and threshold would apply for all protected characteristics

Question 47 Part 2: We do not support any weakening of hate crime protections. In the absence of specific legal dysfunction arising from its inclusion, we would therefore ask that “insulting” words remain included

Question 48: Yes

Expand: Yes, we agree that the offences of stirring up hatred should be extended to cover hatred on the grounds of transgender but also gender diverse identity. We think this is an appropriate response to the problem of increased hate crime against trans and gender diverse people that your research has documented, and are confident that extending the offence will help to ensure trans people are afforded the same protections as other groups.

While disability is not our area of expertise, we would prefer that it be included.

Question 49: Yes

Expand: Yes, we agree with this proposal. We understand that one basis for the argument to extend stirring up offences to cover sex or gender is that women are disproportionately victim to online gender-based abuse. However, we also want to ensure that the offence is extended in an inclusive way, and applies equally to trans women or anyone who is perceived to be a woman. We would therefore suggest that you define the characteristic as “sex and gender” rather than using one term over the other, and include language such as “presumed to be”. Furthermore, online stirring up and abuse targeting non-binary people may sometimes target their gender per se more than their (perceived) trans status.

Question 50: Yes. We appreciate that hatred may be stirred up based on multiple protected characteristics at once and think it is important that intersectionality is accounted for in the stirring up offences, without requiring the prosecution to make a choice between two different characteristics. For example, a case where the defendant is accused of stirring up hatred against a specific intersection might be impossible to prove if the prosecution is required to demonstrate stirring up against a single characteristic. We therefore agree with this proposal.

Question 51: Yes

Expand: We agree with this proposal. We believe it is important to protect people from hatred stirred up against them whether it is in a public or private place. We would encourage specific language including efforts to change the sexual orientation or gender identity of an LGBTQ+ individual which uses stirring up of hatred to attempt to coerce the victim into suppressing their sexual orientation or gender identity.

Question 52: No

Expand: We do not agree with this proposal in relation to trans identity specifically. We disagree with the suggestion that trans rights are up for debate, or that people who express insulting or hateful views about trans people should be protected from prosecution under hate crime legislation under sections 29J and 29JA. We disagree with Professor Stock’s comment that efforts to combat transphobia are intended to censor “different views, even when they are expressed by legitimate scholars whose views are not grounded in hatred, bigotry, prejudice or hostility, but are based on legitimately different value judgments, reasoning and analysis, and form part of mainstream academic research”. Many of the views she describes are not based on any legitimate empirical research and can only be based on a fear or ignorance about trans people. In other words, we hold that “different value judgements” here amounts to a disdain for the personhood and personal freedom of trans and gender diverse people. We think it would be irresponsible to afford legal protections to people disseminating such views, whatever qualifications they may hold.

Trans people face a unique barrier distinct from many other groups in that their right to access certain public services, such as healthcare and education, is still not universally guaranteed in the UK, and their human rights are sometimes framed in the media as up for debate. We think it would be harmful to afford legal protection to people who engage in the “the discussion or criticism of gender reassignment; treatment for gender dysphoria; provision of and access to single-sex facilities and activities” because this criticism effectively vilifies and dehumanises transgender people and encourages the public to do the same.

The other protected characteristics are not within our area of expertise but we would suggest that if these protections are not applied for trans and gender diverse people, they should also not be applied for other groups to ensure all groups are treated equally.

Question 52 Part 2: Please see our response to question 51.

Question 53: We believe all groups should be afforded equal protection. If these protections are afforded for other groups we agree that they should exist for racial hatred; if not, they should not.

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise

Question 55 Part 1: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise

Question 55 Part 2: We favour no exemptions for any publication that is in the public domain.

Question 56: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise

Question 57: Yes

Expand: Yes, we think that if this offence is retained, it should be extended to cover chanting based on sexual orientation, to dissuade people from engaging in homophobic chanting and verbal abuse. We would suggest that it needs also to be extended to include chanting based on trans and gender diverse identity

Question 57 Part 2: We think that the offence should be extended to cover all protected characteristics, to dissuade people from engaging in verbal abuse which targets any protected group. In relation to transphobic and gender diverse abuse, we acknowledge that currently this may not occur at the same frequency as homophobic and racist abuse. However, there are self-evidently other factors which affect this, such as barriers to participation in sport for trans and gender diverse people, and lack of access to inclusive sports clubs and teams, which may prevent transgender and gender diverse people from accessing sport or dissuade those who do participate from "outing" themselves. Should sport become more inclusive and numbers of transgender and gender diverse athletes increase, we would expect them to be protected from discriminatory chanting to the same extent as other groups.

Question 58: We do not feel it is our place to comment on this as it is not our area of expertise

Question 59: We agree that this offence should be extended to cover journeys to and from a designated football match

Question 60: Yes, we do think this offence should be amended to include association and perceived characteristics. Trans and gender diverse people are often victimised because of their perceived gender, which may or may not align with their actual gender, and it is important to ensure they are protected from this. Including "association" will help further reduce the stigma against trans people and encourage others to speak up for those who are victimised. As with homophobic abuse, transphobic abuse can be perpetrated in order to be off putting, rather than because the victim is perceived to be trans.

Question 61: We do not feel it is our place to comment on the appropriateness of a penalty. However, we would say that in relation to transphobic abuse and abuse based on gender

diversity, we agree that training is often a very effective way of educating a perpetrator so that they are aware of the harm their words or actions can do to a transgender person.

Question 62: Yes, we would support the introduction of a Hate Crime Commissioner. We think that having a dedicated commissioner responsible for managing hate crimes would be a useful way to ensure they are addressed in a consistent way.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Not applicable

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I would prefer my responses to be confidential because I have close relations of the same surname and who are involved in legislation and in the judiciary. I would not wish them to be unnecessarily embarrassed by my answers, which is possible.

Question 1: No

Expand: I suspect that if the provisions were to be brought together they would also become more onerous to the public and that seems to me to be deeply undesirable. I truly believe in freedom of speech and debate.

Question 2: No

Expand: I think the ability to debate should be protected in law rather than continuing to be or being extended into protecting specified characteristics. One cannot and should not protect people against everything; those who speak should be able to say what they think without fear of criminalisation and those who are offended by it should instead be encouraged to defend their position.

I would say this should apply to all speech and what is now described as "hate crime", except for incitement to physical violence. There is a case for making incitement to physical violence a crime.

I am deeply dismayed by the current and proposed extended provisions which otherwise prevent freedom of speech. Freedom and truth go together and without truth the whole of society falls apart.

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: To some extent but not entirely.

Subject to my previous comments:

(1) It's important that any allegations of crime should be based on objective criteria rather than, as is the case with some allegations at present, on the alleged victim's perception of whether he or she or they perceive [themselves] to be a victim. So to that extent I agree.

I also agree that the prevalence of such alleged crime is relevant; for example, I would say that hate crime against Jews is worse than hate crime against people who are of short stature.

(2) No. The fact that the alleged victim is particularly sensitive should be irrelevant. It isn't the alleged perpetrator's fault that that may be the case.

(3) I agree in that I think the police and criminal justice people are spending a disproportionately large amount of their time pursuing alleged hate crime and that their resources should be reallocated more towards major physical violence and offences against property.

On the whole the public needs to be more resilient as to speech and the scope and definition of "hate crime" should be curtailed rather than extended

Question 4: On the whole the definitions as to hate crime should be reduced, not extended.

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand: On the whole the definitions as to hate crime should be reduced, not extended

Question 7: On the whole the definitions as to hate crime should be reduced, not extended

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: On the whole the definitions as to hate crime should be reduced, not extended

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: On the whole the definitions as to hate crime should be reduced, not extended

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: On the whole the definitions as to hate crime should be reduced, not extended.

Question 11: No

Expand: On the whole the definitions as to hate crime should be reduced, not extended
People should be encouraged to stand up for themselves by speaking themselves, rather than by alleging hate crimes.

Question 11 Part 2: On the whole the definitions as to hate crime should be reduced, not extended.

Question 12: Both women and men, obviously (Is this a serious question?)

Question 13: Yes

Expand: Women is a perfectly good English word and intelligible to the man in the street.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex is the old and proper English word The word "gender" raises all sorts of totally unnecessary issues.

Question 15: No People are the age they are It is not a big deal

Question 16: I don't think there should be any age-based hate crime protection

However, if there were, then it should include people of all ages for fairness. Besides, age-based hate crime against younger people is no different from the same against older people

Question 17: No. Sex workers are just that; it should not be criminal to say so.

Question 18: No (and this is getting absurd). The definitions as to hate crime should be reduced, not extended

Question 19: No. People experiencing homelessness are just that; others should be able to say so

Question 20: No. People with particular philosophical beliefs are just that; others should be able to say so.

In general, I think the definitions of hate crime should be reduced rather than extended

Question 21: No

Expand: I think that apart from incitement to physical violence "hate crime" should be regarded as relatively minor and that it should not be taken into account in respect of enhanced sentencing. The alleged victims need to stand up for themselves by speaking and debating, not by alleging crime.

I think enhanced sentencing is a great mistake

Question 22: No

Expand: This is a matter of great concern to me; it is the thin end of the wedge and I think that the powers that be should be curtailed in this respect

Question 23: No. This is pretty much impossible to ascertain and I would not trust the police or judiciary to make the right judgment in this respect.

Question 24: No

Expand: I think that the scope of alleged hate crime should be enormously reduced, not expanded; also that what is going on in the alleged perpetrator's mind is difficult to ascertain and should not be relevant, save in the case of clear incitement to physical violence

I have a more general comment that criminal offences should be primarily defined as to acts physically committed rather than as to perceptions of what the alleged perpetrator thought. I am much concerned as to the "thought police"

Question 25: No

Expand: I think that the scope of alleged hate crime should be enormously reduced, not expanded

Question 26: No

Expand: See my answer to q 25

Question 27: No

Expand: See my answer to q. 25.

Question 28: No

Expand: In general (and this question is as to actual violence) I think the act committed should be relevant to the sentence, not what is perceived to have been in the alleged perpetrator's mind I think the "thought police" are making a great mistake

Question 29: Yes

Expand: In general I think that definitions and the scope of "hate crime" should be reduced rather than extended

Question 30: No. In general I think that definitions and the scope of "hate crime" should be reduced rather than extended

Question 31: No

Expand: In general I think that definitions and the scope of "hate crime" should be reduced rather than extended

I also think that enhanced sentencing should be abandoned.

Question 32: I wonder how many of the consultees will understand what the question means ; it has at least word in it which I have never encountered before What does the whole thing mean?

Question 33: In general I think that definitions and the scope of "hate crime" should be reduced rather than extended

Question 34: As said before, I do not believe in the concept of aggravated offences.

Subject to that caveat, yes, provided that the defendant has the opportunity and legal help properly to defend himself or herself in that context I am not sure that it is realistic to expect that the practicalities would allow for that.

Question 35: In general I think that definitions and the scope of "hate crime" should be reduced rather than extended

Question 36: No

Expand: In general I think that definitions and the scope of "hate crime" should be reduced rather than extended

I also think that the concepts of enhanced sentencing and aggravated offences should be stopped or reduced.

Question 37: Yes

Expand: This seems to me to be the only way of encouraging transparency.

Question 38 Part 1: In general I think that definitions and the scope of "hate crime" should be reduced rather than extended

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand: In general, I think that enhanced sentencing is unfair and unjust; the act perpetrated is more important than what is perceived to have been going on in the alleged perpetrators's mind at the time

Question 40: Yes

Expand: In general I think that definitions and the scope of "hate crime" should be reduced rather than extended.

I believe strongly in freedom of speech, including in both written and unwritten material

Question 41: No

Expand: I am concerned as to what might be seen to be "inflammatory material". In general, I think that freedom of speech is much to be desired

Question 42: No

Expand: I am concerned as to what might be seen to be "inflammatory material". In general, I think that freedom of speech is much to be desired

As to (2) I think it should include a defence that the alleged perpetrator thought that the truth which was to be disseminated was worthwhile in the context and that to that extent the fact that others might perceive material to be inflammatory is irrelevant.

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: No

In general, I think that the scope of "hate crime" should be reduced.

In this context, it seems to me that people are likely to have very different vies as to "likely to" and I do not trust the systems to be fair.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: No This is a cause of great concern

If your proposal were to be enacted, the words alleged to be criminal could be bland and polite if it were perceived that a speaker had certain intentions. There would be no actus reus, only mens rea, and the alleged perpetrator would be being criminalised for thought, rather than for action. I think this thought policing is an enormous mistake.

Question 46: No

Expand: In general I think the scope of "hate crime" should be curtailed rather than extended.

(I think you have also missed out the word "Or" in this question?)

Question 47: No

Expand: It would depend on what the single threshold was but on the whole I think that the "likely to" limb should be abandoned

If there were to be a threshold of threatening I think it should be threatening physical violence only.

I think abusive should be left out completely

Question 47 Part 2: See above Certainly "insulting" should be insufficient for a crime

Question 48: No

Expand: In general I think the scope of "hate crime" should be curtailed rather than extended.

Question 49: No

Expand: In general I think the scope of "hate crime" should be curtailed rather than extended

Question 50: In general I think the scope of "hate crime" should be curtailed rather than extended.

Question 51: No

Expand: This proposal reminds me of the book 1984 and various historical and unsavoury regimes, such as that of Germany in WWII, Russia at certain stages and others. .

I am clear that people should be able to say what they like in private dwellings including but not only so that they can discuss truth Anything else would be completely appalling and would threaten for example children reporting their own parents for "hate crime".

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand: In general I think the scope of "hate crime" should be curtailed rather than extended.

Question 52 Part 2: In general I think the scope of "hate crime" should be curtailed rather than extended.

Question 53: In general I think the scope of "hate crime" should be curtailed rather than extended

Question 54: No

Expand: In my opinion, the Attorney General is usually more reliably competent than the DPP, for whatever reason

Additionally, my understanding is that the AG is subject to the ballot box, unlike the DPP, who is non-elected.

Question 55 Part 1: Yes The more truth out there the better

Question 55 Part 2: I agree that those should enjoy full exemption from the offence:

.

fair and accurate reports of ALL meetings and

peer reviewed material in a scientific or academic context

for the pursuit of truth

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand: No views; I know too little about it.

In general, I think the scope and definitions as to "hate crime should be curtailed rather than extended

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand: No views; I know too little about it.

In general, I think the scope and definitions as to "hate crime should be curtailed rather than extended.

Question 57 Part 2: In general, I think the scope and definitions as to "hate crime should be curtailed rather than extended.

Question 58: No views; I know too little about it

In general, I think the scope and definitions as to "hate crime should be curtailed rather than extended.

Question 59: No views; I know too little about it

In general, I think the scope and definitions as to "hate crime should be curtailed rather than extended.

Question 60: No views; I know too little about it

In general, I think the scope and definitions as to "hate crime should be curtailed rather than extended.

Question 61: No views; I know too little about it

In general, I think the scope and definitions as to "hate crime should be curtailed rather than extended.

Question 62: No. There are far too many quangocrats at vast expense already and there are other methods of promoting justice without promoting more.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I see no reason to present the views of an individual to any institution

Question 1: No

Expand: Hate crime legislation has gone far enough

Question 2: No

Expand: Cunning application of the law would allow for persecution of minorities where they err against widely held characteristics

Calling a Caucasian "cracker" by another race would allow for prosecution under these measures.

I believe examples such as this would have to be taken seriously and the law applied

This would have the opposite of the suspected desired effect.

Question 3: No

Expand: This seems to propose that while race can be made a characteristic but "white" would not be protected.

Also that sexuality would be protected but heterosexual would not.

If a characteristic is to be protected then it should be applied to all groups.

Unbiased evidence does not exist as this data is opinion driven when presented statistically

Question 4: No. These are personal statuses and do not form part of a characteristic.

Question 5: No

Expand: Religions are fallible and must be called to account freely without fear when their practices affect wider society.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sectarian groups are by definition separate from the religion in question. If you do not detail these groups in your law and aim to address them within the religious protection then the law is unable to differentiate the particular nuances that arise. Leading the law to be ineffective in these instances

Question 7: No. All forms of intimidation, bullying and attack are covered by existing laws. Asexual covers an increasingly large area of pronoun use and other forms of address, to put into law would put too much onus on individual citizens to educate themselves to be non-offensive. This would also require the citizen or organisation to educate themselves on each person with this characteristic before properly engaging, leading to shadow discrimination and the opposite outcome desired.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: It is unclear how evident the presumption should be. This is also confusing as an incorrect presumption would leave the citizen committing an offence elsewhere in the hate laws. The citizen would frequently be in the wrong as whimsy is permitted for the protected subject of the law

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: You can add all the different nouns you see fit. This has minimal bearing on the effectiveness or spirit of the law

Question 8 Part 3: "Other", or, "all other" would be the most encompassing.

Question 9: Yes.

Question 10: No. This is an incredibly nuanced circumstance and will serve no useful purpose to put into UK law.

An incorrect presumption should not be made a crime

There are disclosure options open for those with disabilities and the existing laws robustly address these areas.

Question 11: No

Expand: The existing laws surrounding discrimination are sufficient to address crimes committed against this characteristic.

Question 11 Part 2: No

The existing laws surrounding these crimes allow for punishment on an incremental scale. Hate Crime Law will not act as a meaningful deterrent in these activities.

Question 12: The Hate Crime Law is not necessary in this area

However, it is unreasonable to limit protections to one gender. Also the law leaves itself open to incorrect presumptions when choosing to apply this protection (Question 10)

You fail to address the other sex characteristics in this consultation question

Question 13: No

Expand: Misogyny is suitable for clear understanding.

Misandry should be included

Question 14: No

Expand: These are different things and can have separate categories

Question 15: No. Existing laws account for this characteristic.

Question 16: There should not be any age based hate crime protection.

Question 17: No. This would very quickly need to be expanded to include entertainers of many different kinds and then other occupations would necessitate their own recognitions.

Sex workers would have other characteristics that could be referred to.

Question 18: No. This would allow protection of subcultures behaving incompatibly with decent society. The Rotherham abusers would easily fit into this defined category and this would only be abused in the courts.

Question 19: This fails to discern those unintentionally homeless with those who chose this lifestyle, leaving this protection open to abuse by those that are not vulnerable.

Question 20: No. Philosophical beliefs can clearly be challenged.

A ridiculous question

Question 21: No

Expand: The aggravated offence process should replace hate crime law.

Question 22: No

Expand: Hate crime law is not required.

An aggravated offence should be applied

Question 23: No This will extend the power of Hate Crime Law to probe into the offender to the extent that conviction will be a trial on the life lived hitherto and near impossible to defend and explain every action taken that may be of interest to the prosecution

Question 24: No

Expand: This should remain exclusive to aggregated offences.

Hate Crime Law is not required.

Question 25: No

Expand: You propose to add occupations, philosophy and subculture for protection. Due to these "characteristics", there is no way I agree to the aggravated offence powers being extended to "any" classification added to Hate Crime Law

Question 26: No

Expand: The law should not be limited or extended in its response due to reported statistics

If the base offence does not allow for adequate maximum penalty then it should be amended to allow for this.

Question 27: No

Expand: I will never find this acceptable. Coupled with other provisionally proposed protected characteristics, such as philosophy, then much communication would become subject to this law in time

Question 28: No

Expand: They have life maximum so all tools are at the courts disposal already.

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: In the case of fraud against those with a disability, it could prove useful to have aggravated offences available

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: No it wouldn't

Question 33: These could be due for revision by assessing reoffending rates in the last 20 years.

Question 34: No, the court must deal only with the offence presented

Question 35: Neither model is ideal. The hybrid approach has its own maladies.

However, Sussex report over yours for now.

Question 36: No

Expand: No enhanced hate crime law sentencing. This should be done through aggravated offences.

Question 37: Yes

Expand: Openness is of utmost importance.

Question 38 Part 1: No, I feel this would allow protection to be applied more harshly where unwarranted

Question 38 Part 2: no flexibility desired.

Question 39: Yes

Expand: The court should sentence based only on the charge presented.

Question 40: No

Expand: Offence can be sought by victims and as such the courts will open themselves up to spurious claims

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand: The defences currently in place allow for some protection against ridiculous charges. I suspect the proposed alignment will lead to a reduction of available defences.

Question 43 Part 1: No, the end user should be ultimately responsible

Question 43 Part 2: Yes.

Question 44: No

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: This targets a speaker who is merely speaking. What is said should always be demonstrably threatening when considering this charge

Question 46: No

Expand: This criteria limits the possibility for education.

How is anyone to know what cannot be said if it can never be said?

Question 47: No

Expand: This eliminates all other parts of the circumstance from consideration by the courts. As long as the threshold is met, (not defined) then the court will have to find guilty

Question 47 Part 2: no

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand: Its already too wide.

Question 50: No, these characteristics can be extended to the absurd and the stirring up of offences should not be an offence when the grounds for proof are so arbitrary.

Buy not including all characteristics, the law clearly places some characteristics in higher regard than others

Question 51: No

Expand: That exclusion allows a person a safe place to learn. Removing that removes any avenue for education

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: no they should not

Question 53: no there should not

Question 54: No

Expand: The attorney general is more accountable

Question 55 Part 1: Yes

Question 55 Part 2: Education and satire.

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: these two characteristics are sufficient, no others need to be added.

Question 58: missile throwing yes

gestures no

Question 59: no

Question 60: no

Question 61: yes, sufficient

Question 62: I never would support it.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: I agree with this so that we can better understand different forms of racism and hate in order to tackle it in all those forms

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: I agree it should be where individuals experience hate or harassment due to identifying as asexual.

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: I agree it should be retained

Question 10: It should fall within the scope of protection

Question 11: Yes

Expand: This is so important and long overdue. In particular, women are subjected far disproportionately than men to public sexual harassment and hate based on their gender and these behaviours are the root of deeply engrained misogyny and sexism within our society. These microaggressions fuel further issues such as sexual assault, verbal sexual and physical abuse, domestic violence and rape. It is not just grown women who experience hate and public sexual harassment due to their gender, it is also young girls children.

Question 11 Part 2: Yes, this would be needed

Question 12: It should include men and women as equality but also understanding of the wider prevalence for all genders are key. However, misogyny as a hate crime has been so long overdue and is much more needed to protect women than men

Question 13: No

Expand: That language further signals that women are the issue and not men, where women are more prevalently subject to hate abuse and harassment from men

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16: All ages

Question 17: I agree it should be

Question 18: I agree it should be

Question 19: Absolutely agree protection against homelessness hate should be enforced

Question 20:

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: I agree this would be useful to understand data and how hate can intersect multiple characteristics

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Yes

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Yes

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hate crime was always an extraordinary direction for law to take

It hasn't stopped hate but has caused unfair and absurd prosecutions and police activity.

It now appears to attack those who have no bad intentions and might simply speak out of turn. Those making these laws may, just as easily be on the wrong end of them.

Question 2: No

Expand: The hate crime laws law already prevents police from attending more clear cut crimes. They should be reduced.

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: If this means more justification and evidence is required, then that is at least a positive.

Question 4: It's very bad law. How can you mix race with asylum status.

Why is an asylum seeker's race relevant?

Question 5: No

Expand: It should be questioned how successful it has been since it was brought in.

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: It will confuse and people will not understand. It will make life very difficult for children to understand what a harm really is

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: The word 'presumed' makes for a nonsensical definition.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Broadening this is an attack on those who are not transgender.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: This appears designed to make criminals of innocent people. The motive behind this appears extremely nasty

Question 11: No

Expand: A simple mistake could make someone a criminal. This could be your family member

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Neither. Any such protection is absurd.

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: It's hard to believe this kind of thing is being proposed. It should not.

Question 16: Blatant stupidity

Question 17: Sex worker is a polite expression for prostitute. What is hateful about it? What should they be called?

Question 18: A clear attempt to capture innocent people and entangle them in this very nasty law.

Question 19: It's difficult to even understand why this is necessary.

Question 20: Why?

Question 21: No

Expand: Vindictive and highly inappropriate use of law.

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: How is this proven?

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand: Much more care about the damage these laws do is needed.

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand: Why? The offence committed is already an offence.

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: They should not. The laws do not need to overlap in this way.

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand: Sentences for serious offences need to be compared to these pernicious laws

Question 37: No

Expand: Easily misused

Question 38 Part 1: There should be no enhanced sentencing.

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand: Truly inappropriate. Why would this be necessary?

Question 43 Part 1: They are allowed to censor already yet that is not addressed so addressing this would miss the more important problem

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: It's an inappropriate law already.

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This is the worst aspect of this The most inappropriate law possible

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand: If this is allowed it will spread to all manner of inappropriate situations.

Question 57 Part 2: This should not happen at all.

Question 58: Gestures and missile throwing are very different things This is an appalling way to put the two under one heading.

Question 59: Unenforcible and very invasive.

Question 60: This is the appalling way in which this type of law spreads Entirely inappropriate.

Question 61:

Question 62: It is a step backwards for any society

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I wish to make a response in my capacity as a criminal defence solicitor and some of my observations may create professional difficulties, in particular as regards comments on transgender

Question 1: No

Expand: I see no reason for this. In practice the law works effectively as it is, subject to some observations (later) There is no compelling evidence to suggest there is a legislative gap or that reform will reduce the number of hate crimes. The current law specifically distinguishes between racial and religious hate crime and that of other protected characteristics This distinction is important insofar as racially aggravated offences are due to the historical and structural nature of racism, the prevalence and seriousness of race hate crime and the impact that this has on wider society. This might equally apply to the characteristic of sex (which must be distinguished from gender) currently excluded It is not clear what are the proposed amendments to the enhanced sentence regime. I would agree these could and should be included in the Sentencing Code

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Hate crime should include and be limited to those characteristics as contained in the Equality Act 2010. Currently it does not include all protected characteristics and It is to be noted that the criminal law does not follow the definitions of protected characteristics contained in the Equality Act 2010. This can and does create some confusion and anomalies In particular the exclusion of disability, sex and age and the inclusion of "transgender" which is not one of the protected characteristics under the EA The actual wording is "Gender Reassignment". In addition, of concern is the definition of transgender in the criminal law The Criminal Justice Act 2003 s146(6) states "references to being transgender include references to being transsexual, or undergoing, proposing to undergo or having undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment. S146 "INCLUDE(S)" but is not expressly limited to " being transsexual, or undergoing, proposing to undergo or having undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment".

The importance of this is that the current definition of Transgender by leading proponents of Trans Rights (eg Stonewall) includes over 100 categories as diverse and nebulous as transgender, transsexual, gender-queer (GQ), gender-fluid, non-binary, gender-variant, crossdresser, genderless, agender, nongender, third gender, bi-gender, trans man, trans woman, trans masculine, trans feminine and neutrois (see <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/help-advice/faqs-and-glossary/glossary-terms#transgender>). Lack of clarity in the criminal law definition of transgender has caused misapplication of the law and is akin to the rejected proposal that "we should move away from a characteristic based approach to hate crime altogether, and recognise the harmfulness of hatred and hostility expressed towards any personal characteristic" since almost every paraphilia appears now to fall under the term the "Trans Umbrella" The omission of sex as a protected characteristic under hate crime law is a serious omission. Statistically hate crime directed against women (even allowing for the exclusion of domestic abuse and sexual offences) is as great as racial abuse and far exceeds that of the other categories Increasing the number of characteristics included, reinforces a hierarchy between those characteristics that are protected and those that are not. The longer the list of groups included, the stronger the signal sent about the status of those who are not There is particular concern about the message sent by the omission of sex from the same protection as other characteristics.

Question 3: Yes

Expand: There should however be a robust and comprehensive reconsideration of the need for inclusion of particular characteristics in hate crime legislation and going forward in terms of inclusion of further categories. By way of example: There is little evidence of prevalence of hate crime based on transgender. Most evidence is driven by the misapplication of the law both in terms of police recording of non crime hate incidents (see *Harry Miller v (1) The College Of Policing (2) The Chief Constable Of*

Humberside [2020] EWHC 225 (Admin)) and by the CPS (see *Scottow-v-CPS-judgment-161220.pdf*.) These cases turn on other points of law but are illustrative of an underlying driver to over hasty criminalisation of the exercise of the lawful exercise of freedom of belief and freedom of expression as enshrined under Articles 9 and 10 of the Human Rights Act 1998 where a vociferous and demanding group use all means including the law to assert the primacy of their rights

Question 4: This is not necessary. From my experience of daily practice in the lower criminal courts such abuse based on these characteristics is unlikely to be a standalone characteristic for hate crime and is always accompanied by racial or religious abuse. Additionally, expanding the band width of racial aggravation again amounts to extending the generality of protected characteristics into a nebulous amalgam of individual characteristics. The courts have shown a willingness in applying the law to include a wide range of groups groups such as travellers, different nationalities etc.

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: There is no perceived need supported by extensive fact based evidence of the existence of hate crime on the basis of asexuality. The number and variety of proposed reforms considered in the consultation dealing specifically with sex and gender non conformity belies the very small size of these populations and is indicative of undue influence brought to bear by certain groups consulted. These include the Gender Trust, GIRES, Stonewall, Stop Hate UK, Trans media watch, Press for change. No women's groups were apparently consulted. These concerns amount to no more than personal lifestyle choices and are not discriminated categorisations per se

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Please see above. in particular as regards the need for more specific definition of transgender in line with the EA 2010. and the reference to lifestyle choices. There is a clear need to differentiate between discriminatory behaviour based upon the protected characteristics in the EA 2010 which a proven demonstrable need has been shown and a lifestyle choice or paraphilia. Were these groups to be included why not also obesity, poverty, poor dress sense?

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: See above

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Agreed

Question 10: No this is inappropriate. Does one become the target of hate incident recording if one challenges an apparently sound bodied person entering a disabled toilet? Mistakes can be made

Question 11: Yes

Expand: Biological women suffer the same structural and historical based discrimination as do people of colour and should be afforded the same rights and protections under the law The proposal to use the term sex is more appropriate than gender as argued.

Question 11 Part 2: Agreed this is appropriate

Question 12: The offence should be limited to women for the reasons as stated that misogyny is endemic in our society.

Question 13: No

Expand: Agreed the term 'women' is more appropriate and that the hate crime should specifically be in respect of biological females only. transgender is already a specific category for hate crime and trans women cannot be said to be subject to the same forms of discrimination and harm as natal women

Question 14: No

Expand: See above

Question 15: Agreed

Question 16: Older people only

Question 17: No I disagree with the contention that sex work is work It is a necessary and last resort of women if they are not victims of the sex trade and trafficking. If however it is classified as work, why should it be afforded protections other unpopular forms of work are not afforded?

Question 18: No, lifestyle choices should not be afforded the same status in law as discrimination based on the protected characteristics of the EA 2010. This undermines the force of sanctions imposed for the serious and harmful impact on society of such discriminatory behaviour.

Question 19: No. Does this meet the criteria for hate crime legislation set out in the consultation? As with many of the proposed categories singled out for special treatment here the mere fact that there is a higher than average incidence of crime driven by or perceived as based upon discriminatory attitudes does not mean they are large in number given that the proportion of the population in those groups is very small

Question 20: They should be protected in the same way as religious beliefs.

Question 21: No

Expand: As a practicing defence solicitor dealing with these offences almost daily I have some concerns about the first limb of proving the aggravating element of offences requiring no mens rea, ie. demonstrating. This is of particular concern with offences under s5 Public order Act 1986 which also of itself does not require proof of any intent The fact remains that a very substantial number of offenders caught up charged with aggravated offences blurt out something on the spur of the moment There is nothing more telling than when a white male attends court with a black partner and mixed race child charged with a racially aggravated

offence on the basis of shouting out something akin to "black bastard" during the course of an altercation. He may just as well have called out "fat bastard". I would like to suggest that the enhanced sentencing regime should be based upon motivation but that is likely to result in a massive increase in the number of Newton Hearings.

Question 22: No

Expand: See above The effect on defendants in terms of impact on sentence, criminal record and the distress caused to many charged with an aggravated offence when they have genuinely held belief they do not hold discriminatory attitudes is significant and ought to be subject to rigorous standards of criminal law Mens Rea is an essential element of most criminal offences (there are only a handful that can be proved on strict liability) and the current regime for aggravated offences and sentence uplift stand outside that norm

Question 23: Yes see above

Question 24: Yes

Expand: But only as subject to the above

Question 25: No

Expand: See previous answers in relation to transgender, non binary and the need to differentiate other forms of discriminatory behaviour from race and religion. The current legislative framework allows for sentence uplift to mark the hate crime element which is sufficient. Including a raft of rarely heard of forms of hate crime undermines the significance in particular of racial hate crime which should be marked out both because of its prevalence and social importance.

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand: Communications offences are an area of particular concern in this day and age of social media and in particular the way in which women are accused of hateful behaviour simply by questioning the dogma of the transgender lobby and discussing how this impacts sex based rights. The offences are in need of reform in any event and are also under consultation The law must be considered very carefully in context of freedom of opinion and expression. "To criticise the colour of someone's skin is irrational. To criticise someone's religion or politics is a wholly different matter. I could go so far as to say that it is a fundamental human right that we are able to do so " (Lord Hunt, 2005, HoL c 1073)

Question 28: No

Expand: Sentence uplifts are already available. there is no necessity

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33: Yes

Question 34: Yes

Question 35:

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: I do not support expanding aggravated offences beyond sex and propose enhanced sentencing remain

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand: For most aggravated offences defendants have a right to elect trial by jury Sentencing on an enhanced basis where the aggravated offence could have been charged will often result in denying the right of a jury trial This is not in the interests of justice and amounts to an abuse of process..

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: Accountable but not under the criminal law.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hate crimes should be abolished if a person commits a crime, he should be prosecuted for that crime. Adding subjective ideas about hate (or other thoughts) is counter-productive and leads to all kinds of injustice

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Has the crime been committed by the person charged or not? Adding subjective ideas about what the accused thinks is not just but political.

Question 3: No

Expand: This is all based on political correctness rather than justice. The Law Commission should understand the damage that is done currently by so called "hate crime" involvement in the Justice System. It brings the law into disrepute. Think of the current anti lockdown demonstrations: they could be interpreted as hate against vulnerable people. But that is not the case.

Question 4: You do not change people's ideas about race by legislation. I was talking to a person at the weekend who left London in the early 1970s when he was a boy. His parents "saw the way things were going" so they decided to move away to the coast. When I asked what he meant, he said it was because of the immigrants.

That is the way some people see the race issue. Right or wrong - it is their view. Penalising criminals for their way of thinking does not help the cause of addressing racism. Indeed, certain people may be unfairly targeted as committing crimes (with aggravating racial ideas) because of their upbringing. This is obviously unfair. Adding migration or asylum or language status to this merely compounds the problem. It does not improve justice.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: Again, religious tolerance is a subject close to my heart. But I would not want religious hatred as an aggravating characteristic in a criminal investigation. I know of cases of harassment and criminal activity against people of various beliefs in this country. We should prosecute them on the basis of the crimes, and not resort to special pleading that the religious connections makes it worse. Indeed, in certain jury cases, that might work against the prosecution's case if the defendant is of the same faith as a majority of the jury.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: This shows the problem of how jurors can sympathise with criminals of their own faith. It is a version of the freedom fighter/gunman/terrorist argument. Stick to the crime - the motive was to commit the crime for various gains. By confusing the case with the religion involved, the law runs the risk of losing the clarity that the crime has been committed by the accused. That is the issue. Why the defendant did it in terms of religious/sectarian culture is best left alone.

Question 7: Again, political correctness strikes back. This is not a victims' charter. If the law is broken, then prosecute the case - adding this kind of thing just confuses the case, and certain victims, if they stand to profit from the case, are incentivised to use such special pleading to extract more punishment. This is using the law in a way that the general public find distasteful, as well as being against natural justice.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: This is unnecessary - see above.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: This is unnecessary see above

Question 8 Part 3: Forget it.

Question 9: No comment

Question 10: "But the criminal law does not treat all of those protected characteristics equally. This means that someone who is assaulted based on disability is not afforded the same protection as someone who is assaulted because of their race "

This is exactly the point: there is no equivalence between the protected characteristics. Trying to bring equivalence between crimes committed against different people who are attacked because of their beliefs/sexuality/disability/etc is a fool's errand. Prosecute the crime. Leave the protected characteristics out of it.

Question 11: No

Expand: Same applies as above. But there is an additional complication in the case of deliberate sex crimes (like rape). Proposing that sex should be a protected characteristic could surely lead to ALL rape cases becoming hate crimes.

Interestingly, Jesus tells us exactly that: all crimes are about hate at the base.

Question 11 Part 2: Again, the crimes should be prosecuted. Adding a hate dimension does not help.

Question 12: If sex or gender-based hate crime protection were limited to women (ignoring for a moment that the non-binary are already included elsewhere) would immediately be seen as discriminatory. For example, male on male rape is much more hushed up than male on female rape. Indeed, female on male attacks are also treated less seriously by the police, being often laughed at as unbecoming. If the aim of hate crime protection is to discourage such offences, then these crimes would be left unaffected.

Again, prosecute the crime. Leave the hate out of it (and accept that all crimes are hate crimes because you do not commit crimes against those that you love).

Question 13: No

Expand: Again, this would be seen as unfair against men.

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: "Sex or gender" avoids the issue of arguing about whether it was a sex or a gender hatred.

Question 15: Again, prosecute the crime. The age of the victim or indeed the criminal is already part of the relevant law (age of consent, age of accountability etc.)

Question 16: Again, why protect one group and not another. There have been various age-based tirades against younger people in recent days.

Question 17: Again, this is leading to trying to achieve equivalence. Killing a policeman used to be considered worse than killing anyone else. Would killing a sex worker be worse? Or not so bad? Or what about killing a rent boy as opposed to a female prostitute?

Prosecute the crime.

Question 18: No. Please stop inventing even more categories.

Question 19: No. Please stop inventing even more categories.

Question 20: No. Please stop inventing even more categories.

Question 21: No

Expand: I have been a juror where a case of assault was prosecuted. Instead of sticking to the facts of the case, the prosecution got caught up with trying to demonstrate a racial motive when it simply detracted from the hard evidence. Aggravated offences may be hard enough adding this is not necessary, or just.

Question 22: No

Expand: This in some ways is the heart of the problem. A person does not need to hate a characteristic - protected or not - the point is that the criminal hates the victim. Trying to pin that hate to a particular characteristic does not further justice at all. Indeed, it may perversely encourage crimes against "normal" (whatever that means) people on the basis that "if I get caught, it is not so bad".

Question 23: Irrelevant see above (Q22)

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: Given the rest of your proposals, I find this bewildering

Question 30: No

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: Given the rest of your proposals, I find this bewildering

Question 32: Do you really want to confuse juries?

Question 33: No comment

Question 34: No stick to one charge this makes it sound like you would go for the hardest and fall back on the least if you fail. Not good.

Question 35: No comment

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: More subjectivity is not a good thing in this case.

Question 38 Part 2: This complexity is what results from a flawed approach.

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: Minded to say yes, given that, if the aggravated offence could have been pursued but was not, then it seems unfair to increase the sentence when it was not proven by the case

Question 40: Other (please expand)

Expand: There could be problems where "all material" includes abbreviated or edited recordings (video or audio) It is a version of the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth .

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: Not sure about the implications of this

Question 42: No

Expand: (3) Unless intention to stir up hatred is proved, no offence would be committed by showing a recording

Delete: that has been certified by the British Board of Film Classification or licensed for cinema performance by a local authority

News or debate or documentary items would not go through BBFC or anyone else.

Question 43 Part 1: The companies could only become liable once they have been told about the material, and given a certain amount of time to remove it However, laws on unlawful material vary between countries So there may be a defence around it not being unlawful in the hosting country. For instance, the Charlie Hebdo cartoons of Mohammed were lawful in France, but not in many (if any) Muslim-majority countries Should the hosts be criminally liable? No.

Question 43 Part 2: In cases of dissemination of inflammatory material where no intention to stir up hatred can be shown, what is the crime? Inflammatory material is material A lot of comedy would come unstuck on this, as would serious philosophical debate. Best to leave well alone!

Question 44: This "likely to" is subjectivity in a nut shell

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: Not sure

Question 46: No

Expand: This is fraught with cultural misunderstandings. Arguments between people from different backgrounds could easily fall foul of this kind of argument

Question 47: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sounds a bit easy needs to be tested with hard cases.

Question 47 Part 2: There is a difference between threatening and abusive. Lots of people losing an argument might take abusive as their version of events, in the same way that

someone who does not understand freedom of speech might think that not honouring his god is insulting.

Threatening is easier to argue as illegal; abusive and insulting are not the same as threatening, and freedom of speech has to allow abusive and insulting language, otherwise it is not free.

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: Wrongfooted approach see above

Question 51: No

Expand: What we say or do in homes should not become part of this just because it can
And note we have got down to Q51 before this has been raised. How many people gave up with this consultation long before they got here?

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Nothing in [the offences of stirring up religious hatred] shall be read or given effect in a way which prohibits or restricts discussion, criticism or expressions of antipathy, dislike, ridicule, insult or abuse of particular religions or the beliefs or practices of their adherents, or of any other belief system or the beliefs or practices of its adherents, or proselytising or urging adherents of a different religion or belief system to cease practising their religion or belief system.

In [relation to the offences of stirring up hatred on the grounds of sexual orientation], for the avoidance of doubt, the discussion or criticism of sexual conduct or practices or the urging of persons to refrain from or modify such conduct or practices... [or] any discussion or criticism of marriage which concerns the sex of the parties to marriage shall not be taken of itself to be threatening or intended to stir up hatred.

Question 52 Part 2: Transgender identity, and sex or gender are already covered by 29JA. Not sure that an equivalent for disability adds value

Question 53: Not sure that an equivalent for race adds value.

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: Nothing should be done to prevent current freedoms being used.

Question 55 Part 2: I hope that these reports are already free of concerns from the offence. The presumption of exemption should be employed

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand: Doesn't indecent cover all things sexual in this context of chanting?

Question 57 Part 2: No comment

Question 58: Gestures should be allowed but missile throwing is dangerous

Question 59: No - the law currently covers that.

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Definitely against such an idea - we do not need any more commissioners!
And the evidence from existing commissioners is not good.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: None

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: There are different types of situations/ freedom of speech/ discussions/ mobs fighting/ terrorism etc that have to be dealt with differently. They have different opinions without hating the opposition,

Question 2: No

Expand: Different situations and circumstances, need to be treated seperately

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: Not sure

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7: Don't think so

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Yes

Question 10: Not sure

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: Girls should be protected from FGM

Question 12: Women only

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: Yes age should be relevant

Question 16: All ages

Question 17: Not sure

Question 18: No

Question 19: Yes

Question 20: No

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: Action / violence would have to be used

Question 23: Not used

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: Not sure

Question 30: No

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33: Yes

Question 34: Not sure

Question 35: No

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Yes

Question 38 Part 2: Not sure

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand: Not sure

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: Intentions to inform not stirring hatred should allowed,

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2: Not sure

Question 44: Not sure

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1: Not sure

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand: Definitely causing hatred

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand: Not sure

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61: Yes

Question 62: No

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: The existing hate crime laws should be abolished. They have demonstrated in practice their tendency to increase the level of injustice in society and to worsen relationships between social groups, and to put certain innocent people and groups at risk.

It is also the case that the hate crime laws are being weaponised against good citizens who express legitimate opinions in defence of other groups. The concept of "hate" has been redefined to include expressing an opinion at variance with the current orthodoxy relating to that minority group. People are ending up with police records as a result of the recording of "hate crime incidents" where no culpability needs to be established, as the sufficient justification for the police record is simply an accusation by another party with an assertion that they subjectively feel the putative action was motivated by "hate". There is also a pecking order in relation to minority rights. At the present time, extreme gender ideology is fashionable and dominant in certain domains: an ideology that threatens the rights of women and of children – especially gay and lesbian children, gender non-conforming children and children with high functioning autism. All the groups whose rights are threatened are treated as though their rights are less important than the rights asserted by extreme gender ideology.

Question 2: No

Expand: As explained above, the current hate crime laws are detrimental to minority rights and deserve to be abolished. People are ending up with disclosable police records for "hate crime incidents" where no proof or even evidence is needed that any such hateful action has been committed, and where people are unable to clear their name, or even know in most cases that a hate crime incident has been logged against their name.

Question 3: No

Expand: As set out above, the concept of "hate crime" needs to be abolished.

Question 4: No. This would have a chilling effect on free speech, and will undermine respect for the law in general. It is a recipe for very serious social discord.

Question 5: No

Expand: The definition of "religion" will continue to grow to the extent that people will be inhibited from basic and legitimate free speech. If hate crime laws are to continue to exist, your focus should be on ensuring that the rights of Christians should be properly protected from hate. As the law stands, religious hatred towards Christians is being ignored by the police in respect of crimes committed against them.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: The laws should be abolished completely.

Question 7: This is absurd. No.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: How could you make a mistake of this kind as the Law Commission? Being "transgender" does not currently feature as a protected characteristic. The protected characteristic is "gender reassignment".

No, inclusion of any of these specious categories will simply have a chilling effect on public dialogue and will undermine public respect in the rule of law. All of these categories have no

scientific basis, and they are also being used to undermine the rights of women, of gay, lesbian, gender-non conforming and high-functioning autistic children, and of members of the public who are defending the rights of the latter groups

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: These are unscientific categories. They undermine respect in the rule of law and endanger the rights of other groups

Question 8 Part 3: It should not happen. You are fomenting social unrest among working-class British people who will refuse to surrender their right to freedom of speech and discussion, and who refuse to see their gay and lesbian children and their autistic children being caught up in extreme gender ideology and their female relatives having their sex-based rights and protections taken away by biological men claiming to self identify as women (including biological men who do this simply because they are predatory and wish to access women's spaces with ulterior motives). This constitutes a very serious attack on women and on the rights of gay and lesbian people (most of whom oppose the gender extremist outfit Stonewall that is aggressively championing gender ideology) and on the rights of autistic children and children in general.

Question 9: Hate crime legislation should be abolished

Question 10: Hate crime laws should be abolished.

Question 11: No

Expand: Sex is a biological fact "Gender" is an unscientific concept that is subjective, non verifiable and non falsifiable Conflating sex and gender will undermine women's and girls sex based rights and protections.

Question 11 Part 2: Sex, not gender, should be the protected characteristic in hate crime legislation, should it continue. Hate crime laws should be abolished.

Question 12: You should not be conflating sex and "gender", as explained above. If you continue with sex based hate crime definitions, it should include both biological men and biological women.

Question 13: No

Expand: Misogyny is the appropriate word, and the only women who can be victims of misogyny are biological women.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex is a scientifically-established and verifiable/ falsifiable term Gender is something completely different. It is a subjective concept based on 1950s sex stereotypes that we should have been able to progress beyond in 2020. The two concepts should not be conflated

Question 15: Hate crime laws should be abolished. If they are to continue, then age should also be a protected characteristic Ageism is currently the only socially acceptable form of vilification among the woke activists who are trying to extend the regressive scourge of hate crime legislation.

Question 16: Hate crime laws should be abolished If they continue, then the vulnerable group is clearly older people, who are frequently attacked and undermined simply because of their age. Younger people are in the process of learning and maturing, and hate crime

legislation that forbids commentary on a young person's inexperience or lack of knowledge will be detrimental to social relationships and young people's personal development.

Question 17: No Hate crime legislation should be abolished Prostitutes (many of whom are coerced into these activities, where they are seriously and systematically abused by men) should be protected by other legal means. The term "sex workers", by the way, does not do justice to the many women who are coerced by poverty or other duress into prostitution "Sex work" is a term that serves to legitimise and normalise an experience that for many women and girls is an experience of oppression and exploitation, and a very dangerous one

Question 18: No This will further encourage the chilling of freedom of speech

Question 19: No. Homeless people should be protected by the law in the same way as every other citizen

Question 20: No This will chill freedom of speech It will end up creating a silenced and anxious society more redolent of the Stasi than anything else.

Question 21: No

Expand: Hate crime laws should be abolished

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hate crime legislation should be abolished If it is not, the current legal position should be maintained.

Question 23: These are subjective concepts. No.

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: Yes they need to accept responsibility for this, due to the reach of their platform and the power they confer on malicious individuals to do harm to good citizens.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: The laws should be abolished.

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 47: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand: Gender is a subjective concept and should be excluded

Question 50: The hate laws should be abolished completely.

Question 51: No

Expand: This would be a very serious attack on freedom of speech and privacy.

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: No

Question 53:

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand: Abolition of hate crime laws needed

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: No.

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60: Yes

Question 61: Yes

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: The existing legislation is more than adequate. In fact any any existing legislation considered as hate crime should be amended to remove any hate related provisions as these so called hate motivations are subjective considerations and only the basic offences should criminalised or subject to enhance sentencing.

Question 2: No

Expand: The law should be amended to remove all cases of protected characteristics as this as led to some citizens being considered as "more equal than others" and created an unequal playing field in the field of Justice.

Question 3: No

Expand: With respect to item 1) If demonstrable need is to be used then the evidence must be overwhelming and the methodology and data supporting such should be published and subject to public consultation before any implementation and in addition there should be a regular periodic review of the data to ensure there is a continuing need. There should be a "sunset" clause to remove any redundant criteria or protected characteristic

With respect to item 2) I do not believe that there is additional harm. Evidence should also be as in my response to 1) above "should be published and subject to public consultation before any implementation and in addition there should be a regular periodic review of the data to ensure there is a continuing need. There should be a "sunset" clause to remove any redundant criteria or protected characteristic"

With respect to item 3) None of this is suitable as it creates an uneven playing field between citizens again some being "more equal than others"

Question 4: These definitions should not be amended in to include any additional status whether related to migration or asylum status There should absolutely be no references to the use of any language. There is far too much danger to the impact on the democratic process if "hate crime" legislation is used with any reference to language used and any status which is rightly in the political domain and will likely cause a potential unintended consequence of stifling legitimate public debate as society seeks to develop informed policy alternatives for difficult social issues In addition not all members of society are equally skilled in their use of language and would adversely affect those lesser verbally skilled members of society whose opinions in public debate and politics are as important and pertinent as the more articulate It is perfectly reasonable to "offend" with words and indeed is a requirement as claiming "offence" is in reality a passive aggressive method of asserting dominance in political debate and should not be in the legal domain.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: Religion should be removed from all hate crime legislation. Religion is a belief and like all beliefs should be in the personal domain and if people cannot criticise or make perceived "offensive" commentary then there should be a level playing field and religious proselytising should also be subject to legislative restrictions.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: I would rather all religious groups have no protected status

Question 7: Legal definitions of sexual orientation should not be expanded. The expansion of the various definitions of gender and sexual orientation and the consequent rise in special interest groups and the various "turf wars" this has generated has resulted a significant rise in the use of police resources to monitor and police "Stasi" like actions for issues that should rightly be open to the "fresh air" of public political debate which has had the consequence of people having "criminal" records for "non crimes" and even stifling debate by children in schools. It has also allowed the development of treating children with experimental therapies for gender related issues and the stifling of public debate on these therapies and policies

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: The current definition is more than adequate. I believe the proposal is seeking to create an additional pool of potential victims with additional rights to the average citizen In addition this proposal should be explained to the public in terms of hard data on the

increase in numbers of potential victims and the methodology of establishing the data should be subject to public consultation

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: This will only result in pressure to increase numbers of different protected characteristics with a consequent increase in numbers expecting special privileges in society and opportunities for forming confected "hate crimes" with the consequential increase in use of police resources

Question 8 Part 3: Do not change any definitions particularly as "fashions in sexual orientation" change rapidly

Question 9: This is OK

Question 10: No this should not. People with disabilities lie on a spectrum on whether they wish to make known to the world the extent of their disabilities ranging from being offended if a person asks politely if they have any disability to proudly proclaiming their disabilities. It is thus invidious to expect anyone not to make a false presumption on disability whether they indulge in criminal activity or not

Question 11: No

Expand: This is another case of elevating certain citizens above others and to use gender and or sex this has the potential of elevating potentially one half of the population to higher status than others. If misogyny is treated as subject to hate crime then so should misandry.

Question 11 Part 2: There should be no carve outs the sexual crimes should be punished in their own rights as crimes against the person. In addition FGM has not had a great deal of success in terms of actual prosecutions. So a sledge hammer to crack a nut.

Question 12: My preference is no gender based hate crime protection. If any then it should be not limited but should include both men and women. We should not be making separate statuses for our citizens

Question 13: No

Expand: Misogyny is more than adequate.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex should be the only category as it the only category that can have a scientific objective definition. Gender as used in current parlance is merely subjective is to use a metaphor a moving feast

Question 15: No We should not have different levels of citizenship in society

Question 16: There should be no age based hate crime and if there is then every citizen should have the same status

Question 17: No If they are subject to a crime then the perpetrator should be punished for the crime they commit and only that

Question 18: No Any culture should be capable of ridicule and that is all culture whether or not considered an "alternative subculture"

Question 19: No. If they are subject to a crime then that should be punished. Political debate on homelessness should not be stifled as this is an intractable social problem and full

public debate is needed however badly expressed by any participant. Everyone's views are valid.

Question 20: No Any belief whether philosophical or religious should be able to be subject to derision as belief is something that is in the personal domain. If a philosophical belief is a hate crime category then equally expressing that belief should be a hate crime as that could also cause "offence"

Question 21: No

Expand: It should be beyond all reasonable doubt

Question 22: No

Expand: Hostility is too subjective and can too easily be confused with anger . For example a can be angry with the behaviour of a person with protected characteristics and assault them or be hostile towards someone with protected characteristics and assault them These are too similar.

Question 23: Motivation or prejudice is too subjective to establish

Question 24: No

Expand: The basic crime should be punished without higher maximum penalties. There is insufficient evidence it acts as deterrent and is unlikely to result in improved rehabilitation rates

Question 25: No

Expand: The basic crime should be punished without higher maximum penalties There is insufficient evidence it acts as deterrent and is unlikely to result in improved rehabilitation rates

Question 26: No

Expand: Aggravated versions of offences is a very bad idea. The sentencing tarrif ranges for offences should be sufficient for individual offences without having to have additional aggravating versions If you are subject to a knife attack whether you have a protected status or not it is still just a knife attack which should be punished.

Question 27: No

Expand: The existing tarrif should be sufficient

Question 28: No

Expand: The existing tarrif is sufficient I do not believe there is any additional deterrent effect

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: None

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: Intersectionality is a nonsensical political movement that is divisive to society and create sa hierachy of competing victimhood. Just use existing tarriffs without recourse to this nonsense A knife attack is a knife attack

Question 33: No view

Question 34: The Courts should not be empowered to always find a defendant guilty on the base offence if only the aggravated offence is prosecuted The prosecution can be too easily tempted to not properly prepare their case and risk a miscarriage of justice.

Question 35: No view

Question 36: No

Expand: Enhanced sentencing does not increase deterrence or improve rehabilitation

Question 37: No

Expand: This adds nothing to justice

Question 38 Part 1: Elimination of protective characteristics from sentencing is preferred any flexible approach should be used in the direction of non inclusion

Question 38 Part 2: There should be no residual category as this should always be subject to parliamentary approval. The sentencing guidance should always be to encourage the judge to exclude protected characteristics if possible

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: This is just an attack on freedom of expression and art.

Question 41: No

Expand: A general attack on freedom of expression and is censorship in disguise

Question 42: No

Expand: Existing legislation in these areas are more than adequate. This is further creep on censorship and freedom of expression in the arts

Question 43 Part 1: They should be treated as publishers.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: "likely to" should also be teamed with "and immediately" and any definition should be in statute and the definition shouls tend towards a direction of certainty.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The bar should be set very high and it should be neccessary to demonstrate that the words used were threatening, abusive or insulting.

Question 46: No

Expand: If intent to to stir up hatred cannot be proven then the case should fall

All the items listed in items 1 to 4 are subjective in nature and particularly for items 3 and 4 it relies on a defendant being able to see into the mind of others and knowing how they would react even if they have never met those people. This is a real attack on freedom of speech and expression. There is no universal acceptance of "ought to have known" much less how it can be objectively measured.

Question 47: No

Expand: All protected characteristics are different with different sensitivities so "the likely to" threshold will be different.

Question 47 Part 2: Everything should be clearly defined with different threshold and agreed in statute. Insulting should be excluded completely as this falls completely in the freedom of expression and no one in society should have a right not to be insulted

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand: Never gender only ever the objective sex characteristic if at all

Question 50: No special protected characteristics

Question 51: No

Expand: Dangerous move into peoples personal family lives. This is Stasi like and would be supported by the Chinese Communist Party. Not the UK

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand: No View

Question 52 Part 2: No View

Question 53: No View

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand: No View

Question 55 Part 1: No View

Question 55 Part 2: There should be extensive exemptions

Question 56: No

Expand: A waste of public and police resources

Question 57: No

Expand: A waste of public and police resources. An other case of censorship and not a major issue

Question 57 Part 2: A waste of public and police resources. An other case of censorship and not a major issue

Question 58: Missile throwing fine Not gestures

Question 59: No.

Question 60: No

Question 61: Sufficient

Question 62: No Hate crime is not a major issue in the UK This would just be more devisive and start a "hate" industry including ambulance chasing lawyer activist sowing greater discontent

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: The privacy notice says that if your response is anonymous we will not include your name in the list unless you have given us permission to do so. I wish to remain anonymous

Question 1: No

Expand: We already have a number of laws and the common law

Question 2: No

Expand: 1 .We already have protections for racially and religiously aggravated assaults/criminal damage/public order and harassment offences and enhanced sentencing for the protected characteristics of race/religion/sexual orientation/disability/transgender identity.

2 Having an expandable list opens the law up to the vagaries of whatever the prevailing political climate is It is conceivable that the executive could come under pressure in the future from pressure groups claiming to speak for a homogenous identity group to add their self-defined group to the list of protected characteristics

- The law should serve to protect a nation from such whims and should not be open to manipulation in this way.

Permitting an expandable list enables additional characteristics to be added without a proper consultation and scrutiny by the general public. Proper consultation is a key part of a true democracy.

3 All victims should be equal before the law Expanding the list of protected characteristics beyond the current protections widens the door to a person falling within a protected identity group alleging that an offence committed against them was committed against them because of that identity rather than simply having a crime committed against them at random.

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: Demonstrable Need On the basis of the rhetoric in the consultation documentation it is not clear that the law would be implemented in this way. Some of the characteristics that have been posed as potentially being added in the future are very loose indeed; for example, taking goths as an example of an alternative subculture; (speaking from some experience) do goths really view themselves as a coherent group with communal objectives and needs? Continuing with that example by way of illustration, there may be some very vocal people who identify as goths who claim that their views represent those of a

homogenous group identity, but in reality such a disparate group is likely to have different beliefs, different needs and different concerns, yet the variances within this group could get whitewashed by the voices of a vocal few. In reality at present if any goth were subject say to an assault, they would already be protected by the current law and there is no need to include them as a protected characteristic: this is unnecessary.

We need to retain the right to challenge all views in society, whether they come from a group with a protected characteristic or not. Implementing draconian laws will result in people fearing to speak out against injustices caused by a group with a protected characteristic. Taking sex workers as an example, a minority of sex workers currently speak vocally in the public eye as if they speak for all sex workers. Whilst some sex workers have chosen that line of work out of choice and enjoy their work, some narratives insist that all sex workers are similarly satisfied. That is just not the case; the majority of workers are either trafficked or are in poverty or on hard drugs. In all these examples they do not have a voice so are not able to speak up for themselves as well as the satisfied few. We cannot be in a situation where it is unlawful to criticise the arena of sex work because a minority of sex workers have campaigned for protection as a protected characteristic and where all subsequent criticism of sex work is prohibited. This is one example.

Suitability With reference to the comments about an 'efficient use of criminal justice resources', the law as it currently stands is not being interpreted correctly by the police (who are following the College of Policing guidelines). The reality is that 'innocent until proven guilty' does not apply. Their guidance states that

"Where the victim, or any other person, perceives that they have been targeted because of hate or hostility against a monitored or non-monitored personal characteristic, the incident should be recorded and flagged as a hate crime (where circumstances meet crime recording standards), or a non-crime hate incident. The victim does not have to justify or provide evidence of their belief for the purposes of reporting, and police officers or staff should not directly challenge this perception" and further:

"Where a case cannot be prosecuted as a hate crime, the flag will remain on file".

Even if a matter is prosecuted, under the current legal aid system, many people would be left having to defend themselves at their own cost.

How will the new law, if enacted, prevent such abuses of the law from occurring? If there is a new law it is essential that crimes are not recorded on the basis of perception, but only if a crime is successfully prosecuted. This is the case for other criminal offences such as rape and there should not be an abuse of the criminal justice system in the enforcement of such laws. There should also be adequate funding for those who have to defend themselves from these claims.

Question 4: I do not believe this is necessary

Were an assault to be made on a migrant or asylum seeker, this would be prosecutable in any event, and potentially might constitute an offence under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and/or fall within the enhanced sentencing provisions of the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

Going further than assaults and into the realm of hate speech, we do not want to create a legal framework which makes it potentially costly for people to voice disagreement with migration and/or the asylum process.

Given the protections already afforded by the current law it would be dangerous to move towards a situation where free speech is damaged. Article 9 and 10 of the ECHR uphold the

right to freedom of thought and freedom of expression and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers. The law should seek to protect these rights and not infringe on them

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Is intersex really part of transgenderism? In my view they are very different and I suspect that intersex people would agree. I do not want to speak for intersex people though This needs to be carefully discussed with people who are intersex (rather than with the transgender lobby per se).

Cross dressing any legislation needs to preserve the right for organisations to have a dress code.

I have an issue with the word 'presumed'. Presumed by whom? This is so subjective. We cannot say what is in someone's mind We cannot criminalise for example hate speech where the person being accused should have presumed that someone was non binary Not everyone is up to date with current social norms and people should not be liable to fall into bear traps because they are not savvy

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: See comments above.

Question 8 Part 3: If a new law is passed (see previous comments about this), any definition should be objective and not subjective, both in terms of the alleged perpetrator and the alleged victim. For example it should not be possible for me to claim to be a victim because unbeknownst to the the alleged perpetrator I self identify as falling in one of these categories.

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: I am female and I do not agree

In terms of crimes that fall into the category of assaults, there is already legislation in place to protect women and men.

In terms of the much talked about 'cat calling'; yes it can be a minor irritation but I would much rather have that irritation than reduction of free speech

In terms of 'hate speech', I point again to Article 9 and Article 10 of the ECHR. Retaining the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion and to freedom of expression, including the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers is paramount and we need to defend this

Question 11 Part 2: Of course you would need to carve out all these (and more)! But why go down this path in the first place. Inevitably something important would be left out. See comments above We do not need regulation in this area

Question 12: See comments to question 11 above. We should not have a law at all. We are dangerously intruding on free speech by proposing that we do.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Please see comments above. This should not even be on the table.

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: See comments above

Question 15: Again, I don't see why this needs to come into hate crime. If someone has a crime committed against them, they would be protected under the current law. In terms of widening 'hate speech' to cover age, again we need to protect freedom of speech and Articles 9 and 10 of the ECHR.

However, we do need to protect the elderly from initiatives such as DNR orders

Question 16: See comments above. This should not be on the table.

Question 17: Absolutely not. I have commented on this earlier.

Moreover 'sex work' is not a 'characteristic'; it is an activity

Whilst some sex workers do the job voluntarily and enjoy this work, this is not true for all sex workers. However, this particular section of sex workers are the most vocal (having the freedom and the resources to campaign)

In fact the majority of sex workers are voiceless (having been trafficked into this country, or otherwise living in poverty and or dealing with addiction). Many are also not in sex work by choice, but are trapped in modern slavery or are in abusive relationships with pimps We need to protect those charities and workers who rightly work to help those that are stuck in prostitution. How can we enact a law which would inhibit the good work and campaigning that charities, organisations and individuals do on this front

Question 18: No, I do not think 'alternative subcultures' should fall under protected categories. See my earlier illustration about goths.

Question 19:

Question 20: No, they should not. No one has the right to be offended. We need to keep the law from interfering with freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 9 ECHR) and the right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers (Article 10 ECHR)

I do not expect everyone to hold the same philosophical beliefs as I do and I would not expect my philosophical beliefs to fall within a protected category that trumps others' ability to question, criticise or even insult those views. Similarly I want that same ability to question and debate other philosophical beliefs

Growth and depth of understanding is fostered by discussing and debating beliefs, not by supressing opposing ideas

Question 21: No

Expand: At the moment the police (following the College of Policing) are interpreting 'hostility' widely. They reference this as being 'unfriendly, adverse or antagonistic or as including ill-will, spite, contempt, prejudice, unfriendliness, antagonism, resentment and dislike'.

This is far too wide, and coupled with the issue that the police record every perceived hate crime, whether or not a crime has been committed and is prosecuted - leads to a dangerous situation where anyone can report someone for deemed 'ill-will', 'dislike' or 'unfriendliness' and that defendant will be listed on the hate crime register.

The definition of 'hostility' needs to be restricted to prevent abuse. We also need to avoid a world where hurt feelings and/or the perception of being wronged leads to reporting and crime recording. Coupled with the fact that it is costly (given the legal aid reforms) to defend yourself, we need to be extremely careful to make sure that any drafting is drawn narrowly.

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: It is essential that to record a hate crime or prosecute a hate crime, (a) the crime was committed and (b) an intention to commit the crime must be proven.

(It is not clear from this question what the alternative is so I have answered 'other')

Question 23: No. As stated above 'hostility' is already interpreted too widely. As the police (following the College of Policing Guidelines and not the legislation) already record every perceived hate crime, we should not widen the ambit of the law any further. The current law is already not being followed by enforcement officials so we cannot truly expect any widening of the motivation test to be correctly and wisely interpreted by the College of Policing Guidelines, and therefore implemented by the police.

Given that any further legislation on this is potentially curtailing free speech, we need to avoid creating legislation that in any way endangers free speech. It is crucial that we uphold:

- Article 9 ECHR: The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; and
- Article 10 ECHR: The right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: See comments above on:

the fact the current law is not correctly policed as it is (every perceived hate crime is recorded) so we could expect that with any widening of the law, law enforcement would similarly act outside of the legislation;

the fact that it is important we are free to debate and discuss any issue without fear of being reported or criminalised;

the importance of freedom of expression, including the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers;

- the importance of freedom of thought, conscience and religion;

the risk of vendettas (people reporting others out of spite);

the fact that there should not be a right to be offended;

- the importance of debate and discussion in growth of understanding and also in bridging differences between people;

the cost of defending yourself without legal aid, coupled with the vendetta risk above would lead to injustices where people have to spend time, energy and money in defending themselves, plus the mental health side effects of this;

the risk that we will end up with a society where people are too afraid to speak their minds

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: In respect of 'the overall numbers and relative prevalence of hate crime offending as a proportion of an offence',:

(a) why does prevalence make something aggravated.?

(b) currently the College of Policing advocate perception based recording of hate crimes, on the basis that

"Perception-based recording will help to reduce under-recording, highlight the hate element and improve understanding about hate-motivated offending "

This might be ok, but we know from their guidance and current policing that:

"The victim does not have to justify or provide evidence of their belief for the purposes of reporting, and police officers or staff should not directly challenge this perception"

and that:

"Where a case cannot be prosecuted as a hate crime, the flag will remain on file"

So the statistics themselves are flawed The hate crime statistics do not record actual hate crime offences, they are a measure of 'perceived' hate crime offences.

It is entirely possible that certain groups may be more open to perceiving that a crime has been committed against them, or be more motivated to report a crime against them (for example, having the means, the knowledge, the funds or encouragement by a campaign group to do so).

If we continue to record perceived hate crime rather than actual hate crime, we cannot use those statistics as a basis for determining that a hate crime is more prevalent. This would be flawed methodology.

Question 27: No

Expand: No, this is already dealt with within the offence of stirring up hatred. We should not have protection beyond that. There is no right to be offended and there should not be such a right The negative effect on freedom of speech of such a proposal would far outweigh the benefit.

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33: Yes, these are sufficient, particularly in the context of penalties under other laws

Question 34: No, this would encourage prosecutors to go for the aggravated offence even where it is inappropriate, in the knowledge that if the Courts didn't agree, the base offence could be charged

The reforms to legal aid in this country mean that many defendants have to pay for their defence themselves, leading in some cases to extreme impoverishment and even bankruptcy

Allowing prosecutors to have this flexibility therefore puts an unfair burden on a defendant. Were that defendant to have been prosecuted in the first case for the base offence only, their legal fees might have been lower and they might have been able to afford better legal representation. The proposal to allow the Courts to charge for the base offence in the alternative is therefore dangerous.

In addition, legislators need to consider this in the risk of vexatious reporting of hate crime (see above) and err on the side of caution.

Question 35:

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: Not if you are going to expand the ambit of aggravated offences.

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: I do not like the premise of this question. The question takes as fact that a flexible approach to characteristic protection is a desirable outcome.

I do not agree with this for the reasons previously outlined

Question 38 Part 2: No no no. see above.

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: We must protect:

- Article 10: The right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers

- Article 9: The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion
- Article 8: The right to private and family life without interference by a public authority

I am fundamentally opposed to any further erosion of these rights

Freedom to debate, analyse, disagree and criticise is paramount. See also comments below at 41 with reference to Articles 9 and 10 of the ECHR and *Matasaru v Moldova* (69714/16 and 71685/16)

Question 41: No

Expand: This is perhaps one of the most alarming part of all of the proposals contained in this consultation

Creating an offence of disseminating 'Inflammatory material' is dangerous and subjective. 'Inflammatory to whom? To the ruling classes? To a particular sub-culture? Would a humanist, atheist or someone of a different religion for example say that a bookshop selling a religious book such as the Koran is breaking the law? Is a dieting book 'fat-shaming'? This should never be enacted; the risk for this offence to be abused whether now or in the distant future is too great

You cannot work around this by trying to precisely define 'inflammatory'. As with the use of the word 'hostility' under the CDA 1998, the CPS and College of Policing would no doubt simply look to the the OED. A check of the dictionary comes up with the definition: 'arousing or intended to arouse angry or violent feelings' .

So 'inflammatory' is defined by the perception of the victim and not necessarily by the intention of the alleged perpetrator. However, even if the 'perpetrator' knowingly disseminated material knowing that the content would make some people angry, why should this be legislated against? This is a severe violation of our right to:

- Article 9: The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion
- Article 10: The right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers

As the European Court of Human Rights held in a judgment delivered on 15 April 2019 in *Matasaru v Moldova* (69714/16 and 71685/16):

...freedom of expression, as secured in paragraph 1 of Article 10 of the Convention, constitutes one of the essential foundations of a democratic society, indeed one of the basic conditions for its progress and for the self fulfilment of the individual Subject to paragraph 2, it is applicable not only to “information” or “ideas” that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also to those that offend, shock or disturb the State or any section of the population Such are the demands of that pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness without which there is no “democratic society”.

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: This would do away with the need to prove actual stirring up hatred had occurred. As with other criminal offences there must be both the act and the intention. Why are there proposals to deviate from this and why does this particular offence warrant this special treatment? Having the act and the intention should be sacrosanct.

Question 46: No

Expand: As above, this would do away with the need to prove actual stirring up hatred had occurred. As with other criminal offences there must be both the act and the intention. Why are there proposals to deviate from this and why does this particular offence warrant this special treatment? Having the act and the intention should be sacrosanct.

Furthermore there should not be a right to be offended. Particularly bearing in mind the proposals to extend the number of protected characteristics. The combined result would be devastating for free speech in our society.

The use of the terms 'threatening' and 'abusive' are difficult to define. Also 'ought to have known' is far too subjective.

Even the threat of being reported for this offence could result in people being scared to speak out or debate in society. Debate, discussion and yes, sometimes disagreement, are healthy and essential in society.

Why is this even on the table? Again, I point to

- Article 9: The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; and
- Article 10: The right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers

As the European Court of Human Rights held in a judgment delivered on 15 April 2019 in *Matasaru v Moldova* (69714/16 and 71685/16):

freedom of expression, as secured in paragraph 1 of Article 10 of the Convention, constitutes one of the essential foundations of a democratic society, indeed one of the basic conditions for its progress and for the self fulfilment of the individual. Subject to paragraph 2, it is applicable not only to “information” or “ideas” that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also to those that offend, shock or disturb the State or any section of the population. Such are the demands of that pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness without which there is no “democratic society” ”

Question 47: No

Expand: There are so many proposed characteristics; they should not all be treated as the same

For example race or being intersex is ascribed at birth and can't change.

Sexual preference, religion, philosophical beliefs, transgender identities and certain sub culture identities develop and/or are behaviours and beliefs. Also people can change these preferences and beliefs over time. Therefore, we need to retain the ability to discuss and debate these so that people are free to make up their own minds, change, grow, develop, learn, teach and listen. This is all part of what freedom of speech is about. We should be

seeking to protect freedom of speech as it is imperative in a democratic, strong, successful, open, dynamic and positive society.

The proposals therefore are inherently dangerous

Question 47 Part 2: See above.

Question 48: No

Expand: Not in respect of transgender identity

- We need to be able to debate transgender politics. For example the recent case with the Tavistock centre where the court has ruled that court orders need to be obtained before starting children on certain treatments. There are cases of people who have had transgender surgery when they were young who later regretted it and believe that they were mis-handled and not protected by the NHS. We should be free to debate these matters in society without it being a hate crime

This is not a once and for all identity. Some people have moved in and out of this identity. Again for that reason, we should be free to debate transgender politics

There are already existing protections in the current legislation, for example the enhanced sentencing regime under sections 145 and 146 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

Disability is different: in the example in Q27 above, it is more akin to race or being intersex, being fixed.

Question 49: No

Expand: For the reasons given above

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Again, this is one of the most alarming parts of the proposals

Article 8 of the ECHR enshrines the right to private and family life without interference by a public authority. What someone does, thinks, reads, discusses or debates within their own private dwelling is their own business

(And further beyond their own private dwelling they should have the right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers)

The removal of this defence results in the unfettered involvement of the state in private affairs and should not be entertained

The very narrow circumstances the removal of this defence is seeking to manage quoted in the report does not in any way justify the sheer erosion of private freedom suggested by this proposal. It would do more harm than good. We do not need to erode freedoms in order to correct 'anomalies'

The removal of this defence would also lead to a Stasi-like situation, with individuals being reported for their private activities. People would be afraid to hold dinner parties and entertain others in case anyone said anything another took offence at and people would not be able to trust each other.

People could abuse the removal of this defence by maliciously reporting others

Add to this the extensions that are being proposed to the Public Order Act above to extend 'stirring up hatred' to all materials, and the potential outcome is dire.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Yes, these protections should remain in the Public Order Act. These are imperative for protecting freedoms. Vocal campaigners may argue that these should be removed, but these are essential defences to the Public Order Act and there should be no question of them being removed.

Again, the following are critical:

- Article 9: The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion
- Article 10: The right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers

As the European Court of Human Rights held in a judgment delivered on 15 April 2019 in *Matasaru v Moldova* (69714/16 and 71685/16):

freedom of expression, as secured in paragraph 1 of Article 10 of the Convention, constitutes one of the essential foundations of a democratic society, indeed one of the basic conditions for its progress and for the self fulfilment of the individual. Subject to paragraph 2, it is applicable not only to “information” or “ideas” that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also to those that offend, shock or disturb the State or any section of the population. Such are the demands of that pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness without which there is no “democratic society”.

Question 52 Part 2: Yes, these same protections should apply to all protected characteristics. We cannot have a situation where the protected characteristics are widened in legislation but this defence in the Public Order Act is not similarly widened. That would be unequitable.

It is important that freedom of religion and belief is protected. Religions that have been around for thousands of years should not have to change to modern social mores and those beliefs should be protected.

Again the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion is a key right enshrined in the ECHR and we should not be infringing on the rights of people to hold certain beliefs even if other groups view those beliefs as unsavoury.

As the European Court of Human Rights held in a judgment delivered on 15 April 2019 in *Matasaru v Moldova* (69714/16 and 71685/16):

...freedom of expression, as secured in paragraph 1 of Article 10 of the Convention, constitutes one of the essential foundations of a democratic society, indeed one of the basic conditions for its progress and for the self fulfilment of the individual. Subject to paragraph 2, it is applicable not only to “information” or “ideas” that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also to those that offend, shock or disturb the State or any section of the population. Such are the demands of that pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness without which there is no “democratic society”.

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand: Yes; any additional protections that can be put in place should be put in place, particularly bearing in mind the lack of funding for criminal defence and the widening of the legislation that is proposed

As mentioned above, the guidance issued by the College of Policing and the CPS is out of kilter with the current legislation. There need to be additional protections in place to prevent cases being prosecuted that don't fit the requirements of the legislation (not the lower thresholds of the College of Policing's guidance or those of the CPS).

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No, I would not welcome this. Whenever a post is created in whatever organisation, there is always 'mission creep' That department/post once created inevitably evolves to create more power and influence for itself We would see subsequent extensions of hate crime and extensions of the curbs on freedom of speech.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/a

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Free speech should be minimally legislated To stifle speech is tantamount to curtailing thought.

Question 2: No

Expand: This will only lead to racism

Question 3: No

Expand: Too broad, you don't have the right to not be offended. People should be responsible for their own emotions

Question 4: Again so broad anyone could be infringing on this and not even know it.

Question 5: No

Expand: Institutions, even religious ones should be able to be criticised without fear of committing a criminal offence

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7: Everyone, unless directly inciting violence has the right to free speech

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: By psychological standards these are mental illness and should be treated as such To say otherwise is denying the truth and not helping the people involved

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: This issue is Marxist propaganda which should not be protected by any law

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: I don't believe in legislating free speech.

Question 10: I don't believe in legislating free speech

Question 11: No

Expand: Again, Marxist propaganda and should not be protected by law.

Question 11 Part 2: These people should be called out as the deviants they are

Question 12: If anything is protected by law both genders should be given equal protection.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: As long as the definition of women, refers to biological women

Question 14: No

Expand: Marxist ideology should not be protected by law.

Question 15: Children should be protected but again this hate crime bill is a slippery slope

Question 16: No.

Question 17: Any adult should be responsible for themselves.

Question 18: No, again this will lead to the protection of Marxist ideologues

Question 19: Any adult should be responsible for themselves

Question 20: Any adult should be responsible for themselves

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: Any adult should be responsible for themselves and their own emotions

Question 23: It should be abolished.

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: Any adult should be responsible for themselves

Question 26: No

Expand: Any adult should be responsible for themselves

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: No intersectionality is a Marxist doctrine.

Question 33: Yes

Question 34: Yes

Question 35: No hate crime is paramount to thought crime and should be abolished.

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: No

Question 38 Part 2: No

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: You cannot prosecute what would essentially be “thought crime” That is, again, a Marxist doctrine.

Question 41: No

Expand: Stop trying to push Marxist agenda

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: If they act as a publisher they should be completely responsible.

Question 43 Part 2: No

Question 44: How about “proven without any doubt”

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand: I refer to the “thought crime” issue

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Only if there was actual abuse

Question 48: No

Expand: Marxism ideology again.

Question 49: No

Expand: Marxism.

Question 50: No

Question 51: No

Expand: You cannot prosecute someone for speaking in their own home This is an Orwellian nightmare scenario.

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Again Marxist ideology should not be protected in law.

Question 53: No

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand: No

Question 55 Part 1: Yes

Question 55 Part 2: All material, stop trying to prosecute people for “thought crime”

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: No

Question 58: No

Question 59: No

Question 60: Orwellian nightmare scenario.

Question 61: No

Question 62: Were back to the Orwellian nightmare.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: A concern I have with this is that it will mean certain groups e.g. men, would not be covered as they will be perceived to be groups who do not have prejudice towards them.

I say perceived as this is often not true. These often groups do have a prevalence of hostility towards them, it is just the case that these are often not reported, data is not gathered, etc.

This is a cycle. By specifically saying e.g. men do not face hostility, hence we will not collect data on this, and we will not call this a crime you are ADDING to the under reporting of this. It is not going to be prevalent, if you never collected data on it.

A study just published showed that around the world boys are more likely to be undernourished, wasted, stunted and underweight. This shocked the researchers as they said they simply had the view that this would affect girls more and also sex specific data is not gathered. It also showed that as a sector, whilst data should be routinely collected on sex, it is not systematically analysed and reported. Where it is, explanations are often conjectural. Another little known fact is that there are more boys out of school than girls in the world. A major reason for this is forced child labour of boys, boys being beaten in school hence not want to return, and bullying. Again these things are not known as people have prejudiced viewed of boys never being affected and never collect data. When data is collected, the affect on boys is often shocking as a result.

Men are the overwhelming victims of murder, assault, kidnap, police killing, death in detention, homophobic crimes, etc. There is clearly some gender element in this if this is the case. I feel that many crimes against women are automatically perceived to be gendered crimes, particularly if the perpetrator is male, and even so if the perpetrator is female. Also areas where there is some difference in prevalence in a crime i.e. more women are victims, that crime is then automatically perceived as "gendered". However, if a crime or event is overwhelming affecting men, even enormously, it is not considered gendered. Or even if men are very explicitly targetted for being men, it is STILL not considered gendered. This is despite knowing that men are often sometimes routinely singled out for violence e.g. if a

woman often does something aggravating e.g. throwing a drink on someone, it is the male companion of that person who is beaten. i.e. proxy violence. Boko Haram became internationally famous for kidnapping 270 girls. However, what they did not become famous for was kidnapping 10,000 boys before, often separating the boys, allowing the girls to go home, and murdering, often by burning alive the boys. Here boys were most certainly targeting because of their sex. It is still considered a female issue however and boys have never received the same attention to help them. Europe's only post WWII genocide was Srebrenica where 8,000 boys and men were separated from women and murdered.

For example in the UK around 90% of homeless are male, and according to ONS 13 men and 1 woman a week die when homeless (calculated by taking annual deaths and dividing by 52) this is not considered a gendered matter at all however, and no special consideration in policy is required.

If we contrast that to many other things e.g. domestic violence this is heavily gendered although the statistics show from ONS show that at least 1/3 victims are male with around 800,000 male victims. Despite this, the men's domestic violence line is not even 24 hours, London does not have a single bed for male victims only.

In domestic violence it has been shown that men are extremely unlikely to report domestic violence if asked. However, if they are asked if they have been victims of

multiple acts of domestic violence (i.e. the acts are told to them) they admit to having experienced these. By not considering men as being victims of something, or victims of prejudice or hostility, you add to this sweeping of things under the carpet.

In summary, I believe this is circular, by falsely saying a group is not widely experiencing prejudice and therefore we will exclude them, makes this false assumption seem true.

Another perhaps a little aside example, is that OECD studies, and then multiple other studies across multiple countries have shown that teachers mark boys lower for identical work to girls. They also give lower grades in teacher assessments and predictions when boys objectively have marks to girls in tests. In some of these studies simply changing a boy's name to a girl's name increased the boy's grade. Other studies have shown boys are disciplined more frequently but also for behaviour that girls are not disciplined for. Most of these findings were found throughout the OECD e.g. UK, Canada, Australia, etc. In countries such as Singapore, only boys are caned. The reason most of these studies cited is that teachers have a preference for girl students and see them as model students and better behaved.

My point of this is that if you are constantly painting this narrative that men do not face prejudice in the example above boys are facing prejudice in every single OECD country tested... you reinforce this false notion.

You especially make it worse when you don't collect data on it (which would be the effect of adding only women to the bill and not men or considering men as not people who face hostility).

Given how overwhelmingly males are victims of murders, assaults, kidnaps etc male gender is most certainly some factor. In violence for example it is known that if a woman often does something aggravating e.g. throwing a drink on someone, it is the male companion of that person who is beaten. Men when bullied, or harassed are much more readily the victims of violence compared to women, and the same bullies would not do so to women.

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: I generally do not agree to adding sex or gender as I think many incidents are over reported to being based on gender when that is not the case. E.g. online abuse

However, if it is to be added, I think it is absolutely essential that it be sex or gender to cover both sexes and all genders and most certainly not for example the proposed just women, but excluding all men.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: I am very strongly against the idea of only including women. If gender or sex is to be added then both must be added. I have discussed this in question 3 so I am re stating some of the points. However, as a medical doctor I would like to give one specific example I have come across

I had a patient, a young boy who came to practice suffering from severe complications after being hit in the genitals. Like other cases of this I saw as a doctor, this was in school by another girl in a completely unprovoked attack. Group of students, often groups of girls, sometimes groups of boys or mixed, were randomly going up to boys and hitting them in the genitals. Often recording this and putting this on youtube, TikTok etc (Youtube and TikTok literally have tens of thousands of videos of such things) Names such as sack tapping, cup checks, were used. The victims were often complete strangers in school

This is not uncommon. This happens in schools worldwide. In fact I recall in the media a boy who had to have a testicle removed after one such random attack. In the news there are many cases of such things. The urologist who operated on him said he gets at least several cases a year due to this. He said in one year there was a particularly large spike as a craze was going around when students would ask a boy what is the capital of Thailand, and when answered they would hit the boy in the genitals. In domestic violence literature it is stated that partners often specifically and purposefully attack the genitals to degrade and humiliate. While not an exact example perhaps, but in a very recent case I read in the press, a woman who killed her partner by stabbing him in the chest, a month prior had grabbed her partners genitals and tried to drag him across the flat. She warned the police, she was worried

someone would be killed, which of course sadly turned out to be true. In many case studies of domestic violence cases, many times the genitals are specifically attacked to degrade, humiliate, and so on

Now these attacks in school which I described I have seen would not be considered to be considered sexual assault. I would say I agree with the law here, as the motivation is probably not sexual (although if groups of boys were going around SPECIFICALLY hitting girls in the groin or breasts while again the same should technically apply, it is not a sexual offence unless that intent can be proven, I do suspect that it is far more likely to be classified as a sexual offence)

However, this is most certainly not simple assault. Clearly they are targeting boys. Any boy is at risk, and specifically because he is male he will be targeted. The motivation is often to sexually injure, cause embarrassment related to genitals, cause pain related to genitals. It of course would have sexual effects too.

This is most clearly what would fall under a hate crime against men. However in this proposal you are suggesting to not even include men, thus making such action not addressable. In the cases above where innocent boys are attacked by groups, the current law would not consider this sexual assault (which as I said, I agree with, although I state it is far more likely to be considered so if the victim was female I suspect) However, it is not a hate crime either. It would likely fall under simple assault, and as such usually no charge or prosecution would be made

A concern I have with this is that it will mean certain groups e.g. men, would not be covered as they will be perceived to be groups who do not have prejudice towards them.

I say perceived as this is often not true. These often groups do have a prevalence of hostility towards them, it is just the case that these are often not reported, data is not gathered, etc.

This is a cycle. By specifically saying e.g. men do not face hostility, hence we will not collect data on this, and we will not call this a crime you are ADDING to the under reporting of this. It is not going to be prevalent, if you never collected data on it.

A study just published showed that around the world boys are more likely to be undernourished, wasted, stunted and underweight. This shocked the researchers as they said they simply had the view that this would affect girls more and also sex specific data is not gathered. It also showed that as a sector, whilst data should be routinely collected on sex, it is not systematically analysed and reported. Where it is, explanations are often conjectural. Another little known fact is that there are more boys out of school than girls in the world. A major reason for this is forced child labour of boys, boys being beaten in school hence not want to return, and bullying. Again these things are not known as people have prejudiced views of boys never being affected and never collect data. When data is collected, the affect on boys is often shocking as a result

Men are the overwhelming victims of murder, assault, kidnap, police killing, death in detention, homophobic crimes, etc. There is clearly some gender element in this if this is the case. I feel that many crimes against women are automatically perceived to be gendered crimes, particularly if the perpetrator is male, and even so if the perpetrator is female. Also areas where there is some difference in prevalence in a crime i.e. more women are victims, that crime is then automatically perceived as "gendered". However, if a crime or event is overwhelming affecting men, even enormously, it is not considered gendered. Or even if men are very explicitly targeted for being men, it is STILL not considered gendered. This is despite knowing that men are often sometimes routinely singled out for violence e.g. if a

woman often does something aggravating e.g. throwing a drink on someone, it is the male companion of that person who is beaten. i.e. proxy violence. Boko Haram became internationally famous for kidnapping 270 girls. However, what they did not become famous for was kidnapping 10,000 boys before, often separating the boys, allowing the girls to go home, and murdering, often by burning alive the boys. Here boys were most certainly targeting because of their sex. It is still considered a female issue however and boys have never received the same attention to help them. Europe's only post WWII genocide was Srebrenica where 8,000 boys and men were separated from women and murdered.

For example in the UK around 90% of homeless are male, and according to ONS 13 men and 1 woman a week die when homeless (calculated by taking annual deaths and dividing by 52) this is not considered a gendered matter at all however, and no special consideration in policy is required.

If we contrast that to many other things e.g. domestic violence this is heavily gendered although the statistics show from ONS show that at least 1/3 victims are male with around 800,000 male victims. Despite this, the men's domestic violence line is not even 24 hours, London does not have a single bed for male victims only.

In domestic violence it has been shown that men are extremely unlikely to report domestic violence if asked. However, if they are asked if they have been victims of

multiple acts of domestic violence (i.e. the acts are told to them) they admit to having experienced these. By not considering men as being victims of something, or victims of prejudice or hostility, you add to this sweeping of things under the carpet.

In summary, I believe this is circular, by falsely saying a group is not widely experiencing prejudice and therefore we will exclude them, makes this false assumption seem true.

Another perhaps a little aside example, is that OECD studies, and then multiple other studies across multiple countries have shown that teachers mark boys lower for identical work to girls. They also give lower grades in teacher assessments and predictions when boys objectively have marks to girls in tests. In some of these studies simply changing a boy's name to a girl's name increased the boy's grade. Other studies have shown boys are disciplined more frequently but also for behaviour that girls are not disciplined for. Most of these findings were found throughout the OECD e.g. UK, Canada, Australia, etc. In countries such as Singapore, only boys are caned. The reason most of these studies cited is that teachers have a preference for girl students and see them as model students and better behaved.

My point of this is that if you are constantly painting this narrative that men do not face prejudice in the example above boys are facing prejudice in every single OECD country tested... you reinforce this false notion.

You especially make it worse when you don't collect data on it (which would be the effect of adding only women to the bill and not men or considering men as not people who face hostility).

Given how overwhelmingly males are victims of murders, assaults, kidnaps etc gender is most certainly some factor. In violence for example it is known that if a woman often does something aggravating e.g. throwing a drink on someone, it is the male companion of that person who is beaten.

Finally

Question 13: Yes

Expand: Yes women is much better. Classifying it as misogyny is entering the realm of ideology This would be highly subjective, how could crime could be derived as being "due to a hatred of all women"?

The same issue would apply to calling it misandry In that case it should be men

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19: Yes

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: There is a risk that the police and prosecutors confuse two completely different things: threatening words or behaviour as opposed to expression of strongly held religious or moral beliefs which some people may strongly disagree with.

This proposal asks the prosecuting authorities to assess whether somebodies words were intended to cause hatred. However, this is impossible to discern because it requires one to make a subjective judgment about a given individual's inner motives. It also expects the

prosecuting authorities to be moral enforcer's using the law to ban one person's beliefs in preference to another's.

This extension of police powers would have a profoundly inhibitory effect upon freedom of speech and signal the effective beginning of seizure of powers by an elective dictatorship. The authoritarian nature of these proposals is evidenced by the idea of appointing a Hate Crime Commissioner which represents a centralization of legal powers and is a waste of public money.

Question 2: No

Expand: Every citizen should be equal under the law and protected from threatening words or behaviour which are obviously intimidating and likely to lead to violence against any particular individual

However, the problem with protected characteristics is that some groups such as homosexual and transgender activists can use them as a weapon to deny their ideological opponents any right to exist or express their beliefs in public forums (for example, the traditional Christian belief that marriage is only legitimate within the context of lifelong heterosexual monogamy does advocacy of this belief constitute a "hate crime" simply because some people or groups regard it as "offensive" and "upsetting"?)

Are individual people's cultural, philosophical, theological and/or ethical preferences a legitimate arena for police intervention?

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: No

Expand: This question provides a good illustration of why the idea of "protected characteristics" does not work in practice since half the human race consists of women - do they all need protecting?!

"Misogyny" better describes a specific aggressive tendency of a minority of men towards some women; and this is preferable to putting all women in a protected category.

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16: It should include people of all ages, as explained above

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand: This is a poorly worded proposal. Specifically, the idea that a defendant could be convicted of conducting himself in an 'abusive' manner or in a way 'likely to stir up hatred' on the basis of his or her words alone would surely lead to miscarriages of justice. It would introduce into English law the concept of a 'speech crime' where somebody committed the 'offence' of expressing a belief which the complainant vehemently disagreed with. Such an offence would have a profoundly inhibitory effect upon freedom of speech leading citizens feeling compelled only to express safe and uncontroversial opinions.

Question 47: No

Expand: There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically motivated complainants. What is deemed 'abusive' is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, this would have an inhibitory effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: It is misleading to ask one question requiring a Yes/No answer which conflates two completely different issues: transgender identity and disability

Stirring up offenses should not be extended to transgender identity Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech legislation in this area would effectively censor free political debate around this issue

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Additionally, protections should be extended to expressing opinions about the validity or otherwise of transgender identity. In particular, an offense against transgender identity must explicitly protect using a person's birth name and pronoun, saying that there are only two sexes and saying that someone born a man is not a woman and vice versa.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The Attorney General has greater independence than the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) and Crown Prosecution Service

The Crown Prosecution Service approach will be set by the Director of Public Prosecutions who is unlikely to correct errors in his own policies.

The Attorney General has greater independence to protect freedom of speech and is directly answerable to parliament, which is a necessary check upon too much power being entrusted to one legal official.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No It would be a waste of public money, as explained previously

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Grace Church Guildford

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: N/A

Question 1: No

Expand: The law already has it covered and this is likely to be abused by radical 'changists' who seek to change to anything other established and biblical morality

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: It depends on what the radical 'changists' can wrongly persuade

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: The principles of the law already do protect adequately if applied properly by our police, and not used as an opportunity to stop free speech.

Question 4: 1 NOT to language the cost of killing free speech is too high

2 Only to the other two if the 'hate crime' contravenes clear existing principles of established law.

3 Those using more 'hate speech' to stifle free speech or freedom of religion should be censured. They used the so-called law to break the actual law.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: You should specifically say that freedom to speak and practice religion is a basic right and is in no way adversely affected by any legislation now or in the future.

Question 6: Yes

Expand: It is logical but they too have the right of free speech

Question 7: You should recognise that the very small minority groups (LGBT+ 'Don't know') already wield FAR too much power and influence compared to the silent but balanced majority ; The only sexual orientation that is scientifically, logically, morally and theologically correct is one that results in one man with one woman in marriage for life. I note that THE vast majority of followers of Islam, Catholicism, Judaism and Protestantism are united on that They are the main religions in the UK Of course, some (not all) immoral people whom don't like that want to dumb down the voice of conscience through those religions, and from the Bible especially

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: I see no need to spend such a disproportionate amount of effort and time on such a relatively small body of people. They can use free speech to criticise the silent majority, and the majority is free to criticise them, That is really 'British'.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: No need to encourage the tail to wag the dog

Question 8 Part 3: No need - don't waste your time. If it needs definition the courts will do it in the normal way through case law

Question 9: No comment

Question 10: Only if you can show both men's rea and actual reus.

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: if you mean that one can openly criticise anything to do with sexuality (free speech) OK. Otherwise No.

Question 11 Part 2: Free speech should always feature. The law covers wrongs clearly already. Danger of subtle redefinition by stealth

Question 12: The law should apply equally to any genuine alleged victim of a crime. It should never be a crime to criticise or speak against something

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: 'women' and 'men' are the only categories to be considered,

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: As there are only two sexes and two genders they can often be used interchangeably, which is why they have been used like that for years.

Question 15: All ages to be protected against abuse, but not against free speech

Question 16: Sauce for goose and gander, however old or young, should be the same.

Question 17: I think 'sex workers' is an inappropriate way of giving immorality unnecessary respect

Question 18: Same general reply. All to be dealt with alike, and with same right to give and receive free speech

Question 19: As last answer

Question 20: As last answer.

Question 21: Yes

Expand: If a real crime has been committed. Free speech is not a crime

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: For years we have lived with guilty mind (men's rea) and guilty act ('actus reus') being absolutely necessary essentials for conviction of a crime. The law has much case law on how to determine that and our whole criminal legal system has run on it. Why change it

now to please such small minorities who often have agendas to bring down morality and religion.

?

Question 23: No - that is too subjective and open to abuse and continued police mis-interpretation Actus reus and mens rea sufficient

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand: Only if you gets the rest right.

Question 25: No

Expand: No need These men or women are already covered under the law Don't make false categories.

Question 26: No

Expand: Let the courts decide and the case law show it

Question 27: No

Expand: Question far too vague to answer specifically

Question 28: Yes

Expand: That's what the law does now.

Question 29: Yes

Expand: Already covered by existing law.

Question 30: No. Out of context .

Question 31: Yes

Expand: No need.

Question 32: Too complicated. Let the courts decide.

Question 33: Yes if applied Perhaps discounts for early pleading are too big

Question 34: Yes - just like dangerous driving and driving without due care.

Question 35: I don't accept these are the only two proposals.

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: It depends on what you decide the crime is.

Question 37: Yes

Expand: Transparency

Question 38 Part 1: Just view each case on its own merits.

Question 38 Part 2: Let the courts decide.

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: Let the courts decide.

Question 40: No

Expand: Freedom of speech should include writing as well as speech.

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand: I am not knowledgeable enough on this point to express an opinion

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: So much of your questioning is unnecessary if you apply mens rea and actus reus

Question 43 Part 1: Social media should be subject to the same laws as everyone else.

Question 43 Part 2: Consistency is always a merit

Question 44: No let case law work it out

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: This breaks the fair and just basis of our criminal law actus reus and mens rea

Question 46: No

Expand: If you cannot prove mens rea there should be. No crime. Don't forget R v Gosh covers that (or did when I practised criminal law)

Question 47: No

Expand: Unjust and open to abuse

Question 47 Part 2: No.

There should be no 'if so', therefore this is theoretical and concerns me because it seems to imply that you might have already made up your mind on such an important point

Question 48: No

Expand: For all the other reasons stated. The police cannot at times apply the clear law as it is (think of the successful appeals against police ignorantly making up their own minds This is a dangerous downward path to take.

Question 49: No

Expand: See earlier answers

Question 50: See previous answers. No point.

Question 51: No

Expand: No need to do that facilitates potential abuse

Question 52: Yes

Expand: It seems just , exceptionally,

Question 52 Part 2: Consistency needed

Question 53: As above.

Question 54: No

Expand: As a former Senior Crown Prosecutor and later an advocate for defence or CPS, I know that the bias towards the prosecution would be unfair and that justice would not be seen to be done

Question 55 Part 1: Don't know - but inclined towards transparency.

Question 55 Part 2: As now No need to legislate let the courts decide,

Question 56: Yes

Expand: It's wrong but hard to prove in individual cases through guilt by association.

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand: No because race is an essential difference we cannot avoid Bear in mind that what was then generally seen as sexual perversion morally is a choice. I disagree with any chanting against anyone including the opposite fans and grounds should be free to ban clubs bringing supporters who do it, but I would not make chanting a criminal offence.

Question 57 Part 2: Deal with by banning fans through their clubs, and making suspect fans get club approval before they can come to a match Get REAL criminals * not just ignorant idiots.

Question 58: No views. Insufficient current knowledge.

Question 59: If there is a genuine crime committed it should be dealt with anywhere

Question 60: Too vague - no,

Question 61: No views I am not up to date on sentencing.

Question 62: Only if you enact good law that needs enacted

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: There is no necessity for a Hate Crime Act. Free speech must be protected. As long as one is not inciting murder, ALL free speech is necessary. Otherwise society, and the public arena, will be controlled by those most willing to be hurt, offended They in turn may use any Hate Crime law to impose a de facto blasphemy code upon the rest of society.

Question 2: No

Expand: Everyone must be equal under the law "Protected characteristics" elevate some above the many. Why? No one who chooses to live in this country should be exempt from scrutiny or debate No one is above free speech and enquiry We are equal under the law

Question 3: No

Expand: Those most willing to claim offence and victimisation - in order to prevent scrutiny and to shut down debate, will exploit these "characteristics" to silence and criminalise others. Free speech that scrutinises all equally, is the only way forward.

Question 4: Why should race, and migrant status be relevant? If a migrant commits a crime he should be subject to the law like any other. Why on earth should he be treated differently? These exemptions are wholly unnecessary and prejudicial to others.

Question 5: No

Expand: We live in a free country because the established church and state are separate. We do not live in a theocracy. This is precious beyond price. The right to scrutinise religious scripture must be protected at all costs.

According to authorised scriptural texts (eg Al Bukhari) Mohammad, when he was 50 years old married a 5 year old child and began having sex with her when she was 9. This would be considered paedophilia in this country. A woman in Germany was convicted of hate crime for pointing this out. The judges concluded that as Ayesha had been 19 when the prophet died it had not been child rape. Strange logic indeed.

In what ways is a society civilised if it jails those who point out facts purely because they offend a section of the community/

Facts do not care about our feelings; nor should they.

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7: Discussion of a person's gender or sexual orientation should not be criminalised.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: People should be free to live their lives as they wish, under the law. They should be free to believe in the reality of their own ideas and convictions. They should not be free, however, to impose that reality upon others. Society should not be coerced through threat of the law into pretending that a man wearing a dress, with full male genitalia and biochemistry, is a woman. He is not, and forcing the population to go against reality, is Orwellian. Women have a right to safe spaces in changing rooms, refuges and prisons. Any real woman would know and feel that instinctively. There is a risk that transgender activists will use this law to silence legitimate debate and place biological women in constant risk of assault.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: As above. There should be no protected characteristics. We are not sugar and we won't melt. You defeat your enemies by winning the argument, not by silencing them with threat of law.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: Who defines hostility?

Question 23: Who defines and decides this? And by what authority?

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand: "likely to" is too vague and open to subjective conclusions and is likely to be abused in practice

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Such a law could outlaw the right of teaching the words of Holy Scripture This right has existed for centuries and should be protected.

Question 49: No

Expand: "Stirring up" is a vague term and is likely to be abused in practice.

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Such a law could outlaw the right of teaching the words of Holy Scripture This right has existed for centuries and should be protected.

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Prosecutions for stirring up could in some cases be highly controversial and lead to severe penalties They warrant consent being required from the Attorney General

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: No

Question 11: Yes

Expand: Biological sex yes

Gender definitely no, it is a minefield.

Question 11 Part 2: Yes

Question 12: Both

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex only

Question 15: No

Question 16: No

Question 17: No

Question 18: No

Question 19: No

Question 20: No

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: Intent is very important.

Question 23: Prejudice may be without harmful intent. For example older generations not understanding new think If the intent is not to harm there should be no prosecution

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: No Intersectionality should not be considered

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: No. And stirring up should not be an offense

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: Should not be liable

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: Likely to is terrible and should be removed rather than specified

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand: Ought to have known should be removed

Question 47: No

Expand: Likely to should be removed

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: No

Question 58: Missile throwing yes. Gestures no.

Question 59:

Question 60: No

Question 61:

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Citizen of U K

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: No privacy required

Question 1: No

Expand: Undermines our psychological sense of civic calmness and it's already legislated against. It will force a new government to come in with a reverse mandate. It's antagonistic.

Question 2: No

Expand: You cause divide

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: No

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Hate is just hate and people are allowed to hate. It's not a question of law. Denazification was abandoned as it clogged up the courts. We have the right to reject and deport asylum seekers

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: No action

Question 9: Yes

Question 10: Absolutely not

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: Leave as is

Question 12: Any one reporting one

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand: Doesn't need changing. Please leave our country, culture and laws alone.

Question 15: No they have safe guards

Question 16: Old people

Question 17: No

Question 18: No

Question 19: No

Question 20: No

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: No

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: No

Question 33: No

Question 34: No

Question 35: No

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: No change or increase at all

Question 38 Part 2: No changes

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Dangerous law

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: They don't take it down

Question 43 Part 2: No actions

Question 44: No

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Don't mend what's not broken This is BLM Marxist agenda

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: No

Question 51: Yes

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: No protections just please stop & scrap all hate crime bills They make Britain's feel uneasy and fearful for our culture.

Question 53: Leave it no changes

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: No

Question 55 Part 2: All should be exempt from hate crime bill

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand: No

Question 57 Part 2: No

Question 58: No

Question 59: No

Question 60: No

Question 61: No

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Rapture Maranatha Ministeries

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Angela Laycock

Name of Organisation: The Disabled Witness Project 2012 18 based in the University of Greenwich School of Law

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Yes

Expand: Although the legal test for hate crime has in the past caused problems of recognition for disability hate crime, in order to ensure equality of protection from all hate crime, I agree that the test should remain the same. Not only is it symbolically important ensuring equality in law and protection from all hate crime but, more importantly, it facilitates recognition, recording, and reporting of hate crime.

However, equality of protection will only be achieved for disability hate crime if “prejudice” is included with “hostility” as part of the legal test. (See answer to Consultation Question 23.)

Question 22: Yes

Expand: The demonstration limb has proved crucial in protecting persons with disabilities from disability hate crime. Often, proving a perpetrator is motivated by hostility towards a person with a disability fails either because the victim believes the perpetrator to be a friend or the behaviour of the perpetrator in committing the base crime is not recognised as “hostile” by the police, CPS or legal personnel or indeed someone who might report the offence (See answer to Question 23)

Question 23: The findings of the Disabled Witness Project would suggest that the addition of “or prejudice” is key to achieving equality of protection from hate crime for persons with disabilities. From identification through to sentencing, the need to provide valid evidence of the perpetrator’s “hostility” towards the victim because of his/her disability has proved a barrier to legal protection from disability hate crime. This is partly due to the nature of disability hate crime which can be ‘targeting’ a person because of his/her perceived disability for example for purposes of theft. There may be no evidence that the perpetrator was motivated by “hostility” but there could be evidence that the perpetrator targeted the disabled person out of “prejudice” that it would be easier to steal from him.

Both the police and the CPS have worked to solve this evidential challenge. The working definition of disability hate crime agreed by the police and CPS in 2013 and confirmed in the 2018 HMFICRS and HMICPS report has facilitated in practice the prosecution of disability hate crime:

“Any incident/crime which is perceived, by the victim, or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a person’s disability or perceived disability.”

The phrase “prejudice based on a person’s disability or perceived disability” provides a working alternative to “hostility”, which facilitates the police in responding to disability hate crime. The Disabled Witness Project found evidence of this when examining police profiles provided by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). In the 2009-12 MPS profiles, all the offences were recorded only as anti-social behaviour or harassment not one was also recorded as disability hate crime. However, in each of the 2016-18 MPS profiles, in contrast, the investigating officer recognised the incident/crime as a disability hate crime. This suggests progress, arguably facilitated by the adoption in 2013 of the NPCC/CPS working definition of disability hate crime. The inclusion of “incident” and, more importantly, “by prejudice based on a person’s disability or perceived disability”, as an alternative to “motivated by hostility”, increases the opportunity for recognising and ‘flagging’/recording disability hate crime.

An observation in the CPS Hate Crime Report 2018 19 highlights the problem posed by the hostility requirement for establishing disability hate crime and the measures taken in practice to ensure a remedy:

“If an offence does not meet the legal definition of a disability hate crime however, the CPS will put before the court any evidence that a disabled person is targeted for this reason, so that the sentence reflects the gravity of such offending even if a statutory uplift cannot be applied ”

Including “or prejudice” in the legal test for hate crime would be to confirm de facto practice and overcome obstacles to recognition, recording and conviction for disability hate crime.

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand: I agree that disability should be protected by an aggravated offence on the following grounds:

1 Provision of equality of protection for victims by ending the limitations of enhanced sentencing:

a. If the defendant is found not guilty of the base offence, then the enhanced sentencing powers cannot be used

b. disability hate crime will not appear on the offender's record leading to lack of protection for disabled persons, particularly when employing personal assistants or independent contractors.

2. Making disability hate crime a criminal offence would be in line with reforms in the Scottish and Northern Irish jurisdictions and would prove a significant step towards fulfilling the 2017 UN Committee for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities' (UNCRPD) recommendation that, to comply with its obligations under CRPD art.16, the UK government should:

“Take appropriate measures to combat any negative and discriminatory stereotypes and prejudices against persons with disabilities in public and media...and adopt measures to address complaints of harassment and hate crime by persons with disabilities, promptly investigate these allegations [and] hold perpetrators accountable...”

3. Practical benefits in enforcement:

a Greater recognition of disability hate crime due to its status as a criminal offence

b Improvement in police recorded disability hate crime it would encourage national consistency in recording disability hate crime. In July 2018, the HMICFRS reported:

“In our inspection, we found examples of effective ways of working which, if more forces adopt them, could make a real difference to the police's approach to hate crime, and improve outcomes for victims. That said, there is considerable inconsistency between forces in their approach to hate crime ”

One strategy to achieve national consistency in response to disability hate crime would be through the Police Effectiveness Efficiency and Legitimacy (PEEL) inspection framework, following the HMICFRS initiative for improving responses to mental health

c. Increase in reporting of disability hate crime due to increase in public confidence in the criminal justice system

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: People very easily take offence in today's society and the accused very rarely would intend to stir up hate.

Freedom of speech is paramount

Question 46: No

Expand: It is very serious to accuse someone of intending to stir up hatred on controversial issues. A conviction of hate crime would ruin someone's life. If hatred doesn't have to be proved in the offence.

Question 47: No

Expand: If discussion about religion, sexual orientation and transgender orientation could be seen as stirring up strife and hatred, this could have a serious effect on freedom to discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: These are 2 completely different issues and it is wrong to put them together.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: We must be able to express our own opinions in our own homes. To extend hate crime to the privacy of our homes would be oppressive and a loss of freedom of expression.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion

section 29JA of the public order act 1986 must be kept for the protection of views on marriage in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: It is important to have the Attorney General's consent on prosecutions. It was included to protect as the stirring up hatred laws can infringe on human rights.

A person could face up to seven years for speaking words.

The Attorney General is accountable to Parliament and they will be held accountable for their decisions.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: No

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Neither or both

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: No

Question 18: No

Question 19: No

Question 20: No

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: Don't understand the question well enough to comment

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: No, shouldn't be

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: No, shouldn't be.

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34: Yes.

Question 35: No

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: No, clarity and simplicity better.

Question 38 Part 2: Sentencing guidance.

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: Don't understand the question well enough to comment

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: No, shouldn't be

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand: Don't understand the question well enough to comment

Question 52 Part 2: Shouldn't be extended

Question 53: No

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand: Don't understand the question well enough to comment

Question 55 Part 1: Yes

Question 55 Part 2: All of the above

Question 56: No

Expand: Racist language should be dealt with consistently across society.

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand: No

Question 57 Part 2: Not extended

Question 58: No

Question 59: No

Question 60: No

Question 61: Yes

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not need a Hate Crime Act at all. There is already too much surveillance of speech and we are supposed to have free speech in the UK We should not pander to hurt feelings!

Question 2: No

Expand: WE DO NOT NEED OR WANT HATE CROME LAWS WE WISH TO RETAIN FREE SPEECH. YOU CANNOT LEGISLATE FOR HURT FEELINGS, THAT'S RIDICULOUS WE ARE NOT A NATION OF SNOWFLAKES

Question 3: No

Expand: STOP TRYING TO TURN OUR COUNTRY INTO A PLACE WHERE PEOPLE ARE SO WET THEY CANNOT TAKE HARSH WORDS THE LAW SHOULDN'T GET INVOLVED IN LIMITING FREE SPEECH. THIS IS THE UK, WE DON'T LOCK PEOPLE UP FOR VOICING AN OPINION!

Question 4: WE ARE THE MOST TOLERANT COUNTRY IN THE WORLD WE ARE POSSIBLY THE LEAST RACIST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD SO WHY WOULD ANYONE THINK WE NEED LAWS TO STOP PEOPLE SPEAKING?

USING THE LAW IN THIS HEAVY HANDED WAY JUST BECAUSE THE TINIEST PERCENTAGE OF CITIZENS HAS A WARPED VIEW OF THE WORLD IS NOT A GOOD REASON FOR LIMITING FREE SPEECH, IT'S THE THIN END OF A VERY DANGEROUS WEDGE

Question 5: No

Expand: EVERYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO CRITICISE RELIGION. I STRONGLY OBJECT TO ANY LAWS AGAINST FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN THIS REGARD

SOME RELIGIONS/IDEOLOGIES ARE SO BACKWARD THEY BELONG IN THE DARK AGES. WHY SHOULD WE TOLERATE PEOPLE WHO TREAT WOMEN AS SECOND CLASS CITIZENS AND THINK IT'S OK TO MARRY THEIR RELATIVES OR FORCE YOUNG GIRLS INTO MARRIAGE?

IF WE HAVE TO HAVE SUCH PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY WE MUST BE ALLOWED TO FREELY CRITICISE THEIR IGNORANT RELIGION.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: REIGN IN YOUR HATE CRIME LAWS. MOST BRITISH CITIZENS DO NOT WANT THIS WOKE NONSENSE

Question 7: MORE WOKE NONSENSE. THERE ARE 2 SEXES, MALE AND FEMALE. THE VAST MAJORITY IN THE UK ARE SICK TO DEATH OF THIS COMPLETE RUBBISH

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: THERE ARE 2 SEXES MALE AND FEMALE. ANYONE FEELING THAT THEY DON'T BELONG TO EITHER OF THESE CAN LIVE HOW THEY WANT BUT THEY DON'T NEED PROTECTION IN LAW

THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO GOOD REASON FOR WHAT YOU ARE PROPOSING, YOU WILL CAUSE MORE PROBLEMS WITH WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO DO. HUMAN BEINGS EVOLVE WE CANNOT AND WILL NOT BE FORCED BY LEFT WING DOGMA

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: YOU'RE TALKING COMPLETE NONSENSE WHY ARE YOU TREATING THOSE PEOPLE LIKE CHILDREN WHO CAN'T DO ANYTHING FOR THEMSELVES?

THE TROUBLE YOU ARE SHORING UP WITH THIS IS INCALCULABLE. A FEW TRANSGENDERS HAVE ALREADY SHOWN THAT THEY LIKE HEADLINES SO THEY'LL DO ANYTHING TO BRING SIMPLE ARGUMENTS TO COURT, IT WILL BE A JOKE AND THE LAW WILL BE THE BIGGEST JOKE OF ALL.

Question 8 Part 3: TAKING THIS COUNTRY INTO THE REALMS OF PROSECUTING PEOPLE FOR HAVING AN OPINION IS A VERY DANGEROUS PRECEDENT. WHAT YOU ARE DOING IS WRONG ON SO MANY LEVELS AND THE PEOPLE DON'T WANT IT!

OUR FREE SPEECH IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS WE HAVE AND WE WON'T GIVE IT UP WITHOUT A FIGHT. WE WILL NOT BECOME A NATION OF SNOWFLAKES WHO HAVE TO BE TOLD WHAT TO DO EVERY SECOND OF EVERY DAY, OUR FREEDOM MEANS TOO MUCH TO US

WE DO NOT WANT TO LIVE IN AN AUTHORITARIAN REGIME.

Question 9: DISABLED PEOPLE DO NOT REQUIRE SPECIAL TREATMENT UNDER THE LAW TO PROTECT THEM FROM UNKIND WORDS THEY HAVE ENOUGH TO PUT UP WITH WITHOUT BEING MADE TO FEEL THAT THEY ARE UNABLE TO DEAL WITH THE OCCASIONAL IDIOT WHO MIGHT SAY SOMETHING OUT OF ORDER.

I HAVE A DISABLED SISTER AND SHE WOULD BE HORRIFIED ABOUT LAWS TO STOP FREE SPEECH.

Question 10: DON'T BE RIDICULOUS! FOR GOD SAKE GROW UP AND GET A PROPER JOB!

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: WELL NOW YOU ARE MENTIONING THINGS WHICH THE LAW SHOULD BE DOING MORE TO STOP, FGM, DOMESTIC ABUSE, FORCED MARRIAGE ETC. WE'RE SUPPOSED TO HAVE LAWS TO PUNISH PERPETRATORS FOR THESE OFFENCES BUT THEY SO RARELY ARE.

OF COURSE THEY SHOULD BE GENDER SPECIFIC BECAUSE ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME THE VICTIMS ARE WOMEN!

Question 12: THERE ARE A VERY FEW MEN WHO CAN'T PROTECT THEMSELVES AGAINST WOMEN BUT IN MY OPINION, UNTIL THE STATS FOR FEMALE VICTIMS IMPROVE DRAMATICALLY MEN SHOULDN'T BE INCLUDED IN ANY HATE CRIME PROTECTION

WE LIVE IN A PATRIARCHAL SOCIETY WHERE WOMEN ARE KILLED ON A HORRENDOUS SCALE BY HUSBANDS AND PARTNERS, MORE THAN 2 A WEEK IN FACT THIS MALE HATE CRIME MUST BE ADDRESSED URGENTLY BEFORE EXPANSION OF THE LAW.

THIS IS INDEED REAL HATE CRIME. IT ISN'T HARSH WORDS, WOMEN LIVES ARE BEING TAKEN FROM THEM AND VERY LITTLE IS BEING DONE TO STOP IT.

Question 13: No

Expand: THE HATE CRIME BEING PERPETRATED ON WOMEN BY MEN IS PURE MISOGYNY SO WE SHOULD CALL IT THAT.

Question 14: No

Expand: HATE CRIME IN THIS AREA DOESN'T NEED A GENERAL APPROACH WHEN CLEARLY FROM THE STATS IT IS ALMOST ALWAYS COMMITTED BY MEN AGAINST WOMEN.

Question 15: AS I SAID PREVIOUSLY, WE DON'T WANT HATE CRIME TO INCLUDE WHAT PEOPLE SAY, ONLY DEEDS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN ANY AGE GROUP.

Question 16: CRIMINAL ACTS OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE AGAINST PEOPLE OF ANY AGE ARE EXTREMELY SERIOUS BUT THE VERY YOUNG AND OLD ARE PARTICULARLY DEFENCELESS AND SENTENCING SHOULD REFLECT THIS.

Question 17: AS STATED PREVIOUSLY, WORDS SHOULD NEVER BE REGARDED AS HATE CRIME THERE ARE ALREADY ENOUGH CATEGORIES OF CRIME TO DESCRIBE PHYSICAL VIOLENCE. SEX WORKERS CAN HANDLE VERBAL INSULTS THEMSELVES I'M QUITE SURE!

Question 18: THIS RUBBISH BEGGARS BELIEF WHAT ARE YOU TRYING TO DO TO THIS COUNTRY? STOP IT WITH GAGGING PEOPLE!

Question 19: THERE SHOULDN'T BE ANY HATE SPEECH CRIME CATEGORIES! STICKS AND STONES ETC

YOU SEEM TO WANT TO USE THE LAW TO STOP UNKINDNESS WHEN THAT IS AND ALWAYS WILL BE PART OF HUMAN NATURE. YOU CAN'T STOP PEOPLE SAYING NASTY THINGS TO EACH OTHER

WE DON'T WANT TO LIVE IN A COMMUNIST STATE WHERE WE CAN ONLY SAY WHAT WE'RE TOLD TO SAY

Question 20: ALL OF YOU WHO THINK THIS STUFF IS NECESSARY SHOULD BE LOCKED UP!

Question 21: No

Expand: EXCEPT THAT WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO DO SHOULD BE SEEN AS AN AGGRAVATED OFFENCE.

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CRIME ACCORDING TO ANYONE WITH AN OUNCE OF COMMON SENSE

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: YOU ARE ALL QUITE MAD AND SICK WITH WOKEISM.

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: I DON'T SEE HOW THERE CAN BE AGGRAVATED VERSIONS OF THOSE OFFENCES

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: I REFER TO MY PREVIOUS ANSWER.

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand: ALL SEXUAL OFFENCES ARE HATE CRIMES AND ONCE AGAIN IT'S USUALLY WOMEN WHO ARE THE VICTIMS THIS IS ONE OFFENCE WHERE THERE CAN CLEARLY BE AGGRAVATED VERSIONS BECAUSE IT MIGHT NOT BE AN ISOLATED OFFENCE. OFTEN THERE IS A HISTORY OF REPEAT OFFENDING.

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: WRITTEN MATERIAL SHOULD NOT VIEWED AS A HATE CRIME AT ALL.

Question 41: No

Expand: YOU SEEM INTENT ON LITTERING THE COURTS WITH THESE RIDICULOUS CASES OF WHAT ARE REALLY PLAYGROUND MISDEMEANOURS. INFLAMMATORY MATERIAL, YOU CANNOT BE SERIOUS

Question 42: No

Expand: YOU GIVE PEOPLE TOO MUCH CREDIT FOR THEIR ABILITY TO STIR UP HATRED THIS SNOWFLAKE SOCIETY WE NOW LIVE IN IS PATHETIC IN THE EXTREME AND YOU SHUOLD NOT BE PANDERING TO IT.

Question 43 Part 1: NONE WHATSOEVER

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: INSTEAD OF HIGHLIGHTING THE MINISCULE DEGREE OF RACIAL HATRED IN THIS COUNTRY YOU SHOULD BE MAKING EVERYONE PROUD OF OUR WORLD LEADING TOLERANCE.

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: YOU SHOULDN'T EVEN BE TALKING ABOUT THIS SUBJECT UNTIL YOU CAN SHOW THAT YOUR LAWS APPLY TO EVERYONE AT PRESENT THE POLICE COMPLETELY IGNORE RACIAL HATRED DIRECTED AT WHITE PEOPLE.

Question 46: No

Expand: YOU ARE EXPECTING ORDINARY PEOPLE TO SIGN UP TO YOUR LEFT WING WAY OF LOOKING AT THIS AND THEY WON'T.

WE ARE UNBELIEVABLY TOLERANT AND WE DON'T NEED THE LAW COMING DOWN ON PEOPLE LIKE A TON OF BRICKS BECAUSE IF YOU'RE NOT VERY CAREFUL YOU WILL SET RACE RELATIONS BACK DECADES. IN FACT I'M ALREADY CONVINCED THAT EVERYTHING YOU ARE TRYING TO DO WILL HAVE PRECISELY THAT RESULT

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: PLEASE SEE SENSE AND DO NOT MAKE SIMPLE INSULTS ILLEGAL!

Question 48: No

Expand: I DON'T THINK THEY EITHER WANT THIS PROTECTION OR NEED IT, THIS IS WHAT MY EXPERIENCE TELLS ME. YOU ARE LEGISLATING FOR THE SAKE OF IT.

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: MISOGYNY IS ALIVE AND WELL BUT WE HAVE ADEQUATE LAWS TO DEAL WITH SERIOUS OFFENCES. WOMEN ARE NOT PATHETIC CREATURES UNABLE TO DEAL WITH MORONS WHO TRY TO "STIR UP" DISLIKE OF WOMEN, WE'VE BEEN DEALING WITH THOSE IDIOTS OURSELVES FOR CENTURIES.

Question 50: YOU ARE TOO FOND OF USING THE WORD HATRED WHEN MOST OF US IN OUR DAILY LIVES RARELY WITNESS IT THERE REALLY IS SCANT EVIDENCE FOR ALL THIS HATRED YOU APPARENTLY SEE EVERYWHERE.

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand: PROSECUTIONS FOR STIRRING UP HATRED OFFENCES WILL BE USED BY WHOEVER GIVES CONSENT AS A STICK TO BEAT ORDINARY PEOPLE WHO WILL REBEL AGAINST THIS NONSENSE SOONER OR LATER

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand: IT SHOULDN'T BE A CRIMINAL OFFENCE, ENOUGH THAT THEY ARE CAUGHT ON CCTV AND GIVEN A LIFE BAN FROM THE GROUND.

Question 57: No

Expand: YOU ARE CLEARLY TRYING TO STOP FREE SPEECH BY CRIMINALISING THINGS WHICH SHOULD BE DEALT WITH AT THE CIVIC LEVEL. WHAT YOU ARE ATTEMPTING TO DO IS UNACCEPTABLE IN A DEMOCRATIC COUNTRY THERE IS NO NEED FOR THE LAW TO BE INVOLVED IN THIS STUFF, FOOTBALL OFFICIALS CAN HANDLE IT

Question 57 Part 2: YOU ARE COMPLETELY OUT OF ORDER WITH THIS AND YOUR ACTIONS WILL BACKFIRE. WE WILL NOT TOLERATE THIS UNNECESSARY AND DICTATORIAL ATTITUDE FROM GOVERNMENT OR THE JUDICIARY

FOOTBALL CAN DEAL WITH IT'S OWN IDIOTS THE SAME AS ANY OTHER SPORTING VENUE, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT FOR THE LAW TO BE INVOLVED.

Question 58: OH PLEASE GROW UP!

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61: THERE SHOULDN'T BE ANY FINES! OFFENDERS CAN BE EJECTED FROM THE GROUND AND GIVEN A BAN BY THE CLUB, END OF.

Question 62: ABSOLUTELY NOT.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: In my opinion the Hate Crime Act, together with much of the Equality Act 2010 has served to undermine equality before the Law which had previously been a part of our culture and understanding. No group should receive such special treatment.

A 'victim mentality' serves nobody well, least of all those who allegedly require special protection

I favour repealing much of the current legislation, not extending it.

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4: No, the definition should not be extended.

Race is defined. Extending the term to include what the person is doing or seeking, amounts to an inherent contradiction

Language is part of culture, not race. It needs no protection.

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No, the fewer inclusions, the better

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: The inclusion of the word 'presumed' will be used to criminalise the innocent of our lands

Lucrative only for lawyers and mischief makers.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: Another red herring. Such terminology will be a lawyer's paradise, but of no benefit to society.

The proposal should go no further

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Neither is necessary. Women do not need protection under hate crime legislation. Neither do men.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: 'Misogyny' is certainly superfluous. As already stated, women do not need special protection under hate crime provisions

Crimes against the person are covered by other legislation, based on objectivity That should be the foundation of law.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex and gender are a minefield, partly created by 21st century, badly constructed legislation.

It needs repealing

Question 15: No.

Question 16: Forget the whole concept.

Question 17: No they should not

Question 18: No, subcultures should not be included.

Question 19: No

Question 20: No

Philosophical beliefs, as with any belief, should be open to any citizen of this country - as traditionally was the case without any interference resulting from hate crime legislation. The latter serves only to limit the discussion and exploration of ideas and beliefs

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: I disagree in principle with the concepts of 'aggravated offences' and 'enhanced sentencing'

If a crime of assault etc is proven, objectively, any penalty should NOT depend on the characteristics of the victim.

That is true equality before the Law

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: Once again 'hostility' is likely to be attributed to the accused for various motives. Such motives may include the hostility of the 'protected' accuser

When was any crime ever committed by reason of love and benevolence? Few circumstances would meet those criteria, yet the desire is to criminalise an emotion, subjectively perceived by some one else This is said to be hatred

Police alerts with their definitions of perceived hatred, appear to be touting for reports of notional hate crimes.

Question 23: No This amounts to thought crime

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand: I believe in equality : The creation of any 'aggravated version of an offence' denies such an outcome.

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30: They should not, for the same reasons as stated above

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34: A base offence is the only one which I consider should be prosecuted.

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: 'Stirring up' is a woolly concept used to criminalise free expression in particular.

Stirring up offences should be removed, not extended to other materials

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: Freedom of expression should be a foundation of democracy. Material, previously lawful, can easily be defined as 'unlawful' by proposals such as those contained in the document under review; this undermines our society.

Media companies should not be liable

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: 'Likely to' should be deleted. It appears that the objective of this wording is to limit freedom of expression. Criticism is too readily categorised as hatred, but is distinguishable.

Such freedoms were hard won and should not be relinquished readily, no matter how the legal wording disguises the intended limitation of our future freedoms

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: Any criminalisation of words should require a very high benchmark which this is not

The concept of 'stirring up' and the words 'threatening' 'abusive' and 'insulting' are indescribably subjective. Hence bad law.

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand: If there is no proof of intent, there should be no case.

Question 47: Other (please expand)

Expand: Disagree with the whole proposal of 'likely to'

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: When people have 'protected characteristics' there is inequality built into law. The main group not protected seems to be the straight, white male.

The so-called Equality legislation has served to introduce division and inequality where there was previously none.

Question 51: Other (please expand)

Expand: A badly phrased question ; hence yes/no may indicate the opposite of the intended response To clarify:

A dwelling is a private space and should be free from State intrusion.

Words and behaviour in the dwelling should not be culpable under the terms of Hate Crime legislation The exclusion should remain

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Definitely not. Another superfluous role at public expense.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Football offences are not a hate crime and should not be grouped together with such

Question 2: No

Expand: If the only "characteristics" not protected are "heterosexual" "Christian" "White" "male", then no others should be "protected".

Question 3: No

Expand: In most cases, what is a now considered "hate crime" prosecution does not qualify as an efficient use of criminal justice resources

Question 4: Would this include white South African farmers seeking asylum?

If not, then why bother with any others.

Language in itself is never a motivation for attack.

Question 5: No

Expand: Why aren't Christians protected in a Christian country?

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7: The term "sexual orientation" already covers this aspect of sexuality

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: How can you presume a gender Isn't that a hate crime?

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: This is getting ridiculous

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Somebody getting attacked because of disability is not a hate crime, its a crime of opportunity and vulnerability

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Unless "male" is gong to be included In which case, everybody ever is now protected.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: How can it be limited? You eithe protect everybody or nobody Otherwise the system is biased, and that would be a human rights violation.

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex and gender are 1 thing

Question 15: Which ages will be protected exactly? All? What's the point of legislating that?

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18: Like nationalists? Will they be protected? What about skin heads? Or neo-nazis? If not, then no sub culture should be protected by legislation.

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand: Only if that specific characteristic was targeted. E. G. Attacker shouting "nazi", "Christian" "White" during the attack or before/ afterwards as a clear and obvious motivation for the attack.

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand: The rape of white girls because they are white should be a hate crime

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Free speech matters, and must be protected.

Question 41: No

Expand: You should be able to disseminate any evidencial material freely if it is found to be true to context.

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: They shouldn't. Free speach matters.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand: Likelihood depends on the audience.

Question 47: No

Expand: Likelihood depends on the audience.

Question 47 Part 2: Likelihood depends on the audience.

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: You can say what you like in your own home

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2: Peer reviewed evidence should not be prosecuted against.

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: Throwing a hot dog is not a hate crime.

Question 59: The journey is not inside the football stadium and therefore not part of the activity proper

Question 60: Guilty by Association should not exist in legislation.

Question 61:

Question 62: Another over-paid bureaucrat is not needed.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: ,

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: Segregation is not the way to fix problems, we have laws to cover crimes against other people, making a special protected class only makes them more of a target and back fires on the well intended law makers These arbitrary rules will make discussing certain topics unlawful, we have been here before, the history books do not show that it went to well

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: Do we not have laws for almost all of these ridiculous questions, why do we have to put 'Hate Crime' in front of them.

Question 16: Honestly, to not make this 'Hate Crime Bill' actually racist, your going to have to not exclude anyone, making the hole thing null and void of any actual substance.

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20: The only way to cover all of your bases is to promote free speech and educate with an unbiased education system and media apparatus Every other approach singles people out, i see the want to protect people but, open discussion is vital, this is why honesty has to win or somewhere down the line lies are being told, either innocently or intentionally, to split a cultural system

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: We are trying to prove what someone thought? This is all subjective, and the separation of the law should be weather or not you act on them, words are not violence

Have you not see the film Minority Report?

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: What sort of country are you trying to create here

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand: Using words like 'likely' should not be in laws, you can spin that anyway you want

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: So you are trying to pass a law and you are now trying to change the definition of some of the words, this is lunacy!! How can you outlaw speech and then change the definition of words to suit your own ideology.

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No, this is totally unnecessary, there is the sickness of communism through this whole bill

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: "Stirring up hatred" aka, offending people

It will be impossible to police, anyone can take offence to anything. Offending people isn't a crime and never should be. It will result in the most ridiculous sentences being handed out for the most innocent of "crimes", turning the country into an authoritarian nightmare comparable to life under Stalin in the Soviet Union.

NO ONE has the right NOT to be offended!

Question 2: No

Expand: Having "protected characteristics" in the name of equality...only creates inequality!

Can't offend a Muslim but can offend a Christian?

Can't offend an LGBT+ person but can offend a straight white man?

Scrap it all!

Question 3: No

Expand: I refer you to my previous answer:

Having "protected characteristics" in the name of equality...only creates inequality!

Can't offend a Muslim but can offend a Christian?

Can't offend an LGBT+ person but can offend a straight white man?

Scrap it all!

Question 4: Neither.

You can never police language, our most fundamental freedom is our freedom of speech. This is the stuff of one of the most murderous regimes in human history, communism in the Soviet Union.

Know your history or be doomed to repeat it.

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: If I (a victim of a crime) pretend to identify as a woman in court (or at any stage of a criminal investigation), I become a transexual and therefore a "protected characteristic", does the person charged with the crime against me get a harsher punishment?

There are two sexes Male and Female This is scientific fact Don't arrest me and lock me up for 7 years now for stating scientific fact.

Repeal it all!

You are fighting perceived inequality with actual inequality.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: There are two sexes Male and Female This is scientific fact

Don't arrest me and lock me up for 7 years now for stating scientific fact.

This needs repealed, not added to.

Question 8 Part 3: This needs repealed, not added to

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Don't fight perceived inequality with actual inequality.

There are two sexes. Male and female.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Why should one's sex impact severity of punishment? That's real sexism...

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand: I can't screenshot the front covers of Charlie Hebdo magazines portraying the prophet Muhammad in a humorous cartoon, and send them to a friend or share on social media without getting arrested and jailed for up to 7 years?

Such a notion is absolutely outrageous.

Freedom of speech must always come first!

No one has the right not to be offended!

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32: Utter nonsense Get back to the real world

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Unprotect all characteristics. They are irrelevant!

A crime is a crime, who cares about what sex, race or creed the victim/criminal was. They were human, that's all that matters

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Absolutely ridiculous. I will send/share/like any Charlie Hebdo cartoon on social media if and whenever I want to, because I am using my right to freedom of speech, and do not cave to demands of terrorists chopping off innocent people's heads.

Why is such nonsense (polite term) even being considered? "Ooh this word might offend a protected characteristic, 7 years for you " This isn't Stalin's Soviet Union! This is the United Kingdom! We are built on freedom of speech. If we don't have that, we have nothing.

JE SUIS CHARLIE, you terrorist loving commies

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand: Are we seriously transitioning to the Soviet Union under Stalin? Is this happening? I bet a fair few of those leaked 1.95million Chinese Communist Party members have infiltrated whoever is behind this utter communist, murderous nonsense

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Communist b*lllocks.

Question 46: No

Expand: Offending someone IS NOT a crime!!

NO ONE HAS THE RIGHT NOT TO BE OFFENDED!

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand: I refer you to previous answer.

Question 47 Part 2: I refer you to previous answer

Question 48: No

Expand: I refer you to previous answer.

Question 49: No

Expand: I refer you to previous answer

Question 50: I refer you to previous answer.

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand: I refer you to previous answer

Question 52 Part 2: I refer you to previous answer

Question 53: I refer you to previous answer.

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Other (please expand)

Expand: Finally, a common sense question.

As long as "racist chanting" isn't simply the "stirring up" nonsense, and is actually audible racist words used, a life ban from attending football matches should suffice.

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: The 2010 Equality Act and the College of Policing's pursuit of non crime hate incidents has created a climate of fear I am completing this consultation as I am concerned about what is happening to our country and the erosion of our rights to speak,

think and live freely. However, I am aware that if my responses are not considered 'correct' I am opening myself to attack with little hope of support from the State.

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: The 2010 Equality Act has increased division and resentment through its 'tick box' approach to human interactions and I suspect that the same will happen with the construction of a Hate Crime Act and I do not support the creation of it

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: There needs to be a review of the impact of the protected characteristics on our country I believe they have damaged relationships and increased the need to play the victim, resulting in an increase of hostility and resentment between groups and individuals. It has also created a climate of fear, where people do not feel they can trust either the State or colleagues, employers, and sometimes even friends This climate is not something I ever expected to experience in the UK. It is sinister, destructive, and it is slowly unravelling us as a nation

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: Refer to my answer to Chapter 10.

Question 4: Continually breaking UK citizens down into ever smaller groups and identities does not enhance our national experience. You are merely creating more divisions and ensuring that identity politics will continue to fragment the UK.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: All citizens should have the right to believe in whatever they choose so long as it does no harm or limitation to another. However, no person of any faith has ever proved that their God exists and it should be acceptable to debate this without being reported for a hate crime or incident.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: The right of the people to engage in free speech without persecution needs to be enhanced and protected. The 2010 Equality Act and the College of Policing's pursuit of non-crime hate incidents is creating a climate of fear. Far from reducing hate, these two developments have increased it

Question 7: I am 62 years old and have never met a UK citizen who has claimed to be asexual, nor have I ever had a conversation with anyone about asexual people and the 'hate' they receive So no, I don't think we need to create another aggrieved category for human rights activists to get worked up about.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Intersex people merit their own category

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Intersex people merit their own category

Question 8 Part 3: See above

Question 9: No view

Question 10: No view

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex is a reality, not a belief or a feeling, and therefore requires specific protection.

Question 11 Part 2: Sex is a reality and needs to be recognised as such

Question 12: It should include both women and men.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Misogyny refers to an unnatural hatred of natal women. It is usually directed at them by men which includes transgender women (natal men). If the word misogyny is replaced, natal women will no longer be able to accurately describe the abuse they receive due to their sex from natal men.

Misandry refers to an unnatural hatred of men, usually directed at them by women. Are men to be excluded from protection? If we are all to become victims in the UK, you should surely think of including them on your ever growing list.

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex is a biological reality and needs specific protection

Question 15: We should strive as a nation to make life more enjoyable for all. Fragmenting us into identity groups who can only assert themselves through aggrievement, due to the poor drafting of law, will not achieve this.

Question 16: Snowflakes - more commonly known as millennials, need protection too!

How can it be wise to place more value on one age group over another? It will cause division and resentment and we have quite enough of that in this country without the State seeking to create more through ill considered, poorly drafted laws.

Question 17: How will 'hate' against a sex worker be measured or assessed?

Question 18: What evidence exists that alternative subcultures are being subjected to hate? How will 'hate' against them be measured or assessed? A micro-aggression? Looking at them for too long, not looking at them for long enough? Seriously, how do you expect the Police to deal with this? They need to get on with responding to crimes that impact on people's lives - assault, robbery, burglary, fraud, murder. They don't have the resources to add yet another grievance group to their 'to do' list.

Question 19: Please see my response above on the folly of burdening the Police with vague, poorly considered and drafted laws.

Question 20: No! The most precious gift we have in this country has been the right to robustly debate and discuss different points of view without fear. Criminalising them, which has already started, will unravel all that has been achieved over centuries.

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: Is the current legal position working? Does it need reviewing?

Question 23: There is no place for the thought police in the UK. This is a truly chilling question.

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: Interpreting every offence through the narrow prism of protected characteristics is absurd and reduces us all.

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view

Question 27: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view.

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view

Question 30: No view

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view

Question 32: We, the people, are more than our protected characteristics. The laws enshrining our rights should inspire and unite us. Fragmenting the population into identities and then weaponizing them creates division, resentment and ultimately contempt.

Question 33: No view

Question 34: No view

Question 35: No view

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: No view

Question 38 Part 2: No view

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view

Question 40: No

Expand: This too easily encroaches on freedom of thought and speech

Question 41: No

Expand: Who is to decide what is inflammatory? I am opposed to all attempts to control free speech and thought.

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: The most precious gift we have in this country is our freedom of speech and that must include the right to offend, provoke and inflame. The 2010 Equality Act and its protected characteristics and beliefs have opened the floodgates of intolerance and victimhood. The College of Policing's sinister recording of non-crime hate incidents is crippling honest, rational debate. These laws need to be reviewed.

Question 43 Part 1: Online platforms and social media companies need separate, detailed, intelligent attention. The issues and scale of what needs to be considered cannot be covered in this Hate Bill

Question 43 Part 2: See above

Question 44: No view

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: There is little to be gained for us as individuals or as a nation by giving the Police and Courts the powers to act like Inquisitors or Witch Finder Generals. The vagueness of your terms and your determination to find hatred even when there is no evidence of it is truly shocking. Furthermore you have no business controlling the English language and criminalising it.

Question 46: No

Expand: You may want to refer to the judgement in the Harry Miller case (Feb 2020), where the judge stated that we have never had a Stasi, Cheka or Gestapo and nor should we.

Question 47: No

Expand: Intrusion on freedom of thought and speech and an attempt to control and police the use of English.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex and gender must not be conflated.

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: How do you plan to police this? Are we going to live in a country where friends, family and neighbours are actively encouraged to snitch on each other? How will this improve our lives? All you will illicit from the public is contempt and more damage to the increasingly fragile relationship between the people and the State.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand: No view

Question 52 Part 2: Sex and gender must not be conflated.

Question 53: No view

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view

Question 55 Part 1: Yes!

Question 55 Part 2: Freedom of speech must be protected Freedom of thought must be protected. Freedom from State driven ideology must be ensured. Repeal or reform the 2010 Equality Act and bring the College of Policing's pursuit of non hate incidents to an end.

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand: At several points in this consultation you conflate terms in an unhelpful way.

Either a chant is racist or it is not. Either a chant is homophobic or it is not.

What is an 'indecent' chant? What one person finds rousing, robust and life enhancing can cause offence to another Who is to be the judge of this? Is the State planning to provide us with a list of approved chants?

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: We do not need a Hate Crime Commissioner.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Private Citizen.

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: On the question of stirring up hatred The short pamphlet called 'On Liberty' was once well known, it contains arguments for freedom of expression that proponents of Hate Speech Laws have never successfully refuted.

Please read it The policing of speech is a grave mistake in nearly all circumstances and Hate Speech Laws should be repealed not consolidated in a civilized nation.

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: No part of these laws should touch upon the right of citizens to express themselves freely.

Please read the pamphlet called 'On Liberty' and you will find out the many reasons why this is so.

Question 3: No

Expand: The law should protect all citizens equally from harm, not including offence, and should never attempt to prosecute thoughts or the expression of thoughts. Read the pamphlet called 'On Liberty' and you will find out the many reasons why this is so

Question 4: All people deserve to be treated equally

Question 5: No

Expand: There must be no laws that censor Religious views and anti religious views. They need to be aired openly. Get the law out of this area.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: Why are legislators taking upon themselves of defining what a religion is ? Its none of the state's business.

Question 7:

Question 8: Other (please expand)

Question 8 Part 1: Use the law protect every person from harm irrespective of their sex But no one from offence. Read the pamphlet called 'On Liberty' and you will find out the many reasons why this is so

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: The law should not classify groups at all.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: It is not the proper roll of the law to criminalise thoughts. We rightly stopped seeking to look into men's souls hundreds of years ago Read the pamphlet called 'On Liberty' and you will find out the many reasons why this is so.

Question 11: No

Expand: Stop the introduction of any new Hate Crime laws

Question 11 Part 2: All of these physical attacks should be prosecuted under existing laws . No hate crime categories are needed

Question 12: This proposal brings everybody without exception into a special category That makes the categories ridiculous. Scrap these laws.

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: These laws will do more harm than good, please scrap them

Question 15: All citizens should be treated equally by all branches of the state at all times.
No excuses.

Question 16:

Question 17: Hate Crime categories undermine equality before the law and should be repealed

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand: No Hate crimes

Question 25: No

Expand: Scrap all categories

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand: All people should be treated equally by the courts. No special category of defendant and no special category of victim.

Question 37: Other (please expand)

Expand: Is someone suggesting secret sentencing criteria? No. everything open please.

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Encouraging violence is already a crime separate to Hate Crime legislation. That's enough to protect everyone

Question 41: No

Expand: This smacks of political censorship. Incitement to violence has always been a crime and that's good enough

Question 42: No

Expand: This is heavy handed political censorship and the end of free expression. Do none of this I beg you

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: So. I can whisper 'I love him' and then you prosecute me as if I'd screamed 'Kill him '

This is a mad proposal. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

Question 46: No

Expand: With these proposals you are creating a wicked system Stop now and return to love of freedom and justice.

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: No

Question 51: No

Expand: This reminds me of when my Dad told me of children being encouraged to inform on their parents for stuff they said at home during the war. This law should stay in the old USSR or Nazi Germany where it belongs

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand: Expressing hatred should not be a crime in the UK

Question 55 Part 1: What? So some people want to censor court reporting and parliament too? These are very dangerous people.

Question 55 Part 2: All of them

Question 56: No

Expand: Who gets to say what is racist chanting?

Is booing 'taking the knee' racist chanting?

Some people will say it is.

Political expression should not be prosecuted by the law. Read the pamphlet called 'On Liberty' and you will find out the many reasons why this is so

Question 57: No

Expand: Offence is not harm. Read the pamphlet called 'On Liberty' and you will find out the many reasons why this is so

Question 57 Part 2: I've heard Referees called Fat and called blind and called a thousand other derogatory names. It's not criminal because it's not harm. it's just speech.

Question 58: Missile throwing is already an offence

You hate football don't you?

Question 59: I get the impression that you hate football and despise football fans. Should that be a crime too No it shouldn't Read the pamphlet called 'On Liberty' and you will find out the many reasons why this is so.

Question 60: Yes I definitely get the impression that you despise football fans. Should that be a crime too No it shouldn't Read the pamphlet called 'On Liberty' and you will find out the many reasons why this is so.

Question 61: No I think you should hang the offenders

Can I say that?

Is it a Hate Crime?

You hate football fans too don't you? Admit it.

Should Legislators be prosecuted for their hatred of football fans?

No they should not

Read the pamphlet called 'On Liberty' and you will find out the many reasons why this is so.

Question 62: Absolutely not. We don't need a new Witch finder General

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hate crime laws infringe upon the natural born rights have citizens

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 4: no

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: no

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Of course it should include men, this presupposition shows the blatant misandry of the Scottish government

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: this presupposes that only women or non-men can commit the crime

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15: no

Question 16:

Question 17: no that is degenerate criminal behaviour

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: they should be held liable if they are a publisher

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: FGC

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Bringing the laws together would only serve to put all the eggs in one basket. It would be too broad and open to interpretation. It would invite non crimes to be classed as crimes

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand: The more specific you are about characteristics the more divisive they become. They remove agency from groups not covered by a characteristic and inevitably lead to inequality and discrimination against those groups

Question 4: No. Migration and asylum status are not immutable characteristics. They are choices. People in protected characteristic groups did not choose to be in that group. Migrating individuals were not born to migrate in the same way that a person's heritage wasn't born out of war.

Question 5: No

Expand: We should be free to criticise religion. Protecting religion too much gives it power over those with no religious beliefs. We have a right to not follow god as much as we have a right to follow a god

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: If you can definitively prove what asexuality is and how it presents, sure. If it is self determined with no definition then it isn't really a sexual orientation

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: We don't presume anything other than innocence. Why are we making laws based on presumption?

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Transgender is fine. We don't need hundreds of definitions to muddy the waters

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Yes

Question 10: If it's criminal conduct then what difference does the victim's circumstances have? If they were wrongly presumed to not have a disability then surely that proves, by definition, that the person was not consciously discriminating against them because of their disability?

Question 11: No

Expand: No. Because every single person on the planet occupies a gender or a sex. What is the point of protected characteristics if they basically refer to all human beings?

This is a potential can of worms and I shudder to think of the damage it will do to society in the long run

Question 11 Part 2: I'm not even sure what you are proposing here. FGM is criminal. Forced marriage is criminal. Domestic abuse is criminal. What difference does gender specifics have to the crimes being committed? Are you saying it would be worse if a woman was affected by FGM?

Question 12: Both women and men. You are looking for equality, aren't you? Because if you favour one over the other then you are not encouraging equality but creating inequality

Question 13: No

Expand: It's irrelevant because the inequality comes from only protecting one gender and not the other.

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15: No. It would be incredibly complicated. If age differences were the basis for complaint then the cases would be infinite. It would be impossible to police. When something is impossible it is left at the discretion of those implementing the law which itself leads to inequality in justice.

Question 16: Perhaps for older people. Specifically in the work environment. People who are capable of carrying out a role shouldn't be discriminated against simply because of their age.

Question 17: No. It's a job. It isn't a defining characteristic.

Question 18: No. Because it's too woolly. What does that even mean? Isn't everyone in an alternative subculture?

Question 19: Yes. Homelessness is not a choice.

Question 20: Absolutely not. That's the whole point of philosophy. It is there to be challenged and queried. Who gets to decide which philosophy is correct?

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: No. That invites a specific response. The cases should be dealt with upon the facts and not what someone's mind reads as person's motivation.

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: No. Simply because there are already too many splinter groups within those definitions. And "any other characteristics" is leaving the door wide open for technicalities. The aim is to improve justice and not to deny it.

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34: Yes. Just because the aggravated aspect could not be proved it doesn't mean a crime was not committed

Question 35: All crimes are motivated by hate in some way Why is there so much focus on characteristics? No. A hybrid solution sounds unworkable or inefficient. Law needs to be clear and concise

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Sure. Whatever that means.

Question 38 Part 2: All of the above

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: No because it is a massive overreach of the intended powers. Again, it is left to the individuals to select which cases to pursue because the courts would be overrun with thousands of unwarranted claims

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: That depends if they class themselves as publisher or a host. It also depends heavily on what is proposed as being unlawful

Best to say they are fully criminally liable for it. To be on the safe side.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Is transgender a disability?

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: No

Question 51: No

Expand: Absolutely not This is an invasion of privacy What is said in the privacy of the dwelling is not for the courts to decide.

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: No

Question 53: No

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: The exemptions should continue

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: Yes

Question 58: No. How can you be sure of who the gesture or the missile is aimed at?

Question 59: No. That is a separate environment. It's link is only tenuous.

Question 60: No Where is the certainty in deciding someone else's perception? And guilt by association used to be frowned upon.

Question 61: Yes

Question 62: No Police commissioners have been abysmal A hate crime commissioner wouldn't be any different. How could one person fairly represent the massive diversity of the subject? It's a fast track to inequality

Name: Alicia Forsythe, Community Outreach Acting Team Leader

Name of Organisation: iSEA / UKFCP

<https://www.ukfcp.com/nsc>

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand: Combining these hate crime laws into a single "Hate Crime Act" would be beneficial in terms of efficiency, especially when considering the establishment of a Hate Crime Commissioner and their corresponding office, with this being said it is important to still retain each case's individuality and understand each one's given circumstances. Every incident will have a different degree of hatred or amount of support that is needed, thus while one term may be used to collectively bring them together it's vital that it doesn't undermine or invalidate each individual's experiences because they are grouped together with other levels of hate crime.

Question 2: Yes

Expand: It is important to distinguish what protected characteristics are—such as race, colour, national origin, religion, gender (including pregnancy), disability, age, and citizenship status—as they are the most often targeted groups in hate crime incidents. As such we can use this to know what support systems are needed for which communities, and we can work to properly educate others on how to assist post a hate crime incident or how to better prevent them as a whole.

Question 3: Yes

Expand: However, it is important that the law commission remains transparent with the public about what these criteria are and how to best identify them—whether that be through a shared infographic with steps, or a rubric, or general guidelines

Question 4: No, because, while those are all characteristics which can be the cause of hate crime, they are all separate identities

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Yes, though asexuality itself is the absence of sexual orientation or attraction to any gender and thus the extent of hate crime is comparable to that of heterosexuals

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: It would always be best to include another option for those who do not fall within those labels but can still be marginalised due to their gender identity, which can, for instance, be labelled as "Other gender" or "Does not fall into these categories"

Question 9: The definition of "physical or mental impairment" encompasses a variety of things and thus is valid with the inclusion of intellectual and sensory impairment in these.

Question 10: While people can commit crimes without meaning for it to fall into the category of a "hate crime" it is difficult to properly assess the intentions of said criminals. Aspects such as them lying are hard when determining how to properly label the crime. Each incident should have a case by case basis; if someone is very apparently physically disabled, for example, it would be hard to believe that the perpetrator did not take into account their disability before committing a crime against them and thus the victim should receive the protection afforded by hate crime laws

Question 11: Yes

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: If gender or sex is protected under hate crime law then the context of the aforementioned crimes can be considered an addition to the penalties already faced by the offenders

Question 12: Hate crime against men occurs due to their belonging to one of the protected characteristic groups: whether they are POC, LGBTQ+, disabled or otherwise. When subtracting all these protected characteristics from a man, there is not enough comparable data to suggest or solidify claims that they experience hate crime--especially when taking into account the role of power dynamics and its correlation to the status of men in society as compared to other minorities

Question 13: Yes

Expand: This is a more suitable descriptor as misogyny can fall under a hate crime but is typically connotated with less aggressive circumstances

Question 14: Yes

Expand: This will maximise efficiency and oftentimes the crime perpetrated against these two characteristics are linked

Question 15: There is potential for abuse or neglect towards older persons due to their vulnerability as being less mobile or alert, among other traits they exhibit. Due to this, there is also potential for criminals to target them for incidents like robbing. Additionally, there is data of recorded hostility and discrimination from youth towards the elderly due to their age. Recently, there has also been a surge of hostility towards younger generations due to the COVID pandemic and their supposed role in spreading it. Thus, even if the level of hate crime is not as drastic as other protected groups, age should be recognised as a protected characteristic.

Question 16: Historically, ageism has always been used to refer to older people but as mentioned before there have been recent developments in hate crime towards younger people due to tensions of the COVID pandemic. There are also societal or institutional systems set in place that favour older people to younger people and the same can be said for vice versa. Thus, it may be more inclusive to use "age" as an overarching category for these hate crime incidents to fall under, so that younger people don't feel invalidated after experiencing harsh setbacks or hate crime.

Question 17: Yes, sex workers should fall under the protection of hate crime laws as they experience societal and institutional oppression due to the nature of their work and are often targeted- hate crime ranging from sexual abuse to beatings for things like their appearance or vulnerability, among other things.

Question 18: If there is enough data to suggest that they have copious amounts of targeted crime against them specifically for being part of these communities and not other protected characteristics they may be (POC, LGBTQ+, etc.) then they should fall under protection. However, as there aren't institutional systems set in place to specifically oppress them, then it cannot be said that they can undoubtedly be targeted for hate crime

Question 19: Yes, perpetrators' bias against homeless individuals or their ability to target homeless people with relative ease and they experience high degrees of inequality

Question 20: If there is data suggesting that people commit crimes in a bias towards those with different philosophical beliefs without the correlation to other protected characteristics, and it can be comparable to the crimes conducted towards those aforementioned protected characteristics, then it can be recognised

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: Yes, it would be good to do this and see the reactions of the perpetrators Depending on their level of pride, assertion, or bias towards the protected characteristic the proper support can be given to the victims but also preventing the perpetrator from inflicting the same ideals onto others within the characteristic Additionally, doing this would be beneficial for comparing data on hate crimes and thus can be used to further prevent or raise awareness on them, maybe even in reforming or properly educating biased parties' views on these characteristics

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: Yes, as there is data of protected characteristics' being targeted through these methods, specifically for the minority group they belong to.

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: Yes, this would be efficient and overall beneficial.

Question 33: With the inclusion of asking the criminal to educate themselves on their problematic mindset or commit to supervised community service aiding the protected characteristics they were hostile towards (in an attempt to remove their biases) though this should be done only after consideration or prevention to possible negative ramifications the maximum sentences given in CDA 1998 are appropriate.

Question 34: Yes, the Courts should always have the power to determine whether the offender be found guilty of the base offence should they not be found guilty of the aggravated -as long as they are just in enacting these verdicts as they deem fit on a case by case basis

Question 35: Both approaches raise beneficial methods for protecting and supporting targeted groups and establishing order for criminal conduct. Thus it would be best to take aspects from both in order to implement the most efficient approach and stabilise societal and industrial support systems.

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Yes, because different cases may have different levels of severity, hence a flexible approach is preferred.

Question 38 Part 2: A combination of approaches, but the set of criteria for judges to consider seems most appropriate, practical, efficient, and transparent for all parties

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: The circumstances where an online platform's company should be held responsible for widespread acts of hate crime as posted by its users are when they fail to enact proper repercussions on the perpetrator. For instance, a major social media platform has fallen under much criticism for the fact its platform allows neo Nazis and other anti-POC

hate speech while simultaneously suspending accounts who fight against these online attacks, reclaim slurs, or even jokingly call their friends insults. Social media video platforms are also hotspots for unlawful material distribution. Proper control of these would look like: account suspension, a warning before reporting flagged activity to larger authorities, or--in serious cases--reporting the user's information directly to local officials to prevent harm of others and ensure accountability of actions.

Question 43 Part 2: In the slim instance that inflammatory material is posted without the intent of stirring up hatred, there should be criteria of which the material can be checked against for whether it falls under freedom of speech or is simply someone thinking that certain characteristics should not hold the same rights as them. After assessing this then the platform can be held liable if need be for its monitoring of the site.

Question 44: It should be defined for full transparency and so there is a set criterion that can be used. Some examples would be someone who shows general prejudice or bias to others or frequently exhibits microaggressions based on race, especially when paired with an assessment of anger levels or any particular event in their life which may cause anger at racial groups.

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Yes, that encompasses it as a whole better.

Question 48: Yes

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50: Yes, that sounds reasonable.

Question 51: Yes

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Yes, the same terms are applicable as long as those protections are not infringing on the rights of other protected characteristics.

Question 53: Yes, the same terms are applicable as long as those protections are not infringing on the rights of this protected characteristic.

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: The public may not understand how these exemptions are managed and consultation can only be done accurately when they are properly explained.

Question 55 Part 2: If the scientific or academic published information is evidence-based and properly caveated to avoid the perception of deliberation and act in the public interest, then yes.

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: It would be preferable to cover all protected characteristics albeit, unfortunately, ambitious

Question 58: Yes, especially if it can be evaluated to be an act specifically against a protected characteristic.

Question 59: No, this may fall under other jurisdiction and the perpetrator should be held accountable regardless.

Question 60: Yes, this would be most beneficial.

Question 61: If possible it would be best to incorporate some sort of monitored community service in support of the targeted racial groups, as to properly educate the perpetrator.

Question 62: Yes, this would be extremely efficient for monitoring cases, and additionally would show the protected characteristics the support they have but also show any potential perpetrators an example of what they may have to deal with.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: not applicable

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury.

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity

and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict.

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes.

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened.

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers.

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over.

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: It should not see my first submission.

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: No see my previous submission

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 4: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 6: Yes

Expand: There should be n protected groups full stop. But adding no more will not make it worse

Question 7: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 10: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 11: No

Expand: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 11 Part 2: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening.

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury.

Question 12: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 13: No

Expand: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 14: No

Expand: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 15: Children should be protected from all harm, either directed from the outside or by their own actions

Offense or fear of hatred should not come into child protection

Harm caused or imminent should be punished or prevented by existing laws: not by reducing freedom of expression

Question 16: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 17: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 18: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 19: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 20: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 21: No

Expand: There should be no sentences for 'hate crimes.'

Question 22: Yes

Expand: Until hate crimes legislation can be abolished, the very minimal protection of demonstrating hostility should be retained just as proof of dishonest accusations intended to harm are part of existing libel and slander laws

Question 23: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 24: No

Expand: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury.

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes.

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups.

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over.

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice.

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 25: No

Expand: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury.

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes.

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups.

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over.

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice.

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety.

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 26: No

Expand: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished.

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening.

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury.

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict.

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners

(trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened.

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers.

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over.

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 27: No

Expand: Hate crime laws should not exist

Question 28: No

Expand: Hate crime laws should not exist

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation

Question 29: No

Expand: Hate crime laws should not exist

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation

Question 30: Hate crime laws should not exist.

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation

Question 31: Yes

Expand: Until hate crime laws are repealed , no further crimes or categories or hierarchies of intensity of crimes should be added.

Question 32: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 33:

Question 34: No

In the spirit of the former notion of double jeopardy, it should not.

Hate crime laws should not exist

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation.

Question 35: Hate crime laws should not exist.

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation

Question 36: No

Expand: Hate crime laws should not exist.

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation

Question 37: No

Expand: Hate crime laws should not exist.

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation

Question 38 Part 1: Hate crime laws should not exist.

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand: Hate crime laws should not exist

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation

Question 40: No

Expand: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished.

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening.

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict.

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened.

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers.

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Hate crime laws should not exist.

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Hate crime laws should not exist.

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation

Question 43 Part 1: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Hate crime laws should not exist

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Hate crime laws should not exist.

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished.

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening.

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict.

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened.

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers.

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety.

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Hate crime laws should not exist

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation.

Question 46: Yes

Expand: Until hate crime laws are repealed , no further crimes or categories or hierarchies of intensity of crimes and punishment should be added.

Question 47: No

Expand: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor , perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening.

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict.

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti-pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened.

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups.

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over.

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice.

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety.

Question 47 Part 2: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury.

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials - or anyone else - who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes.

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups.

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over.

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice.

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety.

Question 48: No

Expand: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished.

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening.

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict.

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti-pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened.

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups.

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over.

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice.

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety.

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 49: No

Expand: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished.

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening.

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury.

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict.

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners

(trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened.

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers.

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over.

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 50: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished.

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening.

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury.

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened.

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers.

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over.

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 51: No

Expand: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor , perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening.

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict.

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened.

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers.

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Question 52: No

Expand: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished.

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening.

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict.

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened.

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers.

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism.

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53: All 'hate crime' laws should be abolished

In expressing disagreement with crimes, oppression, injustice and immoral beliefs or practices, any criminal, oppressor, perpetrators of injustice or practitioner of immorality can claim that criticism of themselves is offensive and threatening

Accusers of so-called hate crimes thus automatically become prosecuting counsel, judge and jury.

All requests for reform, all objection to misgovernment and requests for better service from officialdom could allow officials or anyone else who feels offended or threatened by such requests will, under Law Commission's proposed legislation, be empowered to prosecute the reformers and objectors from the starting point that their 'offence' or 'fear of hate' is itself a crime. All the courts will have to do is judge the 'offended' or 'threatened' person's sincerity and then decide on the correct punishment, since the very accusation of hate crime is the verdict

If these laws had been in place in the past:

Peaceful suffragists could have been imprisoned on the grounds they hate men and their speech and demonstrations banned carte blanche ;

Likewise the Chartists for stirring up hatred against the electorate; likewise any new political parties hoping to overturn the established parties' oligopoly of power on the grounds of class hatred; likewise the trade union movements and anti pollution campaigners likewise modern feminists as proponents of misandry; likewise anti-Apartheid protestors and campaigners (trying to stir up hatred against the white people of South Africa) likewise those who exposed the mass rape of British girls would be convicted in courts of law as racist haters given the ethnicity of the preponderance of the gangs who perpetrated those crimes.

It is no excuse or rebuttal to these historical arguments that other laws and lawless injustice were historically used to suppress such movements. The Law Commission's proposals will mean in practice that anyone in power or influence can have accusations against them treated as crimes if they can plausibly state they are offended or feel threatened

Peaceful reform will be frustrated at every turn when those whose injustices or misdemeanors are being held up for criticism and ridicule can threaten, with the expectation of success, jail terms or fines to the reformers

These proposals will end free speech and if enforced widely by those the officers of the courts who will most likely recognise their fellow official's feelings as conclusive evidence of wrongdoing if they can plausibly prove themselves to be in recognised or potentially recognised defined 'victim' groups.

Peaceful persuasion and reform will be over.

Those who still object to the abuses and injustices of the powerful will have no effective, legal and peaceful way to seek reform and justice.

And when that happens, what avenues of escape from injustice or techniques of persuasion do they have left in seeking a fairer and better world?

Abandon this proposal in its entirety

Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate. He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all '

Question 54: No

Expand: Until hate crime laws are repealed , no further crimes or categories or hierarchies of intensity of crimes and punishment should be added.

The decision to prosecute should be examined from the start at the highest level of authority with the highest burden of evidence and argument placed upon prosecutors

Question 55 Part 1: Yes.

Until hate crime laws are repealed , no further crimes or categories or hierarchies of intensity of crimes and punishment should be added

The decision to prosecute should be examined from the start at the highest level of authority with the highest burden of evidence and argument placed upon prosecutors.

Question 55 Part 2: Individuals can be protected from defamation by sensible libel and slander laws.

Protected characteristics give malefactors a shield behind which to hide their crimes from scrutiny and criticism

Example; 'As a member of protected characteristic group A, my accuser is expressing hatred of me not for my supposed crimes of theft, murder, rape and torture, but because my accuser hates group A and I'm afraid and offended by that underlying hate He should be jailed and any crimes I may be accused of dealt with by officials or better yet, no-one at all.'

Hate crime laws should not exist.

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Hate crime laws should not exist

Courts should punish only for illegal harm actually done to person, property or reputation.

Name: ■■■

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1 threatening words or behaviour; 2 intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic

discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing

two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit new stirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:**Question 48: No**

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:**Question 51: No**

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. • Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:**Question 53:****Question 54: No**

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level.

Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The

Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: No. A migrant isn't a characteristics. You are attempting to use the law to stifle debate on immigration

Question 5: No

Expand: We should be free to criticise religion for the stupid cults that they are. They are the harm you should protect us from

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: No How long do you have to abstain from sex before You ar asexual Stop grouping people and just treat people as people

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: It's made up

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Give it a rest

Question 8 Part 3: A Liberal left wing agenda to further encourage division in this country There are already laws in place to protect everyone, we don't need to protect people's feelings

Question 9: No

Question 10: You're making up victims now

Question 11: No

Expand: We already have laws to protect everyone regardless of their gender or sex

Question 11 Part 2: Why isn't circumcision considered a FGM crime

Question 12: There is no such thing as a hate crime There is just crime

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: No. There is no such thing as hate crime. Only crime

Question 16:

Question 17: If you assault a sex worker you are already committing a crime

Question 18: No. Who defines. An alternative sub culture. Basically every person could be in this group

Question 19: No.

Your just adding this sort of thing in for chuckles Now aren't you

Question 20: No Not at all

Question 21: No

Expand: A crime is a crime.

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: That is just a word salad

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: You are just trying to control twitter Get back in your box

Question 41: No

Expand: Unless I am inciting violence, then my views are none of your business.

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: No

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: No

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1: What does stirring up hatred even mean Its just a tool For Liberal leftys to silence debate they don't like.

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: A person should be free to say what they want in their dwelling. This is a pervasive orwellian attempt to regulate wrongspeak

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: No

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No. Another civil servant feeding off the taxpayer, stirring up trouble to justify their job

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hate crimes should be abolished if a person commits a crime, he should be prosecuted for that crime Adding subjective ideas about hate (or other thoughts) is counter-productive and leads to all kinds of injustice

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hate crimes are a political standpoint not an ethical one

Question 3: No

Expand: If the standpoint is based on what is currently believed to be offensive how can you protect those who have the right to free speech and to say what they believe otherwise It would be a complete infringement on freedom of speech.

Question 4: Legislation will not change people's ideas on race. By adding race into legislation we point it out, make people different and therefore subject to abuse because people become spiteful because of it By treating people the same we encourage equality and move on from racism. We can embrace differences in race in many ways but legislation will never make a racist not racist.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: I am religious but again no one will change their minds due to legislation all it does is fuel hate Hate to those who were meant to be protected by the legislation in most cases If people want to tell me I am wrong or they disagree I welcome that, because I can discuss and maybe change their mind. I don't want people to be penalised for having their own religion or opinion because I disagree

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: This shows the problem of how jurors can sympathise with criminals of their own faith It is a version of the freedom fighter/gunman/terrorist argument. Stick to the

crime - the motive was to commit the crime for various gains. By confusing the case with the religion involved, the law runs the risk of losing the clarity that the

crime has been committed by the accused. That is the issue. Why the defendant did it in terms of religious/sectarian culture is best left alone.

Question 7: This is not a victims' charter. If the law is broken, then prosecute the case adding this kind of thing just confuses the

case, and certain victims, if they stand to profit from the case, are incentivised to use such special pleading to extract more punishment. This is using the law in a

way that the general public find distasteful, as well as being against natural justice.

Consultation Question 8: We provisionally propose that the current definitio

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: See above

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: See above

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: This is why it's such a fools errand to police speech rather than crime. There is no policing speech in a just way that doesn't penalise people expressing opinion or only protecting those who have the popular view. Why is one protected on a basis of sexuality/disability/race but another isn't?

Question 11: No

Expand: Equality is not achieved by protecting only one group

If sex or gender-based hate crime protection were limited to women (ignoring for a moment that the non binary are already included elsewhere) would

immediately be seen as discriminatory. For example, male on male rape is much more hushed up than male on female rape. Indeed, female on male attacks are

also treated less seriously by the police, being often laughed at as unbecoming. If the aim of hate crime protection is to discourage such offences, then these

crimes would be left unaffected.

Question 11 Part 2: If these crimes are crimes then they should always be prosecuted. No exceptions, carve outs or other excuses in hate crime bills

Question 12: Why should one be protected but the other not, as said before.

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: Respect due to age is again not taught by legislation. And again crime is crime and should be prosecuted thus and not by an arbitrary view on age. Things like age of consent are already included in law and rightly so

Question 16: Why does one group get extra protection? Why not treat all equally if equality is what we aim for?

Question 17: Again crime is crime. It's not worse when committed against one person rather than another. That doesn't sound like equality but a caste system.

Question 18: See above.

Question 19: Again.

Question 20: No, that's just inventing useless categories and completely destroying free speech and philosophy.

Question 21: No.

Expand: A legal case already has complications, additional things such as race/sexuality/etc merely distract from the prosecuted being sentenced for the crime committed.

Question 22: No.

Expand: This is in some ways is the heart of the problem. A person does not need to hate a characteristic protected or not. The point is that the criminal hates the victim.

Trying to pin that hate to a particular characteristic does not further justice at all. Indeed, it may perversely encourage crimes against "normal" (whatever that

means) people on the basis that "if I get caught, it is not so bad".

Consultation Question 23: We invite consultees' views as to

Question 23: See above.

Question 24: No.

Expand:

Question 25: No.

Expand:

Question 26: No.

Expand:

Question 27: No.

Expand:

Question 28: No.

Expand:

Question 29: No.

Expand:

Question 30: No. Why are these cases taken more seriously if race/disability/gender etc is involved, the crime is a crime regardless.

Question 31: No.

Expand:

Question 32: Again confusing the process of justice and possibly perverting it by adding unnecessary criminalisation

Question 33: No comment

Question 34: "Innocent until proven guilty", not "find a crime, any crime to stick him with"

Question 35: No comment

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: More subjectivity is not a good thing in this case

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: Minded to say yes, given that, if the aggravated offence could have been pursued but was not, then it seems unfair to increase the sentence when it was not

proven by the case

Question 40: Other (please expand)

Expand: This could lead to edited or doctored tape or video recordings The whole truth and nothing but the truth is to be used

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: Please share your views below:

The companies could only become liable once they have been told about the material, and given a certain amount of time to remove it. However, laws on

unlawful material vary between countries So there may be a defence around it not being unlawful in the hosting country

Question 43 Part 2: Inflammatory material is material, and are you going to prosecute comedy for using such material?

Question 44: "Likely to" is pure subjectivity.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: There is a difference between threatening and abusive. Lots of people losing an argument might take abusive as their version of events, in the same way that someone who does not understand freedom of speech might think that not honouring his god is insulting.

Threatening is easier to argue as illegal; abusive and insulting are not the same as threatening, and freedom of speech has to allow abusive and insulting

language, otherwise it is not free

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: See above

Question 51: No

Expand: How can we have any freedom of speech if what we express in our own homes is policed? I find it scary that the government is proposing something so oppressive!

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Nothing in [the offences of stirring up religious hatred] shall be read or given effect in a way which prohibits or restricts discussion, criticism or expressions of antipathy, dislike, ridicule, insult or abuse of particular religions or the beliefs or practices of their adherents, or of any other belief system or the beliefs or practices of its adherents, or proselytising or urging adherents of a different religion or belief system to cease practising their religion or belief system.

In [relation to the offences of stirring up hatred on the grounds of sexual orientation], for the avoidance of doubt, the discussion or criticism of sexual conduct or practices or the urging of persons to refrain from or modify such conduct or practices... [or] any discussion or criticism of marriage which concerns the sex of the parties to marriage shall not be taken of itself to be threatening or intended to stir up hatred.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: Nothing should be done to prevent current freedom from being used.

Question 55 Part 2: I hope that these reports are already free of concerns from the offence. The presumption of exemption should be employed

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand: Doesn't indecent cover all of this already?

Question 57 Part 2: None

Question 58: You can't police gestures And throwing of missiles I would have thought was covered by assault charges by endangering people.

Question 59: No The law covers such offences already

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Definitely against such an idea we do not need any more commissioners! And the evidence from existing commissioners is not good.

Plus those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it. Wasn't there such things to police thought and speech in nazi Germany?

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Such a bill can have wide, unforeseen consequences that stifle the inherited right of freedom of expression and debate. Entities overseeing such legislation or its enforcement will likely end up being captured by ideologically motivated actors, leading to the violation of the rights of some and not others. Such legislation can be extremely dangerous, and is best avoided.

Question 2: No

Expand: Protected characteristics are a farce. For example, people who identify as trans, which would be included as a protected characteristic, are mentally ill and in need of help, not affirmation Encouraging people to undergo life-altering, optional surgeries that leave permanent wounds on their bodies is criminal, and we should be free to say that.

Religion is sometimes a motivation for crimes against humanity, as we have seen in Iraq and Syria Making it a protected characteristic may obstruct de-radicalisation efforts Furthermore, the use of protected characteristics would stifle debates that bring our society forward There is no need for it

Question 3: No

Expand: Demonstrable need is manufactured by lobbying groups. Additional harm is similarly being pushed around without evidence we are told that trans people would commit suicide if not affirmed, even as the trans suicide rate is itself astronomical because trans people are being affirmed. And suitability is purely subjective. Silencing people is not consistent with their rights

Question 4: My view is that you're insane. I am an immigrant. I do not want illegal entries into this country. You are trying to silence me.

Question 5: No

Expand: It is not up to you to define religion. If you define hate speech law based on religion, then you have to define religion. Then you have to say what's a valid religion and what isn't. Then we end up with a state religion

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Haha!!!!

Your denial of biological sex and its implications is hilarious.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: We should stop encouraging mental illness. It is making our society sick.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: You are ideological operatives who have no respect for science or reality.

Question 9:

Question 10: I am not sure what that means. I suppose it means one can get into a fight, get knocked out, then accuse the other party of a hate crime against a disabled person. That seems great and absolutely will not backfire

Question 11: No

Expand: Will you define all crimes of rape as hate crimes?

Question 11 Part 2: Why not just strengthen existing law, and, more importantly, enforcement? Where's the need for this?

Question 12: Yes. Roving bands of female thugs are terrorising my neighbourhood, and this seems like a great idea

Please don't accuse me of a hate crime for assuming their sex.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: What is a woman? Anyone who says she's a woman, or someone with the correct body parts?

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: I don't even know what you mean any more.

Question 15: What's the correct cut-off age?

Question 16: If I say people under 40 should not vote, would that be a hate crime? Because that kind of defines my views here.

Question 17: Prostitution should be criminalised. Start there.

Question 18: We went from Goths being rebels to Goths claiming hate crimes in one generation. What have you people done?

Question 19: It's not an 'experience'. It's a tragic reality. They need real help, not hate crime BS

Question 20: I always beat up neo-Platonists. Please don't make that a hate crime. Brawls in philosophy department corridors will never be the same again

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: Don't you have real problems to deal with? Like jihadi terrorism, the destruction of the youth, poverty, etc ? Must you waste our time with your madness?

Question 22: No

Expand: I say we define hate crime however we want and get rid of these pesky right wing madmen who disagree with us. Why should we test for anything. These bastards should prove they're innocent.

Question 23: Yes. Specifically, we should check everyone's social media for evidence of opposition to mass immigration, Islamic jihad, universal basic income, sexual mutilation of children, and poopy dicks. That way, anyone with the wrong views can already be assumed to have hostility or prejudice, then we just put them through the process and send them to the gulag Sounds brilliant

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: Are we sure we're doing enough? Where's the thought police provision?

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: We should leave space for adding future categories defined as retroactively protected by future enlightened overlords. Who knows what these right wing nut jobs will come up with next I heard some object to cutting off the penises of boys and surgically molding vaginas instead, because apparently these new vaginas can't deliver babies and seem to stink. These kinds of retroviews should be criminalised, and we should create space to do so in the future

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: Splendid idea. That way, the more people oppose transgenderism or mass immigration, the more people we can lock up I don't see that backfiring BUILD BACK GULAGS BETTER.

Question 27: Other (please expand)

Expand: I'll just show myself to the gulag then

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: Oy! Let's burn that mosque down!

Yeah.

But mate, it might be a hate crime

Hmmmm... let's not then.

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: Why stop at anything , lads? Keep going!!

Question 30: No. Most fraud is perpetrated against the elderly. They're mostly white, you know

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: Wouldn't want Pakistani rape gangs getting additional sentences now, would we...

Question 32: Would you please suck my intersectional balls?

Question 33: Who cares? All white people should be in the gulag anyway Unless they're woke. Then they get a kind of purgatory gulag - it's temporary until either their skin turns brown or falls off completely

Question 34: YES! LET WOKE JUDGES DEAL WITH IT!

Question 35: Does it mean more white people go to the gulag?

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: I support minimum mandatory sentencing for suspicion of committing a hate crime Please remember this when I'm sent to the gulag.

Question 37: Other (please expand)

Expand: If you want to do public shaming, do it right Why not tar and feather the accused? Or make them sit on an ass backwards and ring a bell while they're walked through the streets and have their crime read out for all and sundry to hear?

Question 38 Part 1: I fully support the right of judges to sentence those accused of wrongthink as they see fit. It you want to call that flexibility, so be it.

Question 38 Part 2: A combination of the approaches seems most likely to empower right think judges.

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: Why bother with these niceties? Those who believe in biological sex should all be provisionally sentenced pre-emptively. Then, when they do appear before a court, at least one guilty sentence is guaranteed.

Question 40: Other (please expand)

Expand: Do we not have thought detectors yet?

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: Are we sure inflammatory material is enough? How about, likely to cause an inflammation of feelings among the vulnerable or those prone to violence, and thereby contributing to the weakening of tolerance and inclusion?

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: The innocent disseminators should know better, and should not be treated as innocent All are guilty until woke

Question 43 Part 1: All circumstances.

Question 43 Part 2: Just because it cannot be shown doesn't mean it's not there.

Question 44: No, this should be kept as vague as possible to permit as many prosecutions as possible.

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: I am so happy that you agree that we do not need to use specific words to stir up hate, and that we can show that there is hatred wherever we see it. Go for it.

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand: I love the ought to have known Thought police, here we come!!!

Question 47: Other (please expand)

Expand: All this nuance makes my head ache Send them to the gulag and be done

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Other (please expand)

Expand: I think all those who assert that biological sex is real are criminals. Why waste your time?

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: That's an excellent way of dealing with the mass stirring of hatred against trans people by women. Just because they can give birth these people think they're special!

Question 50: Yes! Kill all TERFs!

Question 51: Other (please expand)

Expand: This requires a very sophisticated effort to police it properly. I suspect that those groups prone to hatred like white people should have surveillance installed in their dwellings to ensure that such legal provisions have the desired effect Alternatively, we can encourage children to report on the words of their parents.

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand: The more the merrier

Question 52 Part 2: Yes, and it should apply retroactively. Anyone who died in the last hundred years believing that only women give birth should be exhumed, tried, and then hanged, drowned and quartered

Question 53: Absolutely.

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand: It should require only YOUR consent, m'lord

Question 55 Part 1: Hell no! MPs can be TERFs or racists like the rest of them. Especially if they're white or conservative.

Question 55 Part 2: No! There are no exceptions!

Question 56: Other (please expand)

Expand: We need to be careful. We should equip football stadiums properly, so that whenever racist chanting starts, the stadium turns into a prison and the pitch turns into a pit of fire into which the guilty and unrepentant can be thrown.

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand: Should we not start by assuming that football is a colonial legacy that should be dismantled, then work from there? Are we starting the wrong way round?

Question 57 Part 2: Extend away This train has no brakes

Question 58: Even better, thoughts that precede gestures should be criminalised

Question 59: And preparations the night before, and drinks after the match.

Question 60: I'm sure these gammons won't understand these niceties but seems sensible. Have at it

Question 61: No. Start with life imprisonment at the gulag, then dangle the prospect of early release for good behaviour

Question 62: Like a commissar? Why have just one? Assign one to every neighbourhood.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: Please keep my submission confidential if possible

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1 threatening words or behaviour; 2 intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred could be inferred – and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up – is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit new stirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity – which are contentious issues – should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs, and effectively outlaw their expression.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is

controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect:

- using a person's birth name and pronoun,
- saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and
- saying that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own

policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 2: Yes

Expand: However, there is a serious problem in the selection of these protected characteristics. They do not align with the protected characteristics outlined in the Equality Act and in addition use different terminology e.g. 'transgender' as opposed to 'gender reassignment'. This means these laws are not aligned which causes problems when academics attempt to publish work relating to girls and women's rights as a sex in sport and when organisations attempt to comply with the law regarding girls and women's rights as a sex in sport, despite this being specifically catered for in the Equality Act.

Further, these characteristics need to be carefully defined. For example, 'transgender' should be changed to 'gender reassignment' and this should be defined as per the Equality Act.

In addition, 'sex' rather than 'gender' should be included since at the moment the hate speech legislation is asymmetrical privileging as it does one of the Equality Act characteristics over another. This creates a hierarchy of protected characteristics and works to constrain free speech in relation to the difficult discussions about the conflicts of rights

between women as defined by biological sex and transgender people as defined by gender reassignment. At present this asymmetry works to constrain those who centre girls and women's rights in academic work as this is often now deemed transphobic by reviewers who are the gatekeepers to publication.

Question 3: Yes

Expand: However, what constitutes evidence that hostility or prejudice towards the group is prevalent should be drawn widely. There is, for example, extensive academic evidence and evidence from social media that hate speech towards girls and women on the basis of their biological sex is widespread. Similarly, there is extensive evidence, documented over decades if not centuries that hostility or prejudice towards girls and women as a biological sex causes additional harm to the victim, members of the targeted group, and society more widely.

Question 4: No view.

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 7: No view.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: The characteristic should be amended to align with the Equality Act and should be 'gender reassignment'. We know that the numbers identifying as transgender without undergoing any medical transition (via hormones or surgery) are much larger than the transsexual population who do undergo a medical transition of some kind. Collin et al (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4823815/>) state 'the empirical literature on the prevalence of transgender highlights the importance of adhering to specific case definitions because the results can range by orders of magnitude. Standardized and routine collection of data on transgender status and gender identity is recommended.' They find 'whereas in most studies estimating the prevalence of surgical or hormonal gender affirmation therapy or transgender-related diagnoses, the prevalence estimates generally ranged between 1 and 30 per 100,000 individuals, self-reported transgender identity was orders of magnitude higher ranging from 100 to 700 per 100,000 or 0.1%-0.7%.' They also find the prevalence of transgender identity in adults is almost twice as high in biological males identifying as women as compared with biological females identifying as men. . The two distinct categories are of central importance for policy and planning purposes, not least in sport and the use of these different terms and discussion of these two different population groups should not constitute hate speech.

Further, many transsexuals appear unhappy about the conflation of the two categories as witnessed by 17 transsexuals who state: 'Replacing the evidenced based process for obtaining a gender recognition certificate with an over-the-counter style self-declaration blurs the distinction between us and transgender people who remain physically intact' (<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/may/04/standing-up-for-transsexual-rights>).

It is even more problematic to include people with intersex conditions, more commonly termed variations of sexual development (VSDs) or disorders of sexual development (DSDs) under the characteristic 'transgender' or 'gender reassignment'. Most people with VSDs are

either female in that they have female reproductive biology (e.g. Turner's Syndrome) or male in that they have male reproductive biology (e.g. Klinefelter's Syndrome), crucially they do not identify as the opposite sex and are not in any sense transgender. In contrast, almost all transgender people do not have a variation of sexual development and are unambiguously either biologically female or male, but, in contrast with people with VSDs, do identify as the opposite sex. It is impossible to change biological sex which is unproblematically either female or male in 99.98% of people (Sax 2002) and thus sex in humans is binary and immutable (Marinov 2020).

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: See answer above.

There should be a category 'gender reassignment' in order to align with the Equality Act.

There could also be a completely separate category of 'Variations of Sexual Development' but this should not be conflated with 'gender reassignment' or included within some form of 'transgender' category. This is a completely different population group.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: No view.

Question 10: No view.

Question 11: Yes.

Expand: If hate crime/speech legislation is retained, sex should urgently be included as a protected characteristic along with all other characteristics protected in the Equality Act. The legislation should be aligned.

Further, the characteristic should be 'sex' not 'gender'. Sex has an unproblematic biological definition whereas gender can mean a range of different things.

There are three main conceptions of gender in common usage:

a. 'Gender' as a synonym for, and conflated with, sex. This is unhelpful, particularly in legislation which requires precision. Biological sex refers to human sexual dimorphism, determined at conception, immutable and unproblematically classified in 99.98% of humans (<https://www.leonardsax.com/how-common-is-intersex-a-response-to-anne-fausto-sterling/#:~:text=According%20to%20Fausto%2Dsterling%27s%20figures,births%20out%20of%20every%20100%2C000.>).

b. 'Gender' often means socially constructed historically and culturally contextualised feminine and masculine stereotypes relating to roles ascribed to the female and male sexes within societies (https://www.who.int/health-topics/gender#tab=tab_1). For example, historically women have been considered emotional rather than rational and therefore suited to domestic rather than public life. Further, women were historically excluded from sport because of concerns it would damage their reproductive capabilities. Boxing for women has only been included in the Olympic Games since 2012 and rugby since 2016. Gender stereotypes change over time.

c. 'Gender identity' is a more recent concept meaning an unverifiable subjective inner sense of being feminine or masculine, not necessarily attached to biological sex (https://www.who.int/health-topics/gender#tab=tab_1).

Thus, a distinction between biological sex and socially constructed gender is widespread. The WHO (2020) explains gender 'describes those characteristics of women and men that are largely socially created', and sex 'encompasses those that are biologically determined'. Further 'these terms are often mistakenly used interchangeably in scientific literature, health policy, and legislation'.

Question 11 Part 2: No view

Question 12: No view.

Question 13: No

Expand: The protected characteristic should align with the Equality Act and be 'sex' meaning biological sex. The hate speech/crime legislation would then refer to misogyny. If 'woman' is used it is important that this is defined as in the Equality Act which clarifies ' "woman" means a female of any age '

Gender as a term should not be used as this term has several different meanings as outlined above. Legislation needs to be clear all to ensure that different demographic groups are quite rightly protected. Biological females need to be separately protected as a demographic group and the terms sex, biological sex or female and the characteristics that unambiguously do this

Question 14: No

Expand: See answers above. The protected category should be sex, biological sex or female

'Gender' is a contested term with two distinct and contradictory meanings and underlying ontological assumptions. For many psychologists, feminist scholars and others gender describes the prescriptive, culturally contextualised, socially constructed stereotypes of femininity and masculinity as distinct from the material reality of biological sex (Haines Deaux and Lofaro 2016). Gender stereotypes are not essentialised components of biological sex and are considered the hierarchical mechanism by which (patriarchal) society constructs men as superior (rational and thinking) and women as subordinate (emotional and feeling). The struggle for justice for girls and women has involved rejecting historically contextualised hierarchical gender stereotypes associated with biological sex. Consequently, gender stereotypes, but crucially not biological sex, are rejected.

Question 15: No view.

Question 16: No view

Question 17: All hate crime/speech categories should align with those in the Equality Act.

Question 18: All hate crime/speech categories should align with those in the Equality Act

Question 19: All hate crime/speech categories should align with those in the Equality Act

Question 20: All hate crime/speech categories should align with those in the Equality Act.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand: No view

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand: No view

Question 23: No view.

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand: No view

Question 25: No

Expand: The characteristics should align with the Equality Act.

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand: No view

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand: No view

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 30: No view

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 32: No view

Question 33: No view.

Question 34: No view.

Question 35: No view

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand: This is likely to constrain free speech and discussion of girls and women's rights as a sex even further if applied asymmetrically to only some of the characteristics in the Equality Act, particularly if the protected characteristics include 'transgender' but not 'sex' or 'females'.

Legal and government clarity regarding terminology and the legal provision of single sex activities and spaces including sport, specifically to ensure no indirect discrimination against females on the basis of biological sex, is essential. This is affecting academic publishing and consequently the ability of academics to even discuss in the public arena (academic journals), the single sex rights of girls and women as legally provided for in the Equality Act.

I have had comments from two academic reviewers of my work resulting in its rejection, looking at the impact of self-identification of gender on the sports participation of girls and women in relation to the Acts, stating the following:

'The use of 'the biological differences' and 'the sexes' is particularly reductionist '

'Putting biologically male and biologically female next to transgender is transphobic'.

'The Authors should remember that not just gender, but sex too, is a social construction '

'Using the term opposite biological sex is not only sexist, homophobic and transphobic, it is biologically incorrect'

'Steps need to be taken to rewrite much of this article to avoid contributing to the moral panic over trans women competing in women's sport'

If academic work exploring the fair, safe and legal inclusion of girls and women in sport in relation to the law is rejected for such reasons this amounts to censorship, a restraint on academic freedom and that girls and women's rights as a sex cannot be discussed in academic discourse.

The law needs accurate and clear terminology. Further, the Government should issue guidelines for academic publishers and universities clarifying the terminology and content of legislation with respect to the legal requirement for single sex spaces and activities including sport for reasons of fairness and safety of female participants.

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 43 Part 1: No view.

Question 43 Part 2: No view

Question 44: No view.

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1: No view

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 47 Part 2: No view

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 49: No

Expand: Sex. Not gender. See answers given above.

Question 50: No view.

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand: No view

Question 52 Part 2: Protected characteristics should align with those in the Equality Act.

Question 53: No view

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand: No view.

Question 55 Part 1: No view

Question 55 Part 2: No view.

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No view.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: The current t legislation in place is open to abuse and used to censor free speech
Many examples of this have taken place. This demonstrates a need to repeal such

legislation, not to increase it. A society that is forever scared of offending others, or even reflecting true feelings, will never address the underlying conditions that cause such feeling.

Question 2: No

Expand: Protected characteristics are a key part of identity politics. Identity politics only delivers division and fragmentation of society. Crimes against individuals should not get specific favour simply because of a characteristic that happens to be applicable to a certain individual or group.

Question 3: No

Expand: All victims of crime should have protection and enforcement regardless of the motive of the offender. The proposal creates a special victim group, which is unfair to those who do not fit into that group

Question 4: None of those things are relevant to race Race is a factor observed at birth and cannot be changed. Migration, asylum status and language all things which are unrelated to a race

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No further characteristics should be added. Where does it stop? Why not have BDSM as a sexual preference then?

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: This is too vague to define. You can not expect two people to make the same assumptions Is a woman wearing a business suit similar to a man's to be considered a cross dresser for example.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Intersex is a medical status and is not in a relevant category as transgenderism

Question 8 Part 3: Intersex people should not be considered relevant to transgenderism.

Question 9:

Question 10: No Disabilities may or may not be presumed by different people Different presumptions will be made and no one should be criminalised simply for not noticing.

Question 11: No

Expand: Sex is observed at birth Gender in the modern sense is irrelevant and mostly self chosen. Some people believe there are hundreds of genders. How can they be considered on a par with something as specific as sex?

Question 11 Part 2: These are all unrelated subjects and should not be amalgamated in any such way.

Question 12: It must apply to all, other wise is discriminatory to men

Question 13: No

Expand: Whats the point of a law that claims to support equality if it discriminates against men?

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex should be used exclusively. Gender seems too subjective in most circumstances and not appropriate

Question 15: No Age should not be considered a protected characteristic and no one should be criminalised for treating someone different based on their age.

Question 16: If it only applies to specific ages, then its a discriminatory law. What defines older? Old means different things to different people

Question 17: No. If it were, then all professions would have to be considered. Why should one profession get special preference?

Question 18: No. Cultures are personally choices and should always be open to criticism.

Question 19: No. People should be entitled to hold views on the accommodation of individuals without being criminalised

Question 20: Beliefs should be open to criticism and not be protected in any way.

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: People should be entitled to hold prejudices or hostility against anything they wish. There may be good reasons for it.

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: No. Sex and intersex are specific and scientific. The rest are too loose to define.

Question 26: No

Expand: These are too vague to define. Existing prosecutions have shown the danger of this.

Question 27: No

Expand: No increase in any penalties should be considered. This endangers even simple things like comedy shared over the Internet.

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: Intersectionality is a racist and discriminatory method of defining victimhood. It assumes that all people of a certain characteristic are the same. It has no place in law.

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Stirring up offences are too subjective and threaten justified free speech. No stirring up offences should exist.

Question 41: No

Expand: Inflammatory is too subjective This threatens free speech and even comedic purposes.

Question 42: No

Expand: Why should specific broadcasts or events be protected, but not the average person? Whether its in a performance or a private dwelling should not matter.

Question 43 Part 1: They should not be

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: No. It is too subjective.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Too subjective and a threat to free speech.

Question 46: No

Expand: If the prosecution fails to prove the intent, the person should be found not guilty

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: We should be free to insult people in an open society. It is more important than hurt feelings.

Question 48: No

Expand: No further characteristics are needed.

Question 49: No

Expand: No People should be free to speak

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: People should be free to speak in their own homes Its not the business of the government to intrude.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No. No further token jobs which offer little benefit at the tax payers expense are required Other such roles in government have shown little value

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Individual

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: Please maintain my confidentiality and anonymity. The current social climate sees personal and professional attacks made for expressing even commonly held, and scientifically evidenced ideas I have already personally suffered this

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: Unsure

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Protected characteristics as specified in The Equality Act 2010 are useful.

Biological sex must never be replaced by gender. Misogyny is rife in the U.K. and women need protection under hate crime laws too. Women must be legally able to define and identify themselves as a unique political class separate to anyone born male without that ever being seen or claimed as a hate crime, as is currently the case. The current attacks and threats to women and women's rights are unprecedented, and hate crime laws are being misused by police to further persecute women for trying to defend their safety in personal, professional, political and public spaces.

'Intersectionality' is an issue, with many people presenting multiple and sometimes conflicting characteristics. The law must understand that conflicts arise and not persecute anyone for that. There is a risk new hate crime laws will favour the most popular groups and causes of a time over others (e.g. transgenderism over women's rights), and see at best marginalisation and at worst persecution and criminal prosecution of the least popular characteristics, for example the criminalisation of women (adult human females) seeking to defend themselves from male violence and intimidation, regardless of how those males identify. Males (indeed anyone) who adopts alternative gender identities should not be exempt from hate crime law. Misogyny must be recognised as a hate crime issue.

Hate crime laws must also never compel speech, require people to deny biological reality or deny anyone democratic agency or freedom of expression. To do so would be to infringe upon British values, restrict scientific progress and academic discourse and fundamentally damage society.

Question 3: Yes

Expand: In principle, yes

Misogyny fulfils all these so should be recognised. There is horrific amounts of evidence of crime against women for being women. This makes British society a fundamentally hostile place for all women. Women need better protections.

Additionally hate crime laws must not be misused to persecute unpopular ideas or people (like women). The right to offend, whether accidentally or deliberately, allows for dialogue and discourse. Freedom of expression of all those protected characteristics must be permitted, and that includes freedom of expression about those characteristics, whether positive or negative. In order to ensure rights are recognised and upheld, we have to be able to talk about them. No debate can never be the answer unless we are to sleepwalk into a totalitarian state.

Question 4: Race is a term with limited scope and often misapplied to people where xenophobia rather than racism is the issue.

However, yet again, freedom of expression must not be curtailed. People must be able to talk about society and people in it without everything being labelled or misconstrued as a hate crime

People should not be criminalised for their ignorance or bigotry, but educated instead. Responsible discourse is something that has to be learned. It cannot be enforced with the heavy hand of the law and people need the right to be able to talk about societal changes that affect them. You cannot demand respect by force, especially when some negative (racist) ideas have been ingrained over generations

Change the dialogue about race, migration and asylum with education not criminalisation

Of course where someone commits violence or directly incites violence, that is likely to be a clear hate crime. The law must define that clear distinction, and not just arrest someone for ill thought out or insensitive ideas and language.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: The freedom of expression must include the right to discuss, and even ridicule, religious ideas.

As long as that discussion is about the idea and does not target the person, or incite violence

Hate crime laws, if poorly developed and applied, can see the U.K. sleepwalk into a state to totalitarianism. That must be avoided.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: No opinion

Question 7: Sexual orientation must be defined by sex, not gender, in the first instance. The changes recently made by organisations like Stonewall to consider 'same gender' instead of 'same sex' attraction, for example, do not reflect perception in wider society, and is an insidious manipulation of language for a political end.

Otherwise I have no objections to the inclusion of any type of orientation or lack thereof

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Intersex people are not transgender. They are an entirely different group of people, and like everyone else some intersectionality with trans people might also exist, but they are separate. Intersex people have a diagnosable variation of sex development (VSD). Trans people often refuse to acknowledge that sex is binary whereas people with VSDs understand their condition exists and is diagnosable *because* sex is binary It is offensive to many people with VSDs to add them to this group because it shows a fundamental misunderstanding of their condition.

I strongly advise you consult directly with independent organisations that represent intersex people (e.g. DSD Families and NOT Stonewall) and recognise them as a group in their own right

Furthermore 'presumption' is a dangerous word and surely no law can ever be based upon it. Is evidence not required any more?

Women must retain the right to challenge males who invade their personal space
Transgenderism and GRA is currently being appropriated and misused by men to fulfil their

misogynistic fantasies. That the U.K. could enshrine their abuse of women as a right via hate crime laws that are so easily manipulated by use of 'presumption', is genuinely terrifying. Don't forget mistakes can also be made on occasion Do you intend to persecute people who make mistakes?

People have a responsibility to be tolerant but it must not be an obligation No matter what a man wears, if he behaves inappropriately and enters spaces allocated to women, he should be challenged.

Having encountered exactly this perverse behaviour by males in spaces allocated to females, and been prevented from keeping myself safe because of current prostrating attitudes giving any man who claims to be a transwoman a free pass, this is a real concern

People must take responsibility for their own behaviour At the same time, no one should face genuine hate for their gender identity or expression.

Extreme caution must be applied in the development of this law, because clear conflicts DO exist between women's rights and the demands of transwomen to access female spaces, sports, opportunities and services. Females of all ages must be able to discuss and defend themselves as a political class, inclusive by biology, as has always previously been possible, without that being a hate crime That includes asking questions in school, debating in Parliament and in the community. People need to take responsibility for their own resilience, and it cannot be an act of hate to upset someone's feelings, whether that's accidentally (or deliberately) using the wrong pronoun or defending women's services based on biology (which would include transmen). The police should not be recording discussions about this on social media unless they directly incite violence (e.g. kill all terfs) They should be dealing with real crime, not thought crime.

Transgender has become such an over reaching umbrella term it is almost meaningless, now inclusive of and offensive to most people in some form or another

A clear definition between sex and gender, and then a hate crime law based upon gender *expression*, whatever that might be, could be more useful. No one can presume an identity, but people can be bullied by appearance without any assumption of presumption necessary.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: There is no end to the trans umbrella This title is not inclusive enough

Perhaps consider gender expression not transgender, non binary or intersex, then everyone is covered

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex (scientific, unchanging and observable biology) MUST be a protected characteristic.

Gender (i.e. changeable societal expectations) could be but it must NEVER replace sex. The consequences for women would be dire.

Sex is the reason for female oppression Gender is a tool of oppression

Question 11 Part 2: These offences are sex specific, not gender specific. Use sex not gender

All children must be protected from abuses to their physical, sexual and psychological development. Any genital mutilation, for cultural (including gender reassignment) purposes must be explicitly covered

Misogyny is a pervading issue in society Please protect women from, abuse at home, at work, in communities, online and offline. Women are persecuted for their sex, not their gender,

Question 12: It must be recognised that women are especially vulnerable, but it should include both women and men.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: As long as the maximum protections are afforded women, and the use of the word women includes anything that is misogynistic, including sex specific online abuse, then that's acceptable

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex and gender are not the same.

Sex must be protected and its importance should in no way be diluted

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18: Yes People are persecuted by appearance which sometimes includes association to subcultures.

Question 19: Yes

Question 20: Yes. As an atheist, I have no recognition and fewer protections. I have faced persecution because of my lack of faith.

If you include asexuality, why not include atheism? Or even agenderism?

Not being into something is just as valid as being into it.

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: Unknown

Question 22: Yes

Expand: Proof is essential. Just because someone has a protected characteristic doesn't automatically mean a crime was motivated by hate towards it Evidence of hate must be clear.

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Other (please expand)

Expand: People must be able to communicate online without unfounded accusations of hate

Hurt feelings do not mean a hate crime was committed

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: All Social media organisations must be held accountable and be the first line of defence against hate.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand: People must be allowed freedom of expression especially in defence of ones own protected characteristic (e g sex vs gender) Please ensure the law is clear on this

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Yes

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: Scrap the hate crime act all together. Punish the crime for what it is not for what you guess the alleged perpetrator was thinking. Ps what is a love crime? The idea is as silly as a hate crime

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Being specific requires discrimination. The exact thing the law is claimed to be against. So basically hating A is acceptable but hating B is a hate crime.

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4: Race is not what language you speak or what your status is. That is obvious

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Other (please expand)

Question 8 Part 1: Who presumes it? I don't presume that about anyone

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: The government... "we fight for equality"

Also the government "shall we include men?"

Perfectly sums up all of this hate crime bias

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand: Who cares what label you put on you anti male double standard hate crime

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex is good enough

Question 15:

Question 16: Once again, everyone is equal but some seem to be more equal than others

Question 17: Isn't sex work illegal?

Question 18: Long live free speech 😊

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: Likely isn't proof

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private, keep out!

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1 threatening words or behaviour; 2 intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussions being caught if the subjects generated heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed – and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up – is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention. In other words, our very thoughts would be subject to prosecution.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately.

In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit new stirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity – which are contentious issues – should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is “abusive” is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had ‘sex changes’ but now regret it. These ‘detransitioners’ could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused’s children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience and a dismal reflection of our laws and Government.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation.

Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect:

- using a person's birth name and pronoun,
- saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and
- saying that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: Scrap all hate crime legislation. An assault should be an offence whatever the motivation.

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: Ridiculous.

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7: Ridiculous

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: You are in a hole Stop digging

Question 9:

Question 10: God give me strength.

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Are you serious?

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: You're getting paid for this, aren't you?

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: At what point do you realise that you are making fools of yourselves, and more importantly, the criminal justice system?

Question 16: Millennial snowflakes must be protected.

Question 17: You're going to have to prosecute a lot of rap artists if calling someone a "stupid ho" is illegal

Question 18: Beyond parody.

Question 19: Are you trying to say "homeless people"? Anyway, the answer is no.

Question 20: Am I in a Monty Python sketch?

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: I despair.

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: What, it is a more serious offence to rip someone off if they are a Cure fan? Extraordinary.

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: Any time "intersectionality" is mentioned I smell bullshit.

Question 33: I am sadly unaware of the maximum penalties, can't be bothered to look them up and can't comment.

Question 34: Don't understand this.

Question 35: Again, I plead ignorance.

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: None.

Question 43 Part 2: Dunno Losing the will to live

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand: No, but Posh Spice still takes it up the arse

Question 57 Part 2: What would the Beautiful Game be without the occasional joshing reference to the referee's guide dog?

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No, because I'd have to pay my share of their wages.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: I see no good reasons for the change are the current laws insufficient?

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4: I disagree

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: A protected group that's half the population?

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Both

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: Seriously???

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: I think we should judge their intention by what they actually say

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Some people are external processors and things don't always come out as they imagined. Shall we prosecute them? I think the current regulations are sufficient and what people say in their own homes should remain exempt.

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: This seems an extraordinary and dangerous proposal as it envisages a situation where intention can be established other than by the evidence of words used. How can intention be inferred and therefore a crime committed if there is no evidence in words or behaviour? How can motive be assessed with the certainty needed to convict somebody of a criminal offense without evidence? Frankly, this could give an opening for a 'witch hunt' on an individual on the basis of alleged motive and present great difficulty for someone to defend themselves on the basis of counter evidence. This is a nightmare in the making and could create the same problem it purports to solve

Question 46: No

Expand: This proposal is the flip side to the proposal put forward in 45 above and has similar difficulties. By trying to separate intention from evidence of intention, the door is immediately open for situations of potential gross injustice. Here we are looking at where intent cannot be proven and may not be present but nevertheless words can lead to the committing of a criminal offence. This immediately begs the question of how this new offence, which may be committed without any intent, sits alongside the very long-established principle of free speech. Again, there is the scope for a 'witch hunt' based on misrepresentation or isolated words reported out of context.

Question 47: No

Expand: This proposal, like 46, could potentially shut down free discussion. Here we are not thinking of the issue of race hatred, but of discussion for instance of religion, belief and human identity where there may be wide differences in perceptions and convictions. Strong disagreement or misunderstandings might then lead on to charges of criminality on the "likely to" basis. What price free speech?

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: This question is fundamentally flawed in that it conflates two entirely separate issues: transgender identity and disability. Unlike disability, the issue of transgender should

be open to free discussion without fear of the threat of criminality as the ideology is controversial and impacts on the practical arrangements as well as beliefs of others.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This is an extraordinary proposal with echoes of the worst excesses of the Stasi about it. Right teaching belongs in the family home including discussion of subjects freely, frankly and without fear. The concept of external policing of conversation within the family home is objectionable to every right thinking citizen.

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The Attorney General as answerable to Parliament should be responsible for granting consent in the prosecution of hatred offences. The very real issues of freedom of speech and liberties that are raised in this area of the law mean that consent should rest with the Attorney General as publicly accountable.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation: None

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: I don't believe that crimes potentially motivated by hatred should be treated any differently than other crimes with the same effect on the victim, particularly where victim's perception is the driving force as to whether it's a hate crime

Question 2: No

Expand: I don't think that creating special categories of victims is fair or equitable.

Question 3: No

Expand: Outcome of a crime should be the only factor, not a special category of victim making it more/less serious in the eyes of the law

Question 4: No. Race hate crimes should be removed. Special victim status is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 5: No

Expand: As above, Special victim status is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 6: Yes

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 7: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 8 Part 3: I believe that creating any Special victim status is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 9: Don't know what that definition is, but as previous answers, no distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 10: No. No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 11: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 11 Part 2: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice. Those things mentioned are already illegal.

Question 12: Things should be either illegal, or not. No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice.

Question 13: No

Expand: "Crimes" based on the perception of the victim are an affront to natural justice and a limitation of free speech. No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 14: No

Expand: No special victim categories should be considered "sex or gender" broadens the categories to be meaningless, particularly where the perception of the victim is used as proposed.

Question 15: No. No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 16: No. No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice. If broadened to all ages, the category becomes so broad as to be meaningless, particularly where the proposal rests on the perception of the victim

Question 17: No. No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 18: No No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice.

Question 19: no No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 20: no. No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice Criticism of political or philosophical beliefs must be allowed in a free society.

Question 21: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice.

Question 22: No

Expand: this should be got rid off No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice.

Question 23: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice Outcome of a criminal act should be the only factor, not perceived hostility or anything else.

Question 24: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice. Where motivated by hatred, malice or greed, the sentence should be broadly similar

Question 25: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice. Hate crime legislation should be repealed not broadened to include practically everyone

Question 26: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 27: No

Expand: Victim's perception is already colouring police action on social media and the media in general Disagreement, criticism and causing offence should not be a crime in a free society, only incitement.

Question 28: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice. Victim perception should not colour whether it's an aggravated offence, merely the facts

Question 29: Yes

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 30: No No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 31: Yes

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 32: No No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice. Whatever the victim's sex, gender or position intersectionally should not colour the process.

Question 33: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice.

Question 34: In general I would be in favour of this, however my views on the inequitable nature of hate crime legislation still stand

Question 35: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice. Hate crime legislation should be repealed not broadened.

Question 36: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand: I'm broadly in favour of all things being stated in open court, but do not agree with protected characteristics being used and an aggravating factor in the way proposed

Question 38 Part 1: No Characteristic protection should be repealed not strengthened or broadened.

Question 38 Part 2: I don't agree.

Question 39: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 40: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice. Criticism, malice, even hatred should be allowed in a free society, so long as it's not incitement to harm etc

Question 41: No

Expand: AS above, inflammatory material is such a broad term that it could and would be used to shut down/infringe on freedom of speech Incitement etc are already offences

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: I believe it should be repealed. however, I also believe that if laws do exist they should properly define terms like that, to ensure that "mission creep" does not broaden the mean of such terms as to make it a vast category potentially seriously infringing on free speech/freedom of expression

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Actual harm should be required, not hurt feelings or offence taken.

Question 46: No

Expand: verbal abuse is such a broad category as to be meaningless Being rude, or verbally abusive should not be a crime, particularly as victim perception/taking offence is being used as the driver to hate crime prosecutions already

Question 47: No

Expand: Actual incitement to violence should be the only criteria where prosecutions occur.

Question 47 Part 2: Threats, but not verbal abuse or insulting

Question 48: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 49: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 50: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 51: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice. I don't believe this proposal should have any place in a free society

Question 52: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 52 Part 2: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 53: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 54: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 55 Part 1: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 55 Part 2: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 56: No

Expand: I don't believe that this should be a crime. The perpetrators may be ostracized from civil society due to this, but unless incitement to violence etc it should be legal. Being an unpleasant, nasty person should not be a criminal offence, only doing someone actual harm

Question 57: No

Expand: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 57 Part 2: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 58: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice. Gestures would be another form of speech. Throwing missiles could be considered attempted violence so should be illegal but not based on protected characteristic, but throwing something at someone else should just be not allowed

Question 59: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice.

Question 60: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 61: No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Question 62: No. No distinction or Special victim status should be considered, as it is an affront to fair and equal justice

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation: None

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Hate is a subjective concept and should not be used as the standard on which criminality rests. I may be hated for saying this. Does this make it wrong?

Question 2: No

Expand: Amalgamation of characteristics which are regarded as engendering hate is dangerous because entirely subjective. Each must be defined and treated on its own merits as being right or wrong.

Question 3: No

Expand: 1. Prevalence of a view may indicate a mass movement towards error. The majority is not always right. Commonality cannot be argued as reason for stronger legal action.

2. Hostility to a burglar is generally understood to be justified. Dislike of a sex worker or drug dealer may be an attitude towards the person as well as the characteristic. Anger directed at a paedophile may cause him emotional hurt. If I upset someone whose views differ from mine, who is in the wrong?

3. Short circuiting of legal processes is a dangerous expedient, which could lead to a kangaroo court and the excesses of dictatorship.

Values must be spelt out and not concealed behind hidden words like 'protected characteristics'. If they are to be protected they must be defined and judged for their legitimacy.

Question 4: Present law is understood to be impartial and should not require amendment

Public opinion should be guided by those who lead and teach and through the media

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: Religion has been side-lined by many and this relates to hate crime as an increasing problem.

Church leaders may well be key to addressing the issue of hate crime.

School curricula have been secularised, contributing to current trends

What is the current definition of religion? Our beliefs are important and affect the way we live and how our nation behaves.

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: Whatever we say or however we feel, we are all sexual beings

There are no human hermaphrodites

A small number of humans are born with intersex characteristics, and some do not have secondary sex characteristics, eg eunuchs following loss of gonads in childhood

Asexuality is an imaginary human state and should not be included.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Law cannot be based on presumption

It is dangerous if a person is presumed to be guilty without evidence.

If I presume that someone hates me, that should not be considered proof that he does.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: To broaden the definition will only confuse further.

Intersex is a recognised condition. The other terms are concepts of the mind which cannot be conclusively defined

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: Criminal conduct should not be judged on the characteristics of the victim but should be impartial.

The motives of the perpetrator should not be excused because he claims that his hatred is justified.

If I am attacked because I am a Christian or a Jew or a Muslim or because of my dress or opinion, the action is inexcusable

Both those with disability and those who are able may fall victim and all should be protected from those who hate them.

Question 11: No

Expand: All should be protected in equal measure. If hatred is directed at specific categories of people it may as well be turned on others and legislation will not remove the problem.

Perceived hatred of susceptible groups may result in the exclusion of others simply because they have none to plead their case. The homeless, and travellers, are just as vulnerable as those who are sensitive because they feel different from others on grounds of race, colour, religion or sex

Question 11 Part 2: Society needs to be taught to respect others, to care for the weaker, to be self controlled and to seek the common good. There has been too much emphasis on self gratification and indulgence

Creation of specific categorisation of gender related abuse will not address the issue of abuse. The protected environment of traditional family relationships should be promoted. Deviation from old fashioned values may well result in greater criminal behaviour. More extreme legislation will not solve this.

Question 12: Both women and men should be protected from hostile attitudes and actions. This is best not done through defining permissible or inadmissible forms of hatred, but by creating a society in which respect for others is valued, and when all are seen to have weaknesses as well as strengths. A culture of blame should be replaced by one of kindness, forgiveness and affirmation

Question 13: No

Expand: Labels are misleading. Misogyny, homophilia or paedophobic might all be categorised. Protection is best given through promotion of a wholesome, moral, compassionate community. Protection must be provided for all who need it.

A wholesome childhood helps to establish healthy, respectful adults and a contented people.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex is a feature of human beings associated with specific chromosomal features.

Gender is a less specific term which has been used to embrace both male and female. Hate crime should not be related to some and not others, real or imagined. All should be protected from those who would cause them harm.

A general approach like this does not clarify but confuses.

Question 15: All who are vulnerable should be protected. An age limited approach is unreliable as maturity does not always follow age.

Question 16: All who are vulnerable should be protected.

Question 17: The men and women who control the sex workers and those who pay for their services should be criminalised rather than those who are obliged to seek an income in this way.

Prostitution reflects a sick society and does not fit well with the desire for equality for all members of our society.

Question 18: Alternative subcultures cannot be regarded as a homogeneous entity. Some may be wholesome and others are deviant. If I hate orgies of naked men, but pity those who indulge in gratifying their passions, who is guilty?

Question 19: The homeless should be helped to find shelter, as the government has attempted to do in the face of Covid 19.

Question 20: I would say that everyone has philosophical beliefs of one sort or another. Some are misguided but cannot be precisely defined.

A philosophical view of life and of others is generally considered a desirable characteristic.

Question 21: No

Expand: Where there is a crime the sentence should be fair and not enhanced. The object of sentencing is not primarily punitive but corrective and restorative.

Who is aggravated by the offence? This question speaks of an attitude of hostility and intolerance underlying the accuser's hatred.

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: How can a demonstrable hostility be proved? It is inevitably subjective and relates to bias and intolerance.

Question 23: The protected characteristic should be defined before motives can be shown to be right or wrong. Who is the judge of characteristics deemed to engender hate? Unless we have national guidelines based on past values, protected characteristics will be entirely subjective and may be based on hatred and intolerance, not on equality and impartiality.

Question 24: No

Expand: Please see my earlier remarks.

Who decides on what aggravates? Penalties must fit the crime and should be impartial and just, not vindictive

Question 25: No

Expand: This proposal suggests that conventional attitudes should be erased as being unacceptable, and that new values should be protected by legislation, describing those opinions which are contrary to present policy as engendering hate. Race and religion are put in in parenthesis but are more relevant causes of hostility and aggression. The attitude of Jews to Jesus should be included in your consideration of offence and how it should be addressed.

Question 26: No

Expand: Justice must be seen to be done

If it is difficult to present evidence before the jury it may be because the ground of proof is insubstantial and subjective

Draconian measures of control are not part of a democratic nation.

"The Nazis destroyed the independence of the press by a series of draconian laws."

Question 27: Other (please expand)

Expand: We should be careful not to stifle free speech through rejecting opinions which differ from our own. Increasing maximum penalties speak of hatred and inability to accept contrary views. Hatred may be in the heart of the beholder, while far from the intention of the communicator.

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: Who is aggravated? These crimes are serious and will aggravate the victim whatever the attitude of the perpetrator. Some crimes will cause more aggravation. Others may show extenuating circumstances. The judge should determine this. If the law is inadequate it should be debated separately in parliament

Question 29: No

Expand: The contribution of aggravation to a crime is very hard to judge. Some commit crimes in anger, others in retaliation of from a lifetime of abuse. If I am aggravated but restrain myself am I to be judged for my feelings? I may act in a callous way after careful planning, but my crime may be far greater than in acting on the spur of the moment

If these offences have sentencing guidelines which are too lenient, this should be addressed on its own merit.

Question 30: These should be considered on their own merits

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand: Rehabilitation should be the aim of sentencing, not unending confinement

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Other (please expand)

Expand: The motive or intention in communicated material is the important issue. If I quote an opinion from an earlier age which is not concordant with present perceived wisdom, will this be deemed to be offensive? Attitudes to slavery have changed but we should not seek to erase the opinions of a previous generation.

Question 41: No

Expand: There is a danger in lumping together material which is considered inflammatory. Poetry, art and music which broaden our understanding may be regarded as damaging and provocative, as seen in certain dictatorships.

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: This is a slippery slope. Who decides that the passage I quote is or is not intended to stir up hatred? What can edify, will alienate those who reject the concept, and they may well feel hurt and claim hatred has been intended.

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: If I say it is likely to rain today, I cannot tell whether it will do so or not. I cannot define what will actually happen and to set this in statute will be futile, both for weather forecasting and in predicting hate crime.

Are young Asian male immigrants with radical Islamic opinions likely to undertake acts of terrorism? Other characteristics encounter the same uncertainty. Theft, rape, fraud or plagiarism are not crimes until committed. The intent even if strong, cannot be discerned or established with certainty by officers of the law. Who can tell what motivates me?

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Presumption of guilt is not considered right in this country. Can you tell what I am about to say before I have spoken, even if I am delivering a prepared speech? We are taught not to jump to conclusions but to consider without bias.

Words can be perceived to be inflammatory, threatening or insulting, when there is no intention that this be so.

I may refer to someone as black, or coloured, or a negro, and he may regard one or the other terms as an insult.

We may describe others as fat, thin, tall or short and although a simple, factual statement will cause offence by someone who is sensitive or upset. Some do not take kindly to being teased.

Football 'hooligans' have the intention of having a good time but may end up causing trouble
Are all football supporters to be apprehended before they enter the stadium?

Question 46: No

Expand: Intent to stir up hatred cannot be proved

So words are taken out of the mouth of the accused, and used to claim hate engendering, even if not intentional

The Jews declared, He is guilty of blasphemy We have no need of witnesses Put him to death.

We should ask, is it true? We need to heed warnings not to play with fire or go out in a thunder storm. We may hate to be told, but it is right for us to listen and take heed.

Too claim that innocently spoken words are stirring up hate, is to fail to recognise the emotional state of the recipients, sometimes reluctant to face up to their own intolerance or guilt.

Question 47: No

Expand: If you have a scale of 0 to 100, what value will you take to determine likelihood?

You surely must define the protected characteristics one by one and determine which requires special status and why. The question must be, how likely is it to be right or wrong, not how should it be concealed under the label of offence

Question 47 Part 2: How can you prosecute for a perceived insult, whether very likely or not?

Sticks and stones words

Is this what is described as the snowflake generation?

Question 48: No

Expand: Transgender identity is subjective and relative

Disability is a separate issue which is more clearly defined, but not normally linked with gender.

It is probable that opinions related to gender and disability will be viewed as provocative, unless entirely consonant with that of the subject. It is hard to avoid accusation of stirring up hatred in this context

Measures to prevent restorative support and guidance from being given to such individuals are brought together inappropriately and viewed as provocative and hateful. Like the surgeon's scalpel, what may cause pain should be regarded as compassionate and good

Question 49: No

Expand: Gender and sex are different terms which should not be confused or bundled together.

Question 50: Disapproval or dislike is very different from hatred Disagreement is not hatred. Opinions vary from strength of conviction to uncertainty.

Hatred should be seen as the antithesis of love or compassion

I would prefer to see more on the promotion of care and consideration than punitive measures for what is perceived as hateful. The heart of the complainant should be examined, for motivation and determination of intended outcome

What are the characteristics to be protected? They are an inhomogeneous group which cannot be gathered together. Each needs to be addressed on its own merit.

Hostility may be relate to illegitimacy. The place of legislation is not to legitimise what is harmful or soul-destroying

Question 51: No

Expand: The domestic scene is private and should not be probed by any seeking to discredit the occupants Freedom of expression at home should not be restricted through fear of interrogation or from Big Brother watching.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: There should be freedom to speak openly and to discuss differences related to matters of religion, sexual orientation, identity and marriage.

We should be free to state things as they are perceived and not be required to refer to persons in terms of their stated preference or imagined gender.

The opinions of each person must be respected and not labelled hateful or worthy of incrimination

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Prosecutions must not be sought on grounds of ease of conviction or intensity of feeling against the accused

The Attorney General is not answerable to the Crown Prosecution Service and is able to provide a more robust check against overzealous prosecution.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: n/a

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: A crime is a crime whether aggravated or not I do not feel that there should be separate offences for racially aggravated matters. This does not mean that the aggravation should not be presented by prosecution or taken into account in sentencing . Of course motivation should always be taken into account when deciding on guilt or sentence, but I do not understand why there should be separate offences for ones motivated by hatred of some sort

Where do the categories of hate end? We can not provide a list of categories that every single person might belong to which might be disliked or hated by another. If it is felt we do not need to do this, then who decides what categories/groups we have which hate can be directed against? If categories/groups are left out then the law becomes a discriminatory instrument. It is far wiser to remove all categories of hate and for each criminal matter to be treated as an offence by one person(s) against another person or persons and look at the motivation behind it and treat it accordingly in the trial and sentence process.

A Hate Crime Commissioner is a deeply worrying suggestion. Again who decides what constitutes hate and which groups can be hated The power the commissioner would hold would be extremely worrying. Some might call them the 'Thought Commissioner'

Question 2: No

Expand: As per my last answer, how are these protected characteristics decided on and by whom?

The persons who do define these protected characteristics/groups have the power to put people into a hierarchy of protection and therefor will inevitably end up being discriminatory

Why are some groups not included and others are? Why are some worthy of protection and others not? Protected characteristics are discriminatory and do not take into account the complexity of the individual

Question 3: No

Expand: There is no need for these laws and in fact defining these characteristics is extremely dangerous Answer to each point:

1. Where does this evidence come from? There are pressure groups and charities which will claim to speak on behalf of particular groups and provide such evidence, but often they will be acting to serve the interest of themselves and members of their organisation rather than the group they claim to represent. How can an organisation claim to speak on behalf of an entire group of people? Surely within that group there is a diversity of experience and thinking on these matters? Often members of the defined group do not participate/interact with these organisation as they don't feel represented by them and as such you have an organisation with a loud voice claiming to be speaking on behalf of more people than it actually does

2. Is the suggestion here that some groups are more sensitive or vulnerable than others based on a characteristic? This is potentially very patronising/degrading to that group

3 I don't find protected characteristics workable and are in fact discriminatory

Question 4: No.

This will limit open discussion and debate on immigration issues which are a genuine social issue no matter where a person stands on the political spectrum Expanding this definition would introduce a form of thought crime, policing language and speech and should be avoided at all costs

Question 5: No

Expand: Religion is an individual matter and can be defined in so many different ways.

Better to introduce the matter into criminal court proceedings without having to have any separate hate offences.

Question 6: No

Expand: Why not? If you propose laws for some groups, why not for others This demonstrates the folly of hate proposals.

Question 7: No.

Again the more categories you list the more you will later have to introduce There should be no hate legislation.

People should be free to dislike others and free to be disliked, for whatever reason

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: See answer to Q7.

Further, these terms are not understood by the majority of the population having only come into use in last 5 years

How will this work with scientific research where sex and gender are defined in biological terms? Will they be able to continue with this?

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: See Q7 and Q8.

These terms define such a small amount of people. It is not a societal issue that needs addressing

Question 8 Part 3: Remove all definitions.

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: I do not feel there should be any hate crime law. It is a dangerous road we are on ending up with thought crime offences. If a person commits an offence they commit an offence. There is ample law to deal with criminality no matter the motivation of the perpetrator..

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: How can you have hate crime against one and not the other?! This will never end. There should be no hate crime laws. This moves us to a police state where our everyday thoughts and speech could end up with a prison sentence

Question 13: No

Expand: No, there should be no hate crime that protects one sex over the other. We should just have legislation that does not discriminate and protects all people

Question 14: No

Expand: No, there should be no hate crime that protects one sex/gender over the other. We should just have legislation that does not discriminate and protects all people

Sex and gender are inextricably linked. 99.9% of people identify their gender as they same as their biological sex.

Question 15: We should only have legislation that protects all people

Question 16: We should only have legislation that protects all people.

Question 17: We should only have legislation that protects all people not just defined groups. Leave the law as it is

Question 18: We should only have legislation that protects all people not just defined groups. Leave the law as it is.

Question 19: We should only have legislation that protects all people not just defined groups. Leave the law as it is.

Question 20: We should only have legislation that protects all people not just defined groups. Leave the law as it is

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hate crime legislation should be abolished and the facts of the case taken into account by judge and jury. This will include the demonstration of hostility

The legal test should be high.

Question 22: No

Expand: This is too narrow and open to abuse. Hate crime legislation should be abolished and the facts of the case taken into account by judge and jury. This will include the demonstration of hostility

Question 23: Motivation of hostility or prejudice should be included in the facts of the case and taken into account by judge and jury. Hate Crime legislation is not required to do this.

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: 'The aggravated nature of the offence' should be included in the facts of the case and taken into account by judge and jury. Hate Crime legislation is not required to do this.

Question 25: No

Expand: 'The aggravated nature of the offence' should be included in the facts of the case and taken into account by judge and jury. Hate Crime legislation is not required to do this.

As per previous answer this becomes a folly of never ending groups being added to the hate crime laws. A competing hierarchy of victimhood will be established. Pressure groups demanding that more groups be added.

Question 26: No

Expand: The prevalence of hate crime is hotly contested. Police reporting of it is over zealous and dependant on how noisy some people or 'supposed groups' are. Very small numbers of people can claim disproportionate amount of hate crime which does not reflect the everyday experience of the groups they claim to represent. There is also a spectrum of recording standards which are not consistent.

You get consistency by removing all protected characteristics and treating all matters on a case by case basis.

Question 27: No

Expand: Most of these communication offences are deeply intrusive into peoples lives and should be abolished. Whether an offence is committed is often dependant on whether the aggrieved was insulted/hurt or offended by the communication rather than by any actual injury. This is extremely subjective and puts an imbalance of power with the aggrieved.

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: intersectionality is a worrying term used here. It comes from Critical Theory which the Equality Minister Kemi Badenoch has great concerns about. It puts people into hierarchies of power based on their immutable characteristics and is insulting to most humans.

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Infringement on free speech and thought.

These laws should be repealed and not replaced. They are an in infringement on freedom of speech and thought Being from a mixed race home I find the stirring of racial hatred deeply abhorrent, however I do not feel that my abhorrence should have any power over anyone else

Also, for people to learn about these arguments and have their minds changed their needs to be freedom to discuss them. These laws will make racist views more entrenched as thy can no be aired and challenged

Question 41: No

Expand: These laws should be repealed and not replaced. They are an in infringement on freedom of speech and though Being from a mixed race home I find the stirring of racial hatred deeply abhorrent, however I do not feel that my abhorrence should have any power over anyone else. Also, for people to talk learn about these arguments and have their minds changed their needs to be freedom to discuss them

These laws will make racist views more entrenched as thy can no be aired and challenged.

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: These laws should be repealed and not replaced They are an in infringement on freedom of speech and though. Being from a mixed race home I find the stirring of racial hatred deeply abhorrent, however I do not feel that my abhorrence should have any power over anyone else Also, for people to talk learn about these arguments and have their minds changed their needs to be freedom to discuss them.

These laws will make racist views more entrenched as thy can no be aired and challenged.

Question 43 Part 1: They should not be liable They are the new public square See my views above.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: These laws should be repealed and not replaced They are an in infringement on freedom of speech and though. Being from a mixed race home I find the stirring of racial hatred deeply abhorrent, however I do not feel that my abhorrence should have any power over anyone else Also, for people to talk learn about these arguments and have their minds changed their needs to be freedom to discuss them.

These laws will make racist views more entrenched as they can no be aired and challenged.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: These laws should be repealed and not replaced. They are an infringement on freedom of speech and thought. Being from a mixed race home I find the stirring of racial hatred deeply abhorrent, however I do not feel that my abhorrence should have any power over anyone else. Also, for people to talk learn about these arguments and have their minds changed their needs to be freedom to discuss them.

These laws will make racist views more entrenched as they can no be aired and challenged

Question 46: No

Expand: These laws should be repealed and not replaced. They are an infringement on freedom of speech and thought. Being from a mixed race home I find the stirring of racial hatred deeply abhorrent, however I do not feel that my abhorrence should have any power over anyone else. Also, for people to talk learn about these arguments and have their minds changed their needs to be freedom to discuss them

These laws will make racist views more entrenched as they can no be aired and challenged

Question 47: No

Expand: These laws should be repealed and not replaced. They are an infringement on freedom of speech and thought. Being from a mixed race home I find the stirring of racial hatred deeply abhorrent, however I do not feel that my abhorrence should have any power over anyone else. Also, for people to talk learn about these arguments and have their minds changed their needs to be freedom to discuss them.

These laws will make racist views more entrenched as they can no be aired and challenged.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: These laws should be repealed and not replaced. They are an infringement on freedom of speech and thought. Being from a mixed race home I find the stirring of racial hatred deeply abhorrent, however I do not feel that my abhorrence should have any power over anyone else. Also, for people to talk learn about these arguments and have their minds changed their needs to be freedom to discuss them

These laws will make racist views more entrenched as they can no be aired and challenged.

Question 49: No

Expand: These laws should be repealed and not replaced. They are an infringement on freedom of speech and thought. Being from a mixed race home I find the stirring of racial hatred deeply abhorrent, however I do not feel that my abhorrence should have any power over anyone else. Also, for people to talk learn about these arguments and have their minds changed their needs to be freedom to discuss them.

These laws will make racist views more entrenched as they can no be aired and challenged

Question 50: These laws should be repealed and not replaced. They are an infringement on freedom of speech and thought. Being from a mixed race home I find the stirring of racial hatred deeply abhorrent, however I do not feel that my abhorrence should have any power

over anyone else. Also, for people to talk learn about these arguments and have their minds changed their needs to be freedom to discuss them.

These laws will make racist views more entrenched as they can no be aired and challenged

Question 51: No

Expand: This would be a complete intrusion into people's lives. Discussions had in the home are had with people you are most closest to and therefore likely to share your inner musings which when uttered you often find are wrong or sound stupid. This is a safe environment to discuss ideas however controversial they may be

I would be extremely concerned for the safety of myself and others if this were to occur This is one of the most draconian suggestions I have read so far in this consultation paper! I hope this is a joke

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Yes But why have the legislation and then the defence which protects the discussion of these issues? Is the legislation designed to scare people into silence to not utter particular no PC views?

Question 53: Freedom of expression should be protected at all costs This does not include the threats to harm others of course unless made in self defence.

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2: All should be exempt.

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: No this is ridiculous. A lot of this chanting is without malicious intent and part of the back and forth between the opposing teams and their fans.

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I think this would be extremely worrying. The Commissioner would in effect be the 'Thought/Speech Commissioner' and have an extremely worrying amount of power over what people can and can't say If people can't talk about topics which are potentially offensive they can't resolve them, come up with solutions or improve their thinking.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Grace Church Guildford

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: We are concerned about the whole concept of classifying actions as hate crimes as the law should as far as possible only address objective observable actions and avoid addressing subjective motives. There is far too much scope for misunderstandings and loss of free speech. We need free speech and tolerance accepting that others may be free to express views that we strongly disagree with or find hurtful. Otherwise we lose much more than we gain.

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Biological sex is objective and observable. Gender as now understood is subjective and variable and so should not be protected.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements:

1. threatening words or behaviour;
2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence.

An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding

that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'

This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely

because intention to stir up hatred is presumed – and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred

If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion.

In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit new stirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. People must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion.

Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the

stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation.

Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect:

- using a person's birth name and pronoun,
- saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and
- saying that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Freedom of speech is key This could mean criminalisation of insults or any trivial words on the basis on inferred intention

Question 46: No

Expand: Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard People often describe options they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: What is abusive is subjective This could have a terrible effect on the freedom to share beliefs. For example discussions around religion , transgender and sexula orientation.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: These two subjects are completely different Why have they been linked?

Transgender ideology is controversial and speech on this area should not be suppressed.

Do you know the strongest critics of the trans movement are women who had the sex change and now regret it These women could be prosecuted for speaking out

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This is a democratic society How dare this even be considered.

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: I consider it important that the Attorney General gives his consent to check over zealous prosecutions.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: I believe that the existing two-stage test ensures that it is only behaviour that merits being described as criminal that is prohibited. It is dangerous to categorise as criminal the expression of a point of view simply because someone presumed that the intention was to stir up hatred, regardless as to whether it actually had that effect. Apart from anything else, the law could then be used as a weapon - someone could say that they believed the intention was to stir up hatred simply to get someone they disliked into trouble with the law. The victim would have no defence.

Question 46: No

Expand: In such contentious matters as religion, transgender identity and sexual orientation, people often describe as abusive opinions they do not agree with. As in Question 45, the law as proposed could so easily be used as a weapon against which someone expressing a contrary view would have no defence.

Question 47: No

Expand: If views expressed on matters of religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be regarded as likely to stir up hatred, discussion of such subjects could effectively be shut down. As in Questions 45 and 46, the law as proposed could so easily be used as a weapon against which someone expressing a contrary view would have no defence.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: This proposal would adversely impact (a) women trying to protect single-sex spaces, (b) those wanting to discuss the impact of transgender ideology on children and young people, and (c) those women who, having undergone "sex change" treatment and now bitterly regret it, could be prosecuted if they speak against it.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Hate crime is treated seriously in law because of its potential impact on public order. There is no threat to public order from opinions of any kind expressed in a private home. Visitors to a private home are clearly not in a public space. How on earth could such views be policed, other than by the kind of surveillance we read about in George Orwell's book "1984"? It's already happening in China; we don't want it here

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Offences relating to stirring up hatred in respect of sexual orientation, transgender identity and religion must include strong protection for free speech so that normal, even heated, debate is protected. Expressing an opposing view should itself never be regarded as stirring up hatred. In our own families and marriages we often profoundly disagree with those we love!

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The Attorney General is directly answerable to parliament. This means that it is easier to hold them to account for their decisions by our democratically elected representatives. He or she has greater independence from the CPS than the DPP

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: NA private individual

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Existing laws cover what is needed

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements:

1. threatening words or behaviour;

2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it

would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild

statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'

This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were

threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit

newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is “abusive” is

subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had ‘sex changes’ but now regret it. These ‘detransitioners’ could

be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to

something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation

Any offence covering transgender identity

must explicitly protect:

- using a person's birth name and pronoun,
- saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and
- saying that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level.

Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies The Attorney General can provide a more robust check The

Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Polly Blake

Name of Organisation: Bent Bars Project

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: We agree that a single act would be likely to be helpful. However, we do not support hate crime legislation which includes enhanced sentencing or aggravated offences penalties.

Although framed as 'prevention oriented', hate crime laws that primarily operate by increasing penalties are actually punishment driven; they merely add harsher sentencing penalties after violence has occurred.

There is insufficient evidence to show that harsher sentences have any significant deterrent effect. Research demonstrates that likelihood of detection is a much stronger predictor of deterrence than harsher sentencing.

In contrast, there is ample evidence that harsher sentencing tends to disproportionately impact the very same groups that punitive hate crime laws claim to protect (e.g. black and minority ethnic people, people with disabilities, LGBTQ+ people). We do not have faith that a criminal justice system which is fundamentally unequal in its administration of punishment is likely to demonstrate any less unequal treatment with respect to hate crimes.

As an organisation which directly supports LGBTQ+ people in prison, many of whom are themselves victims of harm and violence, we are concerned that legislation which increases penalties will only expand the already over-bloated prison system.

We would support legislation that formally records incidents of hate-motivated harm and violence. Although we know that reporting mechanisms are themselves limited (e.g. many people do not report hate crimes), we nonetheless recognise the importance of tracking patterns and trends in hate-motivated violence in order to better understand and address structural patterns of oppression.

We believe that reporting-focused legislation can achieve the same key benefits often used to justify hate crime legislation but without the harmful effects of increased use of imprisonment.

In our view, reporting-based (rather than punishment based) legislation can still achieve the following:

- recognising the additional harm that hate-motivating violence causes to individual victims and the wider community by acknowledging it in law
- the symbolic function of legislation as a tool for tackling bigotry, prejudice and inequality
- the practical benefits of monitoring trends and encouraging reporting by victims

We also support other non-criminal remedies that focus on education, prevention of violence and enhanced support to victims of violence.

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: We support the inclusion of protected characteristics for the purposes of recording and monitoring hate-motivated violence. We do not support any legislation that relies on harsher penalties as a response to violence as we see insufficient evidence that this serves to reduce harm in any way (see previous answer).

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: We support the criteria to determine, but only for the purposes of recording of and monitoring hate-motivated violence. We do not support any legislation that relies on harsher penalties as a response to violence as we see insufficient evidence that this serves to reduce harm in any way (see previous answer)

Question 4: Yes, migration and asylum status should be included, but as noted above, for the purposes of recording hate-motivated violence and not for increasing penalties

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: Yes, we think that asexuality should be included within the definition of sexual orientation

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1: We agree for the purposes of recording hate motivated violence only. We do not support enhanced or aggravated penalties

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand: We agreed for the purposes of recording hate-motivated violence only. We do not support enhanced or aggravated penalties

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: Yes, we agree that gender should be a protected characteristic, but as noted previously, for the purposes of recording hate-motivated violence and not for increasing penalties.

We also wish to emphasise the importance of an inclusive definition of gendered identities. If 'women' is to be included in hate crime legislation as a protected characteristic, this must include trans women as well as cis women. Whilst there is already existing legislation around transgender identities as protected characteristics, it is important to recognise the various levels of violence experienced by trans women, who face discrimination and hate because of the identity as trans people, but also their identity as women.

Question 11 Part 2: We do not support the use of enhanced hate crime penalties to address issues of forced marriage, FGM or crimes committed in the context of domestic abuse

Question 12: We think that gender based hate crime protection should be extended to men and women, but as noted previously, for the purposes of recording hate-motivated violence and not for increasing penalties

However, we wish to emphasise the importance of an inclusive definition of gendered identities. If 'man' is to be included in hate crime legislation as a protected characteristic, this must include trans men as well as cis men. Whilst there is already existing legislation around transgender identities as protected characteristics, it is important to recognise the increased levels of violence experienced by trans men in comparison to cis men.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: We agree that the protected category of 'woman' is more suitable than misogyny, so long as the category is explicitly trans inclusive (i.e. covers both trans women and non trans women). However, our view is that 'gender' is preferable to both 'misogyny' and 'woman' as it covers all gender-based hatred. While gender-based hatred certainly disproportionately affects women, it is not exclusive to women and the broader based term of 'gender' would include a wider range of gender expressions.

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15: Yes, age should be recognised as a protected characteristic, but as noted previously, for the purposes of recording hate-motivated violence and not for increasing penalties

Question 16:

Question 17: Yes, sex workers should absolutely be recognised as a hate crime category, but as noted previously, for the purposes of recording hate-motivated violence and not for increasing penalties.

It is also important to stress that much of the violence experienced by sex workers comes as a result of the policies surrounding their work, such as brothel keeping laws which criminalise two sex workers working together.

Whilst we support the increased recognition of hate crimes against sex workers, we would argue that decriminalising sex work would do more to alleviate this, instead of increasing criminal penalties for harming sex workers.

Question 18: Yes, alternative subcultures should absolutely be recognised as a hate crime category, but as noted previously, for the purposes of recording hate-motivated violence and not for increasing penalties.

Question 19: Yes, people experiencing homelessness should absolutely be recognised as a hate crime category, but as noted previously, for the purposes of recording hate-motivated violence and not for increasing penalties.

Question 20:

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not support enhanced sentencing for hate-motivated violence as there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that such penalties work to reduce the prevalence of such harm. We also have concerns (noted above) about the likelihood that the application of such penalties will disproportionately target the same groups that are ostensibly meant to be protected by hate crime laws.

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand: We do not support higher maximum penalties as part of the model of aggravated offences. There is insufficient evidence to show that harsher sentences have any significant deterrent effect. Research demonstrates that likelihood of detection is a much stronger predictor of deterrence than harsher sentencing.

In contrast, there is ample evidence that harsher sentencing tends to disproportionately impact the very same groups that punitive hate crime laws claim to protect (e.g. black and minority ethnic people, people with disabilities, LGBTQ+ people). We do not have faith that a criminal justice system which is fundamentally unequal in its administration of punishment is likely to demonstrate any less unequal treatment with respect to hate crimes.

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: Whilst we support the recognition of these characteristics as particularly vulnerable to hate crimes, we would not support higher maximum penalties as part of the aggravated offences model. There is insufficient evidence to show that harsher sentences have any significant deterrent effect. Research demonstrates that likelihood of detection is a much stronger predictor of deterrence than harsher sentencing.

Question 26: No

Expand: We believe that these decisions should be guided by the extent to which they will reduce offending and harm to those who suffer hate crimes. There is insufficient evidence to show that harsher sentences have any significant deterrent effect. Research demonstrates that likelihood of detection is a much stronger predictor of deterrence than harsher sentencing.

Question 27: No

Expand: As stated previously, we do not support higher maximum penalties as part of the model of aggravated offences. There is insufficient evidence to show that harsher sentences have any significant deterrent effect. Research demonstrates that likelihood of detection is a much stronger predictor of deterrence than harsher sentencing.

In contrast, there is ample evidence that harsher sentencing tends to disproportionately impact the very same groups that punitive hate crime laws claim to protect (e.g. black and minority ethnic people, people with disabilities, LGBTQ+ people). We do not have faith that a criminal justice system which is fundamentally unequal in its administration of punishment is likely to demonstrate any less unequal treatment with respect to hate crimes.

Instead of increasing the maximum penalty for communications offences, we would support legislation that formally records incidents of hate-motivated communications offences.

Although we know that reporting mechanisms are themselves limited (e.g. many people do not report hate crimes), we nonetheless recognise the importance of tracking patterns and trends in hate-motivated violence in order to better understand and address structural patterns of oppression.

Question 28: No

Expand: As stated previously, we do not support higher maximum penalties as part of the model of aggravated offences. There is insufficient evidence to show that harsher sentences have any significant deterrent effect. Research demonstrates that likelihood of detection is a much stronger predictor of deterrence than harsher sentencing

In contrast, there is ample evidence that harsher sentencing tends to disproportionately impact the very same groups that punitive hate crime laws claim to protect (e.g. black and minority ethnic people, people with disabilities, LGBTQ+ people) We do not have faith that a criminal justice system which is fundamentally unequal in its administration of punishment is likely to demonstrate any less unequal treatment with respect to hate crimes

Question 29: Yes

Expand: We agree that there is no demonstrable need for introducing aggravated versions of these offences

Question 30: No, we do not support enhanced penalties for these offences.

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not support increased penalties either through enhanced sentencing or through the creation of aggravated offences. There is insufficient evidence that increased penalties would reduce the occurrence of such violence. We are concerned that in practice, increased penalties may disproportionately be applied to the same disadvantaged groups that are meant to be protected by such legislation.

Question 32:

Question 33: We do not support the use of aggravated offences as there is insufficient evidence that increased penalties have any demonstrable deterrent or educational effect.

Question 34:

Question 35: We do not support the 'hybrid' model as it still relies on increased penalties and there is insufficient evidence that increased penalties would reduce the occurrence of such violence. We are concerned that in practice, increased penalties may disproportionately be applied to the same disadvantaged groups that are meant to be protected by such legislation.

Question 36: No

Expand: We do not support higher maximum penalties as part of the enhanced sentencing model. There is insufficient evidence to show that harsher sentences have any significant deterrent effect Research demonstrates that likelihood of detection is a much stronger predictor of deterrence than harsher sentencing.

In contrast, there is ample evidence that harsher sentencing tends to disproportionately impact the very same groups that punitive hate crime laws claim to protect (e.g. black and minority ethnic people, people with disabilities, LGBTQ+ people) We do not have faith that a

criminal justice system which is fundamentally unequal in its administration of punishment is likely to demonstrate any less unequal treatment with respect to hate crimes.

Question 37: Other (please expand)

Expand: We do not support the use of aggravated offences. However, if these are to be retained, the aggravation of the sentence should be stated in open court

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Yes. 'Insulting' is too broad and may encompass too wide of actions. Threatening and abusive are more specific.

Question 48: Other (please expand)

Expand: We only support the inclusion of transgender identities and disability for the purpose of recording hate-motivated harm, not for the purposes of enhanced or aggravated sentencing for the reasons set out above.

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: We only support the inclusion of sex/gender for the purpose of recording hate motivated harm, not for the purposes of enhanced or aggravated sentencing for the reasons set out above

We feel that gender is the most appropriate term. But alternatively 'sex/gender' could be included.

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand: We support the recording and monitoring of stirring up hatred offences across all protected characteristics, but do not support the use of increased penalties for any of these offences as we do not see these as offering any meaningful protection

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Yes, we support the introduction of a Hate Crime commissioner but this role should focus on prevention, support for victims and non-punitive responses to hate motivated violence.

As there is little evidence that increased penalties actually reduce incidents of hate-motivated violence, it is imperative that wider strategies be undertaken taken, which focus on more effective prevention-based and support-based measures.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: There is a danger of having a 'fixed list' - in the future, categories may need to be added or even removed. Over-categorisation frequently causes more problems than it solves. I believe that good law should protect people regardless of their identity

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: See my comments above.

Question 4: This is over-complicated. Consider a Sunni Muslim Persian speaker from Iran, for instance. Does he fall into the category of 'Sunni' or 'Persian speaker' or 'Iranian'? Does one category have priority over another? Why? Who decides?

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Yes, why not?

Question 8: Other (please expand)

Question 8 Part 1: It is not clear what is meant by 'presumed to be'. Of course transgender people need to be protected by law, but what is meant here is unclear to me.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Titles can suffer from 'title-drift' - this is not helpful in my opinion. All forms of trans, non binary people should be protected by law anyway. I'm not clear how more definitions in a 'hate crime' law will improve things

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Many in the general population do not agree that gender and sex are identical. Sex is commonly held to be a biological fact, whilst gender is believed by some (but not all) to be fluid. Protecting gender AND sex would be more appropriate - Gender and sex are not the same thing.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: I'm surprised the law doesn't already protect both women and men. Do we need a hate crime law to ensure the protection of everyone?

Question 13: Yes

Expand: But I don't agree the protected category should only be applied to women

Question 14: No

Expand: 'Sex' is determined at birth by biology and is in the DNA....It cannot be changed. 'Gender' can be changed For example, if a crime is committed, the DNA at the location can only inform us of the 'sex' of the perpetrator - it cannot tell us about his/her gender. When dealing with hate crimes, this blurring of the lines could cause confusion.

In addition, women need to have continued access to single sex spaces I'm thinking of all women (for reasons of safety and privacy) but in particular Muslim women. Those Muslim women who wish to wash to pray would be discriminated against if these two statements : 'sex'/'gender' are blurred A Muslim woman according to Islamic law cannot wash in the presence of someone of the male sex. This is a complicated situation - a man may identify as a woman and enter a women's toilet, but Muslim women would struggle to cope with this. Muslim women are not being considered at all in this debate There may well be other religions that are similarly affected.

This is an example of one category clashing with another. Which category is given priority? Who decides?

Question 15:

Question 16: It should include all ages

Question 17: Yes, if they are not already protected by the law If they aren't protected already, I'm really surprised. But I'm not an expert.

Question 18: Where is the line drawn here? Could paedophiles claim protection under this law? How would this work in practice? If someone objects to a man having sex with a child, for instance, could 'the accused' then claim he's a victim of a hate crime?

Question 19: Of course, but again I'm surprised they are not already protected by existing law.

Question 20: It depends on what you mean by 'philosophical beliefs' as I've no idea, I've no comment

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I think we must surely have enough commissioners Existing law should be applied as it should be sufficient - I do not think more and more categorisation, plus an expensive bureaucracy will improve things

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The existing offence on religious grounds and on sexual orientation I am told has 2 elements:

- 1 Threatening words or behaviour
2. Intention to stir up hatred.

If a complaint only requires one of these elements to be successful it would make scurrilous and baseless accusations far easier to be made see Pakistan as an example where this is used to persecute minorities.

Freedom of speech must be defended. It includes the freedom to offend where there is no intent Unpopular non mainstream views will be criminalised

Intention can never be really known.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender self-identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred

A conviction for hate crime would be likely to ruin a life or livelihood

This law will be used to close religious or political discussion.

Question 47: No

Expand: As stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues is so serious only threatening conduct meaning to stir up hatred should be covered.

The current law is more sensible in distinguishing between racial characteristics and those of religion or sexual orientation because race is a neutral inherited trait, Religion, sexual orientation and transgender are debatable because they are about beliefs and behaviour

There is a major risk that disagreement will be called hatred by maliciously motivated complainants. "Abusive" is a subjective term.

Honest debate will be suppressed

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are 2 utterly different issues and it is wrong for this question to put them together and require a yes/no answer.

Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity as this is an unproven and controversial issue It has already lead to women being abused in hostels and to chaos in prisons.

Transgender propaganda has caused children's health to be affected by puberty blockers and this borders on the illegal.

it is reported that the strongest critics of the transgender movement are women who have had sex changes and now regret it: these could be legally attacked for speaking out if this law is extended.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: A "British man's home is his castle" This question is that of a totalitarian Freedom of expression would be utterly stifled .

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have full protection for free speech built in to protect debate, to protect individuals and to protect a democracy

Both sections must be kept as they are

Any matter involving "transgender identity" must explicitly protect : using a person's birth name and pronoun, saying that someone born a man is not a woman and vice versa, saying that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It is included because laws concerning hatred are already a potential infringement of human rights.

I am concerned that a person could face 7 years in prison for spoken words. Free speech is vital and must be protected.

The Attorney General has more independence from the CPS than the DPP and provides a safeguard. He is also directly answerable to parliament as a further safeguard.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: private individual

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Not Answered

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: there are already far too many restrictions on free speech ,

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: intent is far too general a concept and will in effect severely restrict freedom of speech

Question 46: No

Expand: again this is likely to lead to severe restrictions on freedom of speech .

Question 47: No

Expand: I would like to be able to express my views (as others should be able to even if different from mine) without fear . Restriction of freedoms of speech which have been guaranteed for centuries are under threat from this

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Transgender and disability are so different that it is disingenuous to lump them together .

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: I want the right to speak freely in my home and the homes of friends and colleagues . What right does the state have to control this ?

Question 52: Yes

Expand: freedom of speech eve on controversial topics must be protected

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: this is needed to add a level of protection to freedom of speech and the tendency of some to be overly keen to prosecute the they disagree with

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: It will damage freedom of speech

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The

existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1 threatening words

or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it

would make it easier to commit the offence An intention requirement does not guarantee that the

accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred In most situations intent would have to be inferred from

the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic

discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence

would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate People react strongly against even mild

statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding

that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'.

This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing

two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is

caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up

hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean

the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender

identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to

accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be

committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to

shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit

new stirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales

should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual

orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive

conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening

conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction

between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation
Race is a

neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated

in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that

disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically motivated complainants What is "abusive" is

subjective If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and

discuss beliefs

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this

question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be

extended to transgender identity Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws

covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate Women seeking to

protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring

up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender

ideology on young people A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned

Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans

movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it These 'detransitioners' could

be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society

people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government

has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence.

Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form

part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive

move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to

something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the

accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender

identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the

Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA

of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the

stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation • Any offence covering transgender identity

must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a

woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was

included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human

rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious

penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from

the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct

any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The

Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: None, I am a private individual with intense interest in this subject.

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I am subjected to immense harassment by neighbours who use the current protection of race and religion to obtain the upper hand against me in a dispute relating to my objection to excessive noise which they used as a weapon against me as part of their overall campaign of harassment.

I suffer substantially from anxiety and depression, and know only too well how the information I have provided in this response would be cruelly used against me.

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: As long as any such 'Act' of Statutory Law relative to Hate Crime is indisputably equal amongst all sections of the community, and, perhaps more importantly is forcibly APPLIED equally to all classifications of vulnerable persons, plus publicly SEEN to be APPLIED EQUALLY to all sections of the diverse community, then yes, I agree that a single "Hate Crime Act" would be a good idea.

Concentrating the legislation into one single 'Act' would undoubtedly clarify the situation rather than leaving it spread across numerous other elements of legislation.

However, if the introduction of a single "Hate Crime Act" merely follows the current extensive favouritism towards 'Race' and 'Religion', then it will be no more than another aspect of the existing state discrimination against members of many other sections of society who find themselves confronted with numerous forms of deliberate hatred in their day to day lives, but who have no automatic redress to law in order to seek protection

It worries me immensely that the introduction of the office of 'Hate Crime Commissioner' may all too easily become yet another statutory authoritative position which puts 'Race' and 'Religion' uppermost amongst its criteria

Additionally, what would the 'Race' and 'Religion' of such a 'Hate Crime Commissioner' be?

Presumably a white person, (male or female) would automatically be viewed as 'Racist' by members of BAME communities, and thus the office itself considered untrustworthy.

On the other hand, how could members of the white community be assured that if the incumbent of the role were to be from a BAME background, (which is most likely in order to satisfy political correctness), then members of the white community could expect to receive equal recognition of their complaints of verbal/physical abuse, harassment, and discrimination, in particular if those complaints were against someone from one of the many BAME communities?

Believe me, I speak from extensive, bitter past and current experience on this topic.

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: I agree in part, but only in part.

Whilst I accept in principle that a range of characteristics do require protection under law for the purposes of tacking hate crime where it genuinely exists, I equally have very grave concerns about the manner in which such protection is currently implemented by the Police; by the Crown Prosecution Service; plus by Magistrates and Crown Courts

From years of bitter personal experience stemming from an ongoing neighbour dispute originally relating to excessive noise, which in turn has had the adverse consequence for me of causing substantial detriment to my mental and physical health, I can categorically state that at present the law does not apply equally, and most definitely is not applied equally

It is far too easy for unscrupulous individuals or families from BAME communities to abuse certain aspects of their 'protected characteristics' by making thoroughly malicious allegations of hate crime against a white person with whom they have an otherwise unassociated dispute.

This is particularly so in relation to race and religion, both being at the top of the tree when it comes to legislative 'protected characteristics'.

Currently, it seems all any unscrupulous individual has to do is simply drop the alleged use of a particular word, (the 'P-word' being a prime example), into an allegation, and all hell comes raining down on their unfortunate, selected victim

It becomes a matter of:-

Automatic labeling as the 'offender';

Automatic assumption of guilt;

Automatic interview under Caution, (even arrest depending on the personal attitude of the individual investigating police officer);

Automatic provision of a file to the CPS;

Automatic decision to prosecute by the CPS;

Automatic guilty verdict by the Magistrates Court, mostly upheld by the Crown Court on Appeal

It seems NO CORROBORATIVE EVIDENCE or INDEPENDENT WITNESSES are required.

Solely the word of the accuser is enough

It becomes a 'their-word-against mine' scenario where the accused victim is left having to PROVE THEIR INNOCENCE rather than the prosecution having to PROVE guilt. That goes against the entire concept of so-called British Justice

Innocent until proved guilty? NO, it is automatically GUILTY unless and until you can prove yourself to be innocent!

It is a travesty of justice

I cannot help but wonder how many innocent people have had their good character and lives ruined as a result of falling victim to such a miscarriage of justice.

If the law continues to specify 'protected characteristics' for the purpose of tackling hate crime, then undoubtedly those laws MUST be tightened up to ensure all present loopholes are closed, and no innocent person finds themselves hounded by the police, or wrongfully convicted by the courts as the result of what is currently a 'Liar's Charter'

It is a 'Liar's Charter' which facilitates any unscrupulous individual or family to undertake a criminal act free of fear of repercussions in order to cause untold harm to another human through vindictive harassment and blatant abuse of the law for personal gain

Deliberately making a false witness statement to the Police is a criminal offence.

Knowingly giving false evidence in Court under Oath is PERJURY a serious criminal offence

Both can amount to a further serious criminal offence of 'Perverting the Course of Justice'!

YET, time and time again all this criminal activity is blithely overlooked by organisations which compile the Criminal Justice System, so that at individual or at corporate level each can put on a visible show of how strenuously THEY are working to tackle 'hate crime' in the form of Racism!

The problem is, many of those alleged 'hate crimes' carried out against persons with 'protected characteristics', especially in relation to Race and Religion, did not happen in the first place

I am a single, middle-aged (white) woman living alone.

My neighbour dispute began in September 2002

After months of saying nothing, on the subsequent advice of a local authority environmental health officer, I finally spoke to the neighbouring Asian Muslim couple asking them to stop the extent and source of excessive noise which was penetrating the party wall of our semi detached houses on a daily basis.

Use of my lounge had become near impossible. Concentration in my lounge, or any adjoining room, had become near impossible. As a result, after the couple arrogantly refused to accept it was possible for me to hear their noise inside my house, I took to the age-old means of banging on the party wall whenever their noise transgressed into my house.

It was only intended to let them know I could hear their noise.

In October 2002 they made their first malicious allegation of 'harassment', which was classed as 'Racially Aggravated' by local police.

In September 2003, on the first anniversary of my original complaint to them, they made another ridiculous allegation of 'Racially Aggravated' harassment after stems from a shrub I was pruning fell over my rear boundary fence into their garden.

In May 2004, a 'cousin-brother' of theirs made another malicious allegation, this time of 'Racially Aggravated' verbal abuse. All I had done was rebuke two of his teenage children after they had made deeply offensive gestures towards me as I walked past their father's car in which they were sitting.

Their father falsely claimed I had used 'The P-word' to them. He had no corroborative evidence, or independent witnesses.

This resulted in my having to attend a Voluntary Tape Recorded Interview under Caution.

The fact I had also reported the incident to our local police force was ignored.

Ultimately this male withdrew his allegation, but I was not informed for approximately 3 months.

In early April 2005, after this male had purchased the adjoining property and moved in with those same two teenagers, he again made a malicious allegation of 'Racially Aggravated' verbal abuse after I rebuked his teenagers for repeatedly pushing at my boundary fence with a brush.

I had not said anything racially abusive, it was merely defence of my property, however as previously, he slipped in the alleged use of 'The P word'.

He had no corroborative evidence or independent witnesses.

- His word alone was sufficient for the police to accept his allegation, and I subsequently received a Summons in relation to a Section 4 (or 4A) Public Order Offence classed as 'Racially Aggravated'

- It was stated his teenagers were not available to attend Court as witnesses. His daughter, claimed to be 14 years of age, was said to have gone to Pakistan for an arranged marriage never to return to this country. His son, said to be about 13 years of age, was said to have gone to live in Manchester and was incommunicable.

The neighbour himself did not arrive at the trial ultimately held late January 2006, having allegedly 'gone abroad' and 'forgotten' to inform the Court Service

The case was withdrawn, but it was made clear to me by the Magistrates Chairman that I was held to blame

In late April 2007, the same neighbour made yet another malicious allegation of 'Racially Aggravated' verbal abuse.

He again alleged I had used 'The P word', this time towards his toddler son, who was 18-months old.

I had not made this remark.

Obviously the child was far too young to be asked questions or give evidence as a witness.

Once more my neighbour had no corroborative evidence, or independent witnesses.

This time, the investigating police officers were indescribably aggressive, and I found myself threatened by them, plus tricked into an arrest situation which in turn caused a panic attack for which I was also blamed by those thuggish officers.

I was even thrown on the floor by them, despite having already made it abundantly clear I suffer from chronic anxiety plus depression, and had asked for a doctor to be called.

In the event, it took me two years of going through the Court system before I could clear my name of the criminal allegation

- Ultimately I made a complaint to what was then the IPCC, who predominantly found in my favour

I wanted to sue the police, but as I am not eligible for civil legal aid simply because I own my house, I was denied justice again.

In June 2012 there was yet another malicious allegation

This time the investigation was conducted by a representative of LASBU, (Leicester Anti Social Behaviour Unit), and became an utter debacle.

After initially being told my same neighbour had once more made an allegation of 'Racially Aggravated' verbal abuse, again involving 'The P-word', when I asked for a specific date on which this incident was alleged to have happened, I was later told it had been confused with an historic allegation that had already been investigated, therefore could not be investigated again

On further questioning of the reason behind the allegation, LASBU moved the goalposts even further, and claimed the reason for the investigation had nothing to do with

my neighbour, but had been brought by the local police because, in their opinion, I had 'wasted police time' by making too many 'unnecessary' complaints against my neighbour.

Where is the equality of justice in that?

- If I report what I genuinely believe to be harassment by my neighbours against me, then I am told I do not have sufficient EVIDENCE, or any WITNESSES for the case to be investigated. In addition to this I am accused of 'wasting police time'
- However, on the other hand, when my neighbour repeatedly makes thoroughly malicious allegations of 'Racist Abuse', even though he had no corroborative evidence such as audio or video, he is automatically believed and a substantial amount of public money is readily wasted on a totally unnecessary prosecution!

I believe an explanation for this can be found in a statement of 'Force' Policy quoted to me during a lengthy telephone debate. The officer, a sergeant deputising for his Inspector, finally told me after I had repeatedly pressed him for an answer to a question:

'...force policy dictates that precedence, and a greater level of belief be given to a member of an ethnic minority community who make a complaint of harassment, than to a member of the white community making a complaint of harassment!'

Surely that is indisputably RACIST and DISCRIMINATORY on the part of the police force concerned, namely Leicestershire Police, the very same police force from which policy on Hate Crime is substantially quoted in the Full Consultation document accompanying these questions

Under the investigation of my complaint by the IPCC, the officer admitted making this quote, but claimed I must have 'misunderstood it's meaning'.

I do not believe for a moment that I 'misunderstood' one iota of its meaning

- In September 2018, after the neighbouring property had changed hands in 2017, but contact with that earlier owner's family was still possible via a local newsagents, there was yet another malicious allegation of 'Racially Aggravated' verbal abuse made against me
- Regardless of my having reported a number of instances of verbal abuse, including threats to kill, an incident of assault, plus criminal damage to plant material in my garden, by members of that new neighbouring family, no police action was taken against them. Any excuse they gave was accepted.

The 17 year old son who made the threats to kill was eventually interviewed voluntarily under Caution, but denied the allegation. His denial was readily accepted, and he was immediately informed that no further action would be taken against him.

Once more, I was told I did not have EVIDENCE, or WITNESSES to support my accusation. (I had not had my camera to hand at the time.)

However, by stark contrast, the malicious allegation of 'Racist Abuse' made by the family in September 2018 resulted in my not only being interviewed voluntarily under Caution, but progressed to a full prosecution

They, (a Sikh family), claimed I had used the word 'Indians' in angry criticism of them. I had not.

My accusers did not have corroborative evidence to support their allegation, indeed the Officer In Case admitted in the file sent to the CPS that video provided by my accusers

of my standing outside their lounge window insisting they turn down the volume of their pounding stereo DID NOT evidence any criminal activity on my part, but merely placed me 'at the scene at the time'

- The fact one male in the extended family had spat at me after opening a window, and which I had reported to police that night, was totally ignored. I later discovered it had not even been recorded on the written Incident Report by the member of Call Management staff taking my call.

It was only after I arrived at the designated Magistrates Court that I discovered my accusers had tried to get the trial date changed at the last minute

They were given sufficient opportunity to still attend the trial, however both refused, one claiming to be too busy, the other claiming to have a prior appointment which, as they had three weeks notice of the trial date, could have been re-arranged.

It was therefore decided amongst all the legal representatives involved that this demand by my accusers was unacceptable, and so a request was put to the Court that the case be withdrawn on the grounds there was 'no evidence available'.

That was accepted by the Magistrates. Accordingly I was acquitted.

However the extreme stress involved inevitably had an enormous adverse impact on my existing anxiety and depressive mental health conditions.

In May 2020 the house, which had been substantially extended and fully refurbished internally by the Sikh family of builders, changed hands again

- I had already experienced intensive construction noise, often seven days per week and continuing until late in the evening, from August 2017 until May 2018. I had endured more than I could take

- Added to that I had also endured similar excessive construction noise, plus verbal abuse, ridicule, and even physical assault from neighbours the other side from late May 2019 until December 2019, resuming early in May 2020 until late November as they too built a large extension.

When the new owner of the adjoining semi once again began noisy construction work shortly after moving into the property, replacing much of the recently installed refurbishment to the lounge, and again continuing seven days per week, often until at least 9:00PM if not later, I had to voice my objection

He reacted very aggressively, threatening me that if I did not 'keep quiet' he would, 'make things very difficult' for me. He specified he would, 'turn my music up loud!' This of course would penetrate the party wall and attack me psychologically in my own home

I reported his threats to the police, however, again, he denied them, excuses were made for him by the police who immediately latched on to the reference to 'music' to claim this was a 'noise nuisance' issue therefore not a police matter, and no action was taken leaving me vulnerable to his aggressive, threatening actions

I had video evidence of these threats, however the police have not given me the opportunity to show this to them

- On the other hand, the local beat officer claims to have 'seen video' of me 'shouting and screaming' at this neighbour. If alleged video from my neighbour can be accepted and viewed by the police, why won't they view my video?

- Such double standards surely amount to discrimination, and as this new neighbour is again Asian Muslim it could be claimed that this is based on preferential 'racial' or 'religious' grounds. What is certain is that my mental health conditions are not being given equal status as a 'protected characteristic'!

Above I have briefly referred to being subjected to verbal abuse, ridicule, and to physical assault by my other neighbours on the 'detached' side. They too are a Muslim family of Asian origin.

This has included water being thrown in my face by one of their adult sons when I complained about excessive noise. He was only required to sign a Community Resolution Form. It was made clear to me the incident would not proceed to a prosecution whether or not he admitted his actions.

His father, the owner of the house, opened a bottle of Coca Cola and sprayed its contents over me from an upstairs window in July 2019 when I complained about horrendous hammering and drilling coming from inside the property on a Saturday afternoon during the extension work. This was well after the 1:00PM cut-off point stipulated in Environmental Health legislation. He taunted me by saying, 'did you like that?'

I had video footage of this whole incident, but all the police would do was suggest 'MEDIATION' as a means of resolving the matter. Again, it was made clear the incident would not proceed to a prosecution.

The same male owner slapped me across the face in November 2019 in addition to repeatedly calling me a 'f-king bitch' and 'f-king cow' after he had falsely accused me of 'trespassing' on his property the previous day. I had not set foot on his property.

He additionally taunted me that, 'no-one wants you round here, everybody hates you!' If I had said this to him, then he would only have had to claim it was based on his 'race' or 'religion', and I would have been confronted with a full police investigation and almost certain prosecution.

In the same incident, he grabbed my left arm and tried to pull me head first over my front gate. This caused a small rip in the fabric of my jacket sleeve. It also left a very small bruise on my left arm.

I reported it to the police, however, my neighbour made a false report against me, therefore, claiming I did not have EVIDENCE to PROVE my neighbour's actions, the investigating officers REFUSED to take action against my neighbour unless they took the same action against me.

Another adult son of the family has repeatedly subjected me to significant verbal abuse targeted at my mental health conditions, for example, 'you're not right in the head'; 'you should be in a care home'; 'you should be in a hospital'; and, telling me, 'do everyone a favour, go stand in the middle of the road!'

He has also accused me of being a paedophile because I have taken photographic evidence of the family's torment of me which includes the large number of grandchildren within the extended family.

· This accusation has links to a case history of murdered Bijan Ebrahimi, described within the Full Consultation document where his attempts to take photographic evidence of anti-social behaviour directed at his disability was also falsely accused of being paedophilia

· The Full Consultation document goes on to state how his murderers were not sentenced on the basis that the offence was motivated by hostility towards him on account of his race or disability because; quote, "Prejudicial targeting", which often characterises crimes directed at disabled people, is not currently recognised as constituting hate crime".

The police repeatedly tell me I have no evidence, no witnesses. As I live alone, how can I obtain the required evidence if I do not use my camera as my 'witness'? Yet, when I do so, I am further abused by my tormentors who then claim I am 'invading their privacy'!

Further to the verbal abuse directed at my mental health conditions by this neighbouring family came from the mother of this abusive son She has taunted me, 'you should be living in a loony home'!

Not only is such a comment highly abusive to myself or to anyone else suffering from a mental health condition, so fits the criteria for causing 'Additional Harm' to the wider community as stated under Consultation Question 3, but it is also amazing that it came from someone whose race and religion guarantees them the status of having a 'protected characteristic' under existing law, which in turn grants them 'automatic belief' from the police if they make a complaint of 'racial abuse' or 'religiously motivated' abuse.

This situation is ongoing What I have tried to point out is the appalling discrimination that currently exists in favour of 'race' and of 'religion' in terms of protected characteristics.

THIS MUST CHANGE!

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: Firstly, I note repeated use of the word EVIDENCE here within points of Consultation Question 3.

As an innocent individual who has repeatedly found themselves to be the victim of a thoroughly malicious allegation of 'Racist Abuse' by a deceitful neighbour all too willing to abuse the law in their quest to obtain the upper hand over me by whatever foul means they can, this is a subject extremely close to my heart

In my own bitter experiences, those neighbours, (both from a large BAME community), did not require EVIDENCE to support their vile allegations

Simply their word was sufficient to bring about a full police investigation, followed by a virtually automatic prosecution.

It was the proverbial 'his word against mine' situation

However, on the force policy basis of 'precedence', and 'a greater level of belief' given to the ethnicity of my neighbour, his word was automatically taken against that of my own.

In all instances my neighbours had no corroborative EVIDENCE They had no INDEPENDENT witnesses.

It did not matter that within the context of a police interview under Caution I honestly denied the allegation, it was my neighbours' word that was accepted by the police, subsequently by the CPS, and then by the Magistrates Court.

Surely this flies in the face of subsection (1) of Consultation Question 3 that, to achieve the requirement of demonstrable need: there must be "evidence that crime based on hostility or prejudice towards the group is prevalent"

Again with subsection (2) of Consultation Question 3, to achieve the criteria for Additional Harm, it states, "there is evidence that criminal targeting based on hostility or prejudice towards the characteristic causes additional harm to the victim, members of the targeted group, and society more widely".

Surely if there is no corroborative evidence to support an individual allegation, then this criteria for Additional Harm cannot be (has not been) met!

This brings me to subsection (3), "Suitability".

Consultation Question (3) states, "protection of the characteristic would fit logically within the broader offences and sentencing framework, prove workable in practice, represent an efficient use of criminal justice resources, and is consistent with the rights of others."

The two aspects of this which stick in my gut are, 'represent an efficient use of criminal justice resources', and, 'consistent with the rights of others'.

How can any protection of a characteristic truly 'represent an EFFICIENT use of criminal justice resources' when it is so abundantly easy for unscrupulous individuals currently benefiting from the highest level of those 'protected characteristics' to knowingly abuse that privilege and treat the entire criminal justice system, plus its 'resources' as a personal weapon of spite against an innocent person!

It cannot be an EFFICIENT use of criminal justice resources to falsely cause a significant amount of those resources to be spent for no real reason.

Again, how can any protection of a characteristic truly be 'consistent with the rights of others', when it is so abundantly easy for unscrupulous individuals to abuse those 'rights' of others by blatantly lying in order to have an innocent person investigated by police and prosecuted?

Such people are laughing up their sleeve at the whole system, but that system is so deeply wrapped up in its own fear of accusations of 'Institutional Racism' that it metaphorically pulls the wool over its own eyes in order to give the most advantageous public image

I realise that Consultation Question 3 is fundamentally discussing the criteria for determining why certain characteristics to be included in the proposed new hate crime legislation in a wider sense, but nonetheless, in doing so such legislation MUST NOT be allowed to fall into the same diabolical situation that currently exists where loopholes and overriding political correctness facilitate another 'Liar's Charter'

Question 4: NO, because from my experience far too many people who speak a different language already make use of it to the exclusion and even ridicule of persons who only speak English

There would be far too great a risk that when a person responds with the all too oft used response 'No English; No English' when they do not want to answer a question or criticism, (often said with a smirking grin on their face), they could unscrupulously twist this to make a claim of 'racial/religious discrimination/abuse'.

Including migration and asylum status; and/or language into the definition of race within the hate crime laws would only lead to yet more malicious allegations and false prosecutions

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: A difficult one, but if the definition of religion is to be retained for the purposes of hate crime laws it must also include Christianity for it to amount to true equality, otherwise such a law merely becomes discriminatory in itself.

Just because an individual follows a religion other than Christianity does not by any means make them incapable of being abusive towards people who are Christian by faith

This must be spelled out very firmly in law to prevent such-minded persons from believing they have the upper hand because their religion is protected whereas Christianity is not

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: I do not have a opinion on this.

Question 7: I do not have a specific opinion on this topic

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1: I do not have a specific opinion on this topic.

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: I do not have sufficient legal knowledge to comment on this.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: I do not have sufficient legal knowledge to comment on this What I will say is that there must undoubtedly be a staunch definition of disability covering both physical disability, learning disabilities, AND, mental health conditions.

Question 10: This is another element very close to my heart

Not all health conditions falling under the classification of a 'disability' are visible. This is especially so with mental health conditions such as anxiety, depression, obsessive compulsive disorder, bipolar, etc

There seems to be a general consensus that 'if it cannot be seen, it does not exist'!

This is where it is all too easy for a person to fall victim to a wrongly presumed lack of disability

Some people are determined not to recognise certain health conditions as a disability, even if those health conditions meet the relevant criteria to be classed as such.

This is where persons suffering from 'hidden disabilities' can, and all too often do, fall victim to some very nasty verbal abuse, often including sarcasm and ridicule.

It can be immensely distressing to face ridicule when having tried to explain to another person that as someone who suffers from a mental health condition like anxiety, you need additional time to carry out a task, or additional space around you in order to prevent an anxiety or panic attack developing.

I know this feeling only too well having faced it innumerable times, especially when shopping in a supermarket, or travelling on a bus.

If an individual suffers from a hidden disability, such as some mental health conditions, then they will almost certainly have proof of a diagnosis obtainable from their doctor which can be produced for a legal purpose

I think this is why criminal conduct based on a wrongly presumed lack of disability on the part of the victim should fall within the scope of protection afforded by hate crime laws.

As things stand, people who suffer from mental health conditions have far too little protection in law when it comes to being a victim of hate crime.

To be ridiculed on the grounds of a mental health condition, or a spiteful accusation based on a wrongly presumed lack of such a condition, can be just as emotionally painful as abuse based on the grounds of a person's race or religion.

Sadly at present, it is not recognised as such

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: I do not have sufficient legal knowledge to comment on this. All I would say is that elements such as forced marriage, FGM, and aspects of domestic abuse, all of which are currently protected in law anyway, can carry a strong element of misogyny, therefore becomes a hate crime, so could benefit further from the proposed protection

Question 12: A difficult one, because although it is obviously possible for women to carry out acts of hate crime against men just as it is for men to carry out hate crimes against women, if the legislation includes both women and men, then it becomes somewhat counterproductive.

For one thing, where the two parties are known to each other, then a situation could develop where each would be accusing the other of hate crime

On the other hand, it would be discriminatory against men not to afford them some protection in law.

However women can be subjected to hate crime via being viewed as subservient to men. This needs to be acknowledged and addressed in any legislation.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: A protected category of "women" would perhaps have a broader scope than just "misogyny", and as such I agree it could be a more suitable name.

However any category of hate crime protection limited to females must include a clear provision for misogyny to be classed as a hate crime within its legislation

I say this for a specific reason, again based on the bitter personal experiences I have outlined under my answer to Consultation Question 2

The abhorrent, archaic attitude of many Islamic males that women are/should be automatically subservient to men MUST be included within any protected category of the female sex. It is undeniably a form of abuse, and in my opinion amounts to misogyny in its utmost despicable form

It cannot be denied that the so named 'Honour Killings' of some Asian women by males in the family takes place

It cannot be denied that some Asian women are subjected to forced marriage by males in their family as though they are nothing more than a chattel.

This is proof if any is needed of the way women can be and all too often are viewed as unequal.

In the 21st Century no man should be allowed to demand a woman 'keep quiet' in terms of not making a complaint against his actions as a man because his so called 'cultural' beliefs cause him to develop the arrogance to assume superiority over a woman.

No male should be permitted to impose enforced subservience onto a woman which in turn classes her as a second class citizen

The law cannot be allowed to shirk from this purely for fear of being classed as 'Islamophobic'. To do so would be letting women down badly. It would leave us hugely vulnerable

For 21st Century western women, be they black or white to be subjected to such an arrogant attitude is grossly insulting. It attempts to take away the freedoms we have fought for over decades.

It drags women, and the law of this country, back to the middle ages.

If Muslim women choose to adhere to such subservience of their own free will, then that is up to them, as long as it IS of their own free will and not forced on them by males in the family.

However, it must never be acceptable for such a discriminatory, hypocritical attitude to be overlooked while it is imposed on a female neighbour, colleague, etc.

Let's face it, if a Muslim man felt he was being discriminated against on the grounds of his race or religion, then he would be the first to complain. Why then should such men believe they have the right to impose discrimination on women?

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15: This is a difficult one, but for the main purpose of imposing an enhanced sentence on an offender for attacking an elderly person, or tricking them out of money, then some form of protected characteristic relating to age is necessary

Question 16: As stated in my answer to Consultation Question 15, some form of protected characteristic is required for older people

Children already have laws specifically designed to protect them, so to include people of all ages within an age-based hate crime protection is maybe unnecessary.

Question 17: I do not have an opinion on this subject

Question 18: I do not have an opinion on this subject

Question 19: Deliberate attacks on the homeless are obviously unacceptable in a civilised society, but could classing them as a hate crime category be enforced?

Question 20: I do not have an opinion on this subject

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment on this question.

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: In line with my answers to other Consultation Questions, I note use of the word PROOF!

It is PROOF of any 'demonstration' of hostility towards a relevant characteristic of a victim that is vital

What worries me most about the way in which current legislation is applied is that it seems very much as if only lip-service is applied to the need for PROOF

Question 23: I do not know enough about the law to comment on this question

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: I think higher maximum penalties have to be retained in future hate crime laws, because there is no doubt hate crimes do take place, BUT, that being said, what concerns me most deeply is the requirement to ascertain that such an offence has actually taken place, and obtain corroborative evidence LONG BEFORE things get to a sentencing stage

I am emphatically opposed to the conviction of innocent people simply on the 'word' of an accuser who otherwise does not have any corroborative evidence to support their allegation.

Question 25: Yes

Expand: I can only comment on the 'disability' element of this Consultation Question.

In that respect, I most definitely agree that 'disability' both hidden and visible, whether physical or in terms of mental health, should be characteristics protected by aggravated offenses.

Not to afford them the same level of protection as race and religion is sheer discrimination.

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment on this question.

Question 27: Other (please expand)

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment on this question

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment sufficiently on this question

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: As someone who was confronted with a threat to kill by a BAME neighbour, who freely got away with his threat owing to political correctness and fears of accusations of 'Institutional Racism' by investigating officers, THREAT TO KILL should be included in reformed hate crime laws.

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34: As someone confronted with this following a malicious allegation of 'Racist Abuse', I have grave concerns that it gives the CPS 'two bites at the same cherry'

If the local police are intent on obtaining a conviction of a person against whom they have a clear grudge, then it affords them too great an opportunity to condemn an innocent person unnecessarily

Question 35: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 37: Other (please expand)

Expand: If the nature of the aggravation is not stated in open court, then it is in danger of becoming subversive and secretive That must not be allowed to happen or it could adversely impact on the accused making an Appeal if they know themselves to be innocent.

Question 38 Part 1: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 38 Part 2: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 43 Part 1: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Yes

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 50: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 52 Part 2: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 53: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 55 Part 1: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 59: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question

Question 60: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 61: I do not know enough about the law to comment satisfactorily on this question.

Question 62: As stated in an earlier answer, I have huge concerns about the 'politically correct' nature of the person appointed as Hate Crime Commissioner.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Retired

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand: Hate crime should be restricted to threats regardless of characteristics

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: No

Question 5: No

Expand: The definition of Religion should be the one use in the Human Rights Act, which, incidentally, precludes Islam as a religion

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Yes

Question 10: Yes

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Both

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15: Yes, particularly the elderly are subjected to hate crimes.

Question 16: There is little evidence of hate crimes against any but the older people

Question 17: No

Question 18: No

Question 19: Definitely

Question 20: NO

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34: Yes

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: No

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: No

Question 59: No

Question 60: No

Question 61: Yes

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous to free speech. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. Threatening words or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred This existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on contentious issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. At the moment in this country, certain sections of society can regard disagreement as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved, it will unfortunately become easier to use the law to stifle religious and political discussion.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on contentious issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred needs to be covered. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated people. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity is considered as likely to stir up hatred, it could very regrettably have a chilling effect on the freedom of speech.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is very contentious and hate speech legislation covering this would stifle a subject of significant political debate. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime legislation. In a democratic society people must be able to express their own opinions at home.

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: I do not support downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Consolidating existing laws into a new piece of legislation makes no sense unless the purpose is also to expand those laws. Hate crime, by its nature as a concept, is nebulous and subject to subjective interpretation. We should be extremely cautious about expanding the remit unless and until it can be shown that existing laws are inadequate.

Question 2: No

Expand: Fundamentally "hate crime" should be narrowly interpreted. Possibly only to the level of inciting violence against others. Defining groups means that some will therefore not be protected while there will be ever the pressure to expand the list ad infinity.

Question 3: No

Expand: This is a wholly subjective assessment and prone to political and "social cause de jour" interference. Fundamentally the law should not criminalise hurt feelings. Actions which encourage violence (physical or economic) are already well legislated. We have libel laws for the rest.

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Why is this a hate crime? Does that mean that all incidences of misogyny and misandry are now to be criminalised? Should Monty Python be locked up for the philosophers song, (with its cry of "No Poofers"?). Although this is a trite example, it is an indication of the potential insidious creep of this legislation

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: If we need to go down this path at all, why should only women be protected? To mind this exposes the logical fallacy that underpins much of the commission's proposal. You have a solution in need of a problem, rather than the other way around.

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15: Where does this lead us in practical terms? Does that mean that every half drunken utterance of "you young (expletive)" or "you old (expletive)" now becomes a hate crime? Can modelling agencies be criminalised for refusing to put octogenarians on the catwalk?

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand: These acts already attract a sanction under our existing law. What makes eg arson more heinous if it is motivated by a “ hate crime” than by simply dislike or malice? The physical act and its consequences are the same.

Question 29: No

Expand: Again, these acts are already subject to sanction Threatening someone with a knife does not become a worse offence through some actual or imputed underlying motivation.

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: This question lacks specificity, but appears to imply latitude in determining whether a crime is a hate crime This should be rejected The criminal standard should continue to apply.

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Freedom of speech is one of our most cherished rights and we should be extremely cautious about infringing it. This should include the right to say otherwise objectionable things. It is unlawful to incite violence. This needs to be measured by what was said, not what the underlying intent was. Unless the actual words used can objectively be ascertained to incite violence,, there should be no offence

Question 46: No

Expand: If intent to stir up hatred cannot be proven, then why is there even a question?

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Does the commission truly intend to criminalise words said over dinner in a private dwelling? Ridiculous

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Why would we remove an extra check and balance for a subjective area? It would seem the only logical reason is to enable more prosecutions to be pursued. This should be carefully reconsidered

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No I would not. If you put in place an infrastructure dedicated to hate crime, the net result will only inevitably be that that infrastructure will grow and to justify their own continued existence, the "problem" will be positioned as far greater than it is, thereby requiring more legislation and more resources.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: I support clarification and consolidation of the law where possible but for me the more important thing here is clarity, particularly around definitions and the question of intent.

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Again, in principle this may be a useful starting point but I am not persuaded by the different language used (compared with the Equality Act 2010 protected characteristics) and the way that hate crime law has developed seems haphazard and over-influenced by certain lobby groups and victim perception. I wonder if it is a necessary specification. The active intent of the perpetrator seems a more important pre-condition for determining a hate crime. This would also solve the problem of ever-expanding categories.

Question 3: No

Expand: See also answer to Q2

Question 4: Again, motivation and intent seem more important criteria. Race, as defined in S9 in the Equality Act 2010, already includes nationality and citizenship status.

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: I don't see what this would add - again it goes back to motivation and intent, for me. It is certainly difficult to maintain an asexual orientation in this society. If this was the clear motivation for a hate crime regard can already be given to this within the existing law, as, in a different example, the Sophie Lancaster case shows. But it would have to be clear that this was the actual intent and motivation. The problem with these proposed expansions

is that lobby groups steeped in their language, meaning and nuance forget that they may not be well understood in wider society and this can over-influence change.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Please see also answer to Q7 - the current definition already runs ahead of the protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010, which, for example, has been used by some lobby groups to deny, hide and ignore that there is a protected characteristic of sex. Gender identity is a hotly contested social issue and, while genuine victims of a hate crime should be protected by law, this must be defined by the intention and actions of the perpetrator. The criminal law is not the right method to seek to impose social change in this way.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: See answers above

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: There is a desperate need for all areas of the law to clarify terms here - there is much current confusion and overlap. Gender and sex have distinct meanings that should be made clear in law and their practical application explained. In my view sex is the better term to use. The term 'gender identity' has crept into public policy as a result of certain lobby groups misrepresenting the language of the Equality Act 2010. This has often led to the absence of sex as a protected characteristic in policy documents and serves to undermine protections for females in particular. If there is to be an additional protected characteristic it should be sex and for the protection of females from misogyny and male violence. The argument in the consultation paper seems to be that misogyny is so rife in our society that we cannot add it as an aggravating factor. However, if hatred of women is the motivation for a crime and this can be proven then this should be taken into account.

Question 11 Part 2: See also answer to Q 11. I think you mean sex-specific. 'Carve out' is an awful expression to use, how insensitive of you! If misogyny is the proven motivation and intent then this should be taken into account. Given the endemic nature of misogyny and VAWG how can crimes of sexual violence by males against females be anything else?

Question 12: See also previous answers: sex based protections in law should be for females

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Provisionally, yes, depending on how you resolve definition issues discussed in other questions - what will 'women' mean? It should be sex-based as a starting point and there will need to be clarity for both transmen and transwomen and the overlap with 'transgender' etc

Question 14: No

Expand: This conflation is unhelpful and needs to be resolved in law. If you have 'sex or gender' and 'transgender' (++) what will that mean in practice? This does not seem to have been thought through. Sex is the better term for what is being protected here.

Question 15: Again these expanded categories seem arbitrary- either follow the Equality Act or, as I would prefer, look at motivation and intent/actions.

Question 16: I think this question illustrates the problem the question to ask is what has motivated the crime.

Question 17: No crimes against women, the majority of sex workers, should be addressed as discussed above Adding more and more expanded categories serves no one Would Peter Sutcliffe get an enhanced sentence for a hate crime? One would hope so - the motivation and intent are the important issue. This can already be dealt with in law as the Sophie Lancaster case demonstrates

Question 18: No - This can already be dealt with in law as the Sophie Lancaster case demonstrates

Question 19: No This can already be dealt with in law as the Sophie Lancaster case demonstrates. An alternative would be to use socio-economic status from the Equality Act 2010

Question 20: No This can already be dealt with in law as the Sophie Lancaster case demonstrates.

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: Why not ask 'towards the person because of their actual or perceived membership of a particular group'?

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand: I am extremely wary about this. There seem to be huge dangers here with your intended expansions. I thought communication offences were the subject of a different consultation?

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: Don't agree

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Yes as already discussed in previous responses

Question 38 Part 2: A combination of approaches seems reasonable The discussion focuses on hate but it is also about communities that live in fear

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: This all seems highly dangerous

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: This is a highly contentious proposal in relation to 'transgender identity', which has no settled definition in law and no agreed social meaning.

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50: This is all highly concerning who decides, and on what basis?

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No, this seems an entirely unnecessary public expense.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: This is already covered in our laws.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15: No, as there are already laws for this.

Question 16:

Question 17: No

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20: No

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Laws based on the idea of intention alone are very dangerous and results in an academic debate. This is philosophy not law.

This also impacts freedom of speech which should be maintained.

This law could result in prison being full of people who make a comment, who are criminalised based on their inferred intentions, this is wrong.

Question 46: No

Expand: It should be clear that this was a deliberate action

Also, on many issues disagreement can be misinterpreted as a hate crime.

People can feel strongly about contentious issues and people describe opinions that they disagree with as abusive.

I also note that the justice minister of Scotland has limited offences based on where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated This should be agreed across the UK

Question 47: No

Expand: Only threatening conduct that intended to stir up hatred should be covered.

The term, 'abusive' is subjective

Existing laws are sufficient.

And, free speech could be significantly impacted.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: transgender identity and disability are two separate and different issues and should not be put in one question

There would be issues for women only areas if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences.

De transitioners, the strongest of which are women who have had a sex change but now regret it, could be prosecuted for speaking out as part of free speech.

Question 49: No

Expand: This is already covered in our laws

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: No, I do not agree! People should be able to express their opinion's in their own homes.

Again the Scottish government were criticised for attempting to implement a law like this, which would significantly impact our free speech laws

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Strong protection should exist for free speech, to protect debate.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General is an independent check on prosecutions raised by the Crown Prosecution Service, which could impact human rights significantly.

As a person could face up to 7 years in prison, then effective and good safeguards should be in place at the highest level.

Additionally, this could impact our free speech laws.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Cordelia Tucker O'Sullivan

Name of Organisation: Refuge

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: We are taking this opportunity to summarise our response to the entire consultation, but we do not have the expertise to respond to this question in particular.

Introduction

1. Refuge is the largest specialist provider of gender-based violence services in the country, supporting over 7,000 women and children on any given day. Refuge opened the world's first refuge in 1971 in Chiswick and 49 years later provides: a national network of 48 refuges, community outreach programmes, child support services, and independent advocacy services for those experiencing domestic, sexual, and other gender-based violence. We also run specialist services for survivors of tech abuse, modern slavery, 'honour'-based violence, and female genital mutilation. Refuge provides the National Domestic Abuse Helpline which receives hundreds of calls every day.

Summary

2. Refuge has focussed our response on questions that we have expertise in and has declined to respond to those for which we do not hold the requisite experience. Refuge strongly supports the introduction of hate crime against women into the hate crime framework. There is ample evidence of the criminal targeting of women on the basis of their gender, which is driven by misogynistic and sexist cultural and social norms and stereotypes. As we detail in our response below, there is a significant and growing body of research demonstrating the pervasive misogynistic targeting of women, from domestic abuse, sexual violence and other forms of VAWG, to online abuse and sexualised street harassment. The additional harm to individual women, and women as a group, is clear from the prevalence of fear around completing everyday tasks and activities, such as walking home alone at night, self-censorship online, and widespread social ills, such as the fact that more than one in four women will experience domestic abuse at some point in their lives. Clearly, this harm also engenders further inequalities and harms within society. Women currently make up only a third of MPs, there is a consistent and significant gender pay gap, and the impact of women refraining from taking part in public debate online means we are losing vital perspectives which is ultimately a detriment to our democracy. There is no equivalent evidence for the criminal targeting of men on the basis of gender. Refuge therefore strongly supports the introduction of a gender-based hate crime that is limited to women and strongly opposes a gender-neutral hate crime.

3. On balance, Refuge also supports a carveout for domestic abuse, rape, and other sexual violence offences from misogynistic hate crime. These crimes against women are inherently misogynistic, frequently drawing on discriminatory gender norms and stereotypes to control and abuse women and are used to reinforce patriarchal power structures that reassert men's dominance over women. While Refuge acknowledges the tension in the introduction of misogyny hate crime that does not cover some of the most serious crimes against women that pervade our society, we do not believe the solution is to arbitrarily label some of these crimes as misogynistic and others as non-misogynistic. We believe that the way the criminal justice system currently operates would make this inevitable. However, we do support the broader misogyny hate crime framework to have parity with the other hate crime categories, particularly around the 'stirring up hatred' offences and the 'aggravated offences' framework.

4. In addition, we are very supportive of aggravated versions of the communications offences being introduced. There is significant evidence of misogynistic and sexist abuse online, which, if charged, would commonly fall under the communications offences. Given the additional seriousness of misogyny hate crime perpetrated online, particularly in relation

to the growing 'incel' movement, which has resulted in real-life injury and death, it is essential that aggravated versions of these offences can be charged, with harsher sentences available. Finally, we support the establishment of a Hate Crime Commissioner, but would welcome further consultation on this. We welcome further conversations with the Law Commission about any of the issues or arguments detailed in this response.

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand: Refuge broadly supports the approach, provisionally proposed by the Law Commission, to determine whether a characteristic should be included in hate crimes laws. Refuge is responding to this consultation in its capacity as the largest specialist VAWG service provider in the country, primarily to support the inclusion of misogyny hate crime in the hate crime legal framework. It is our view that misogyny hate crime clearly meets the proposed criteria for inclusion in hate crime legislation. We strongly believe that misogyny hate crime meets these criteria, subject to a carve out for domestic abuse and sexual violence offences. We provide further details on this in our answer to question 11.

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: 8. Refuge strongly supports the inclusion of hate crime against women, or misogyny hate crime, in the hate crime legal framework in England and Wales. Specifically, we support the introduction of gender-based hate crime that is restricted to women (for more detail, please see our answer to question 12). As the Law Commission outlines in the consultation document, there is a wealth of evidence that women are targeted on the basis of being women, that causes significant additional harm not only to individual women, but to women collectively and to society in general. It is essential that crimes perpetrated against women on the basis of their gender are recognised as hate crimes, reflecting both the additional severity of those crimes, as well as sending a clear message to the public that such crimes are unacceptable and will not be tolerated.

9. There is a wealth of evidence that women are targeted by men for some of the most serious and violent crimes in the country. According to the latest statistics from the ONS Crime Survey of England and Wales (CSEW), we know that more than one in four (27.6%) women aged 16-74 have experienced domestic abuse at some point in their lives, with 1.6 million women experiencing domestic abuse in the past year alone. This makes women twice as likely as men to experience domestic abuse according to the ONS. While these figures clearly demonstrate that women are much more likely to experience domestic abuse, we also know that these figures do not capture the true extent of the disproportionate impact of domestic abuse on women. This is primarily because coercive and controlling behaviour is not captured by the CSEW. Research suggests that if coercive control were captured by the CSEW, this data would demonstrate that domestic abuse is an even more gendered phenomenon, disproportionately experienced by and disproportionately impacting women.

10. Moreover, women are significantly more likely to experience rape and sexual assault compared to men. In the past year, 126,000 women experienced domestic sexual assault, compared to 17,000 men. This means that more than 7 times the number of women than men experienced sexual assault within a domestic abuse context. In England and Wales, 98% of defendants in rape cases are men. Additionally, women are significantly more likely to be killed in a domestic homicide in comparison to men. On average, two women a week are killed by their current or ex-partner, with five times more women than men killed by their current or ex-partner in the year ending March 2019.

11. Of the thousands of survivors Refuge works with and supports every day, many describe the ways in which they were punished by their abusers for failing to conform with discriminatory gender norms and stereotypes. Abusers frequently seek to reinforce patriarchal power structures which place men in power, with women subjugated to that power. For example, many women have told us about their abusers controlling access to money, even that which the survivor had earned herself, refusing to contribute child related costs, judging this to be something she was responsible for as the mother and treating her income as his property:

Niamh is in her mid twenties and is currently separated from her abuser. While Niamh is currently unemployed and in receipt of Universal Credit, she worked full time in various jobs during the relationship, the earnings of which she used to support herself and her ex-partner. While he was also working, he kept his income secret from her. Niamh's ex-partner began treating her income as something to which he was entitled to very early on in the relationship. He would often use her bank card to take money out without telling her what he was spending it on and 'borrow' money for lunch or petrol. When Niamh had their baby, her abuser refused to support her with items for the baby, meaning she had to rely on handouts from her mother as she didn't have enough money to cover essentials, such as nappies and milk.

12. Survivors have also told us how their abusers manipulated them by espousing ideas of male entitlement to women's bodies in order to shame them into doing things they did not want to, and then using societal expectations about women's sexuality to control and abuse them further. A survivor of domestic abuse involving sexual violence, Natasha, told us:

'I'd been in a relationship with my ex-husband for six months when he first ordered me to remove my clothes and pose for intimate photos. In the beginning, I thought taking these photos was an act of intimacy, but they were actually being used as another form of domestic abuse and as another way to control me. I'd repeatedly tell him that I didn't feel comfortable taking intimate photos. When I refused, he would taunt me saying, 'you're so uptight,' then bring up things I'd disclosed to him about my past sexual experiences. He

would berate me and mock my appearance until I gave in. Posing for these photos made me feel so dirty and worthless, but I was just a teenager and I wanted to make him happy. I never imagined these pictures would become leverage for my abuser's campaign of isolation and coercive control.

'One day I'd planned to meet my mum at the local train station, but my ex-husband was adamant that it was too dangerous for me to walk there alone. Reasoning with him was useless, he just wanted me all to himself. "What about if I send these photos to your Mum and Dad then?" he said, revealing a folder on his laptop with the intimate pictures he'd taken. "Do your parents want to see their slut of a daughter?" It was like having a bucket of ice-cold water thrown over me. I was gripped by terror, fearing he would share something so deeply intimate without my consent. The threat of those photos being shared was my worst nightmare. I had no choice but to comply with his continued abuse or face potential humiliation. The photos were a part of his plan to intimidate and pressure me into submission and compliance. The threat was always there and as the years went on, it was like I ceased to exist. He made me feel invisible to everyone and if I displeased him in any way, I knew he could use those pictures to ruin my reputation. Until the day I was able to escape, the fear never left me. He would still talk about going through my phone and sending intimate pictures to my contacts. Today I'm happily re-married and my ex is in prison, but I know he still has those photos of me somewhere. Knowing an abuser has intimate photos feels like you're being violated. Those images were for his own gratification and a tool to keep me compliant. I had no way of proving my ex had shared these images but the threat of sharing them was equally distressing and compounded my isolation.'

13 These survivor stories demonstrate that discriminatory gender norms and stereotypes, together with misogyny and patriarchal power structures, are used to abuse women and perpetrate crimes against them. In addition to domestic abuse and other forms of violence against women and girls, there is a growing body of evidence of the prevalence of online abuse that is perpetrated against women and girls. For example, research from Amnesty International in 2017 found that one in five women in the UK had suffered online abuse or harassment, with almost half of these women saying the abuse or harassment was misogynistic. 27% said that it threatened sexual or physical assault. Young women were found to be particularly affected, with one in three polled saying that they had experienced online abuse.

14. Additionally, in 2017, the Fawcett Society and Reclaim the Internet conducted an open-access online survey to hear from women who use social media about their experiences of online harassment and abuse. They found that on Facebook and Twitter, sexist messages were the most common forms of harassment or abuse experienced, with 64% of those experiencing abuse on Facebook and 70% of those experiencing abuse on Twitter saying that this was the form of online abuse they were subjected to. Around a third of women had experienced politically extremist hate messages, unwanted sexual messages or images, stalking and/or threats of violence.

15 The impact of misogynistic online abuse is severe for women. According to research from Amnesty, 55% of women that had been abused online said they had experienced anxiety, stress, or panic attacks as a result. Many women faced other psychological consequences such as low self-esteem or low confidence (70%), trouble sleeping (62%), and a sense of powerlessness (65%). Amnesty also found that three quarters of women who had experienced online abuse, aged between 18-55 across eight different countries, made changes to the way they used social media platforms as a result. Young women and girls are particularly impacted by misogynistic online abuse, with Girlguiding finding that 49%

of girls aged 11-21 say that the fear of abuse online makes them feel less able to share their views, with 50% saying they think sexism is worse online than offline. They also found that 25% of girls and young women aged 13-21 had had threatening things said about them on social media and 24% had been sent photos or content by people they knew that they found upsetting.

16 Harassment and abuse against women and girls is prevalent online and offline, with multiple surveys finding that street harassment is very common amongst women of all ages in the UK. A survey published by the EU Fundamental Rights Agency in 2014 found that 68% of women respondents in the UK said they had experienced sexual harassment since the age of 15, with 25% having been sexually harassed in the past 12 months. Similarly, a 2016 survey from EAW found that 64% of women of all ages had experienced unwanted sexual attention in public places and 35% had experienced unwanted sexual touching

17. Multiple surveys have also found that street harassment is even more common amongst younger women. For example, the 2016 EAW survey found that 85% of women aged 18-24 had experienced unwanted sexual attention in public places, with 45% experiencing unwanted sexual touching. The survey also revealed that street harassment starts at a young age for most women, with more than a quarter being less than 16 years old the first time it happened, and more than three quarters being under 21. Additionally, a 2018 survey of 14-21 year olds by Plan International UK found that 66% had experienced unwanted sexual attention or harassment in a public place, with 35% of UK girls who wear school uniform being sexually harassed in public.

18. Evidence from Plan International UK and Our Streets Now published in November 2020 found that street harassment worsened during the pandemic. A fifth (19%) of young women and girls aged 14-21 experienced being catcalled, followed, groped, flashed, or upskirted during the Spring lockdown. This rose to a staggering 51% during the Summer as Coronavirus restrictions were eased. Again, this is having a significant impact on young women and girls. Research from Girlguiding in 2018 found that 63% of girls aged 13-21 have experienced feeling unsafe walking home, or know someone who has, and 52% have felt unsafe using public transport. Research also found that 80% of parents said they worried that their daughters would experience public sexual harassment, which led to four in ten parents asking their daughters not to go out after dark or to take certain routes, while two thirds said they had instructed them not to walk home alone after a certain time

19. Not only is there significant and growing evidence of women being targeted for violent and abusive crime, online sexist abuse, and sexual harassment, including in public settings but there is also evidence of widespread misogynistic beliefs among the general public. Research published by the Fawcett Society in 2017 found that of the 8000 adults surveyed who were asked "if a woman goes out late at night, wearing a short skirt, gets drunk, and is then the victim of a sexual assault, is she totally or partly to blame?", 38% of all men and 34% of all women said that she is totally or partly to blame, 41% of men aged 18-24 and 30% of women of the same age agreed. 14% of men aged 18-34 said she was totally to blame. Women aged over 65 were more likely to blame women, with 55% saying she is totally (5%) or partly (50%) to blame, compared to 48% of men the same age. The research also found that the underlying attitudes of many were negative and/or hostile towards women. 14% of men aged 18-24 said "I do not want the women in my life to have equality of opportunity with men" and 17% of men aged 25-34 said they would be disadvantaged if women and men were more equal, with 20% saying women's equality has 'gone too far'

20. There is therefore clear evidence of the predominance of misogynistic crime in England and Wales. The evidence detailed above demonstrates the range of crimes being

perpetrated against women, falling on a continuum of misogyny, from the 'everyday sexism' of street harassment and sexist online abuse, to threats of rape and violence (both online and offline) and violence, including homicide. As it stands, the gender-based hostility that motivates and is demonstrated in these behaviours is not adequately captured by current legislation. Introducing misogyny hate crime within the hate crime framework would reflect the seriousness of these crimes, in terms of capturing the additional harm to individual women, to women as a group, and to society more broadly, in line with existing hate crime categories. It would also send the clear message that misogyny and sexism has no place in our society and will not be tolerated, thereby utilising the educative function of the law.

Question 11 Part 2: 21. All instances of domestic abuse, rape and other sexual violence that are perpetrated by men against women, as is overwhelmingly the case for these crimes, are forms of gender-based violence, more specifically, violence against women and girls. VAWG is predicated on men's domination over women and uses violence and abuse to reinforce the patriarchal power structures that perpetuate these beliefs and behaviours.

22. While Refuge strongly supports the inclusion of misogyny hate crime within the hate crime legal framework, we share many of the concerns outlined by the Law Commission in the consultation document regarding the inclusion of domestic abuse, rape, and sexual violence offences within criminal misogyny hate crimes. Refuge, as a feminist organisation, believes that all instances of domestic abuse, rape, and sexual violence perpetrated by men against women are acts of gender-based violence. Therefore, we are of the view that, by their very nature, all VAWG crimes are misogynistic.

23. A significant portion of Refuge's work consists of educating the public and raising awareness around the dynamics domestic abuse, rape and other sexual violence as gendered phenomena, with the understanding that gender inequality is both a cause and consequence of VAWG. In our experience, this is poorly understood by the general public. This is particularly concerning, given that, in the cases of aggravated offences, juries would be responsible for deciding whether there is evidence of misogynistic hate crime. Considering the lack of consensus amongst the public that all instances of VAWG are misogynistic, Refuge, like the Law Commission, would be deeply concerned that, should these offences be included in the aggravated offences regime, which includes misogyny hate crime, that this would lead to the arbitrary labelling of some VAWG crimes as misogynistic and others as non misogynistic.

24. We would be similarly concerned about the lack of understanding of these crimes as inherently misogynistic amongst the police, CPS, judges, and other professionals in the criminal justice system leading to an under utilisation of both the misogyny aggravated offences, and enhanced sentencing frameworks for domestic abuse and sexual offences. For both frameworks, the police would be required to investigate and gather evidence of the crimes being motivated by misogyny. The CPS would have to then agree to prosecute aggravated offences, or present evidence of misogyny for the judge to decide whether the criminal burden of proof has been met in order to hand down an enhanced sentence. We are concerned that the nature of domestic abuse, rape, and other sexual offences as deeply gendered and misogynistic is not understood well enough across various criminal justice agencies to ensure that the misogyny hate crime framework would be appropriately utilised in these VAWG crimes.

25. Additionally, even in cases where the criminal justice officials involved have a very high level of understanding about the inherent misogyny of VAWG crimes, we are concerned by the difficulties in obtaining proof that would meet the legal test for misogyny hate crime.

The CPS would have to prove the presence of misogynistic hostility in each case, which is problematic in two ways. First, as with most other hate crimes, it is very difficult to prove motivation, meaning that most prosecutions rely on the 'demonstration of hostility' test, for example, by proving the use of racist or homophobic slurs. However, because misogyny is so deeply ingrained in our culture and institutions, it is very unlikely that perpetrators would explicitly articulate misogynistic hostility. The second part of the problem is that even if perpetrators did, for example, use a gendered slur during domestic abuse or sexual offences, because many of these crimes are perpetrated in private, it would be very difficult to prove this. We are concerned, therefore, about the inclusion of domestic abuse, rape, and other sex offences within the proposed misogyny hate crime framework as it would very likely be under-utilised, leading to the arbitrary labelling of some VAWG crimes as misogynistic and others as non misogynistic when, in reality, all such crimes are driven by misogyny.

26 We share the concerns held by the Law Commission, that the VAWG offences that would be most likely to be labelled as misogynistic hate crimes, would be those that are structured around, for example, rape myths. Myths around what constitutes a 'real rape' i.e., those involving additional physical violence, weapons, or stranger rapes, are also those that are most likely to be prosecuted as misogynistic hate crimes. Therefore, there is an additional risk that including VAWG crimes within a misogynistic hate crime framework may reinforce these dangerous myths that Refuge, and others, have worked very hard to counter.

27. We are also concerned that the requirement to present evidence of misogyny would further complicate VAWG trials, lengthen the court process, and therefore potentially exacerbate the trauma experienced by survivors as a result of the criminal justice process. This is particularly the case for rape trials. It has been well publicised that the number of rape cases that are prosecuted by the CPS are at an all time low. In 2019/20, in England and Wales, the total number of rape suspects referred to the CPS by the police fell to just 2,747 from 3,375 in 2018/19, which is a drop of 19% in a single year. CPS referrals for rape have fallen 37% in just two years. The number of convictions for rape are in an even worse state. The number of rape convictions in England and Wales fell to 1,439 in 2019/20 from 1,925 the previous year, equating to a 25% drop in a single year. Since 2017, the number of rape convictions have fallen by 52%. We are, therefore, concerned that adding another layer of complexity to all VAWG crimes, but rape and other sexual violence offences in particular, would further complicate an increasingly under performing area of the criminal justice system.

28 That said, we found arguments for the inclusion of domestic abuse and sexual violence crimes in the misogyny hate crime framework compelling. In particular, we are concerned that deeply misogynistic crimes like rape, sexual assault, and domestic abuse, will not be capable of being labelled as such in law if a gender-carve out for VAWG crimes is implemented. It seems perverse to leave out some of the most extreme examples of misogynistic crimes from the remit of misogyny hate crime and we would be concerned that this could send the wrong message to perpetrators, survivors, and the public, that these crimes are not capable of being misogynistic.

29 On balance, Refuge is in favour of a misogyny hate crime carve out applied to domestic abuse and sexual violence offences. While we think it very important that these crimes are understood as VAWG, and therefore inherently misogynistic, we believe that the criminal justice system, as it currently operates, would not deliver the results that would be necessary to ensure that some misogynistic VAWG offences are not arbitrarily labelled as non misogynistic. It is essential that these crimes are understood as motivated by misogyny.

and are used to reinforce patriarchal social norms and power structures, but we do not believe that the way to increase this understanding is to arbitrarily designate some of these crimes as misogynistic and others as not. In fact, we believe this would be regressive. Therefore, we support the proposed carve-out for domestic abuse and sexual violence offences.

Question 12: 31 Refuge is strongly in favour of limiting gender-based hate crime to women only. The test proposed by the Law Commission for adding a characteristic to the list of protected characteristics for the purpose of hate crime laws – evidence of criminal targeting of a group on the basis of a shared characteristic, additional harm to the individual, to the group, and society on the whole, and practicability – is not met for men, but demonstrably is for women.

32 As the Law Commission showed in the consultation document, and as we detailed in our answer to question 11, there is widespread evidence of the targeting of women for crimes ranging from domestic abuse and homicide, to rape, to misogynistic online abuse and street harassment. There is also evidence of misogynistic and hostile attitudes widely held by the general public, amongst both men and women, that is based on and feeds into a victim blaming culture, where women are wholly or partly blamed for the gendered violence, rape, and abuse they are subjected to. There is no evidence of men being targeted for criminal activity on the basis of their gender, or of widespread hostility or hatred of men on the basis of their gender. In our answer to question 11 we presented evidence of the impact this targeted hostility and violence has on women and girls – from anxiety and panic attacks following online abuse, self-censoring and feeling less able to share their views online, feeling unsafe walking home or using public transport, to refraining from walking home alone after a certain time or avoiding certain routes home because of safety concerns.

33. The societal impact of the criminal misogynistic targeting of women is well documented. For example, it limits women's equal participation in the workforce and contributes to the gender pay gap, which, if bridged, has the potential to create an extra £150 billion to business-as-usual 2025 GDP forecasts. It also dissuades women and girls from engaging in public debate online, and is at least partly to blame for the lack of gender parity in UK Parliament – only 34% of current MPs are women.

34. Gender-based hate crime must, therefore, recognise that women are disproportionately victims of crimes that cause additional widespread harm, in which violence and abuse is used to subjugate women and reinforce patriarchal power structures. It must also recognise that this is not the case for men. While we acknowledge that some of the other hate crime categories are multi-directional, such as race (which applies to all races), religion (which applies to all religions), and sexual orientation (which applies to all sexual orientations), the other two existing categories, namely transgender status and disability, are unidirectional, i.e., they only apply to transgender people and people with disabilities, respectively. As the Law Commission pointed out in the consultation document, it would be impracticable in the cases of race, religion, and sexual orientation to produce a list of all the sub-categories that are the subject of hate crime, owing to the huge diversity within each of these categories. As with transgender status and disability, gender hate crime is capable of being unidirectional, applying exclusively to women. As such, it is preferable and practicable to protect just women under the proposed new category of gender-based hate crime.

35 Finally, we are very concerned that a gender or sex neutral hate crime category has the potential to do more harm than good if introduced. This is because it is women that are the exclusive subjects of societal hostility and misogynistic hate crime and introducing a

gender-neutral hate crime would significantly reduce the impact of the message that misogyny hate crime is a social ill that is unacceptable in society and would fail to offer the enhanced protection that women as a group need, and which men as a group do not. Therefore, Refuge strongly opposes the introduction of a gender-neutral hate crime and strongly supports its limiting to just women.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: 37. Refuge would like to reiterate its opposition to the introduction of a gender-neutral hate crime, and to draw attention to our answer to question 12. We do not have strong views on whether the category of 'women' or 'misogyny' is more suitable if the proposed gender-based hate crime is limited in scope to women.

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: 39 Refuge reiterates its strong opposition to the introduction of a gender-neutral gender-based hate crime, drawing attention to our answer to question 12. We urge the Law Commission to base their recommendations on the evidence which clearly demonstrates that women are systematically targeted for criminal behaviours, while men are not. As such, we do not take a position on whether 'sex' or 'gender' is preferable.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand: 41. Given Refuge's focus on the introduction of misogyny hate crime, we limit our comments to the extension of the aggravated offences regime to include misogyny hate crime, if introduced. We believe that, in line with similar arguments made about the protected characteristics that are currently not included in the aggravated offences framework, that it is essential that misogyny is treated just as seriously as other forms of hate crime and that legal parity is a necessary component of ensuring this.

42 There is ample evidence of the 'aggravated offences' being aggravated on the basis of gender. Leaving aside domestic abuse and sexual offences (which would constitute many of the aggravated offences as they apply to misogyny hate crime), there is significant

evidence of misogyny driven aggravated offences, particularly the public order offences and harassment offences. We would like to draw attention to our answer to question 11 and the evidence contained therein, particularly regarding the prevalence and gendered nature of street harassment. There is also significant evidence of the prevalence of misogynistic online abuse, which is why we support the inclusion of aggravated communications offences, which we detail in our answer to question 27. If aggravated versions of communications offences are introduced, we would strongly support misogyny hate crime applying to these offences.

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand: 44. Refuge strongly agrees with the Law Commission's proposals to include aggravated versions of the communications offences particularly as they apply to misogyny hate crime. There is a significant and growing body of evidence of the targeting of women for sexist and misogynistic online abuse. We would like to draw attention to our response to question 11, and, in particular, the research from Amnesty International in 2017⁸ and the research from the Fawcett Society and Reclaim the Internet,⁹ both of which found misogynistic and sexist abuse against women and girls to be widespread. We would also like to draw attention to the research referenced in our response to question 11 from Girlguiding that found young women and girls were self-censoring online due to the prevalence of online abuse.

45. Refuge believes that there is more than enough evidence of the targeting of women for misogynistic and sexist communications offences to justify the inclusion of these offences in the aggravated offences scheme. They clearly cause additional harm to individual women, women as a group, and wider society, in line with the existing aggravated offences. As such, Refuge strongly supports the inclusion of communications offences within the aggravated offences framework.

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: 47. We would like to draw attention to our answer to question 11, regarding the carve out of VAWG crimes for the purposes of misogyny hate crime within the enhanced sentencing framework. Refuge, on balance, supports a carve out for domestic abuse and sexual violence crimes in this context. For the same reasons listed in our answer to question 11, we also support a carve out for misogyny aggravated sexual offences, if aggravated sexual offences are introduced at all. Drawing attention to our answer to question 11 again, we remain concerned by the potential of further complicating rape trials, given the extremely low prosecution and conviction rates.

Question 32: 49. Refuge strongly supports ensuring the law can capture intersectional hate crime. Our expert frontline staff have supported many women that have experienced, for example, racist gender-based abuse. Frontline workers have supported women where

their perpetrator takes advantage of bruising being less visible on Black women, knowing that more severe incidents of physical violence will not be visible to others. This is reflected in the quantitative data that is available. Research from Tell MAMA showed that more than half of those who reported Islamophobic incidents in 2016 were female. However, while Refuge strongly supports hate crime legislation being capable of recognising intersectional hate crime, we reserve comment on the appropriate legal mechanism of doing so, as this is not our area of expertise.

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: 51. Internet connected technology, including social media platforms, gives perpetrators ever-growing ways to control, isolate, humiliate and dominate women using the tools of everyday life. We refer to this use of technology to abuse as 'tech abuse'. Refuge has found that perpetrators are increasingly using technology to facilitate their abuse of women, including via online harassment, stealing online identities, hacking their social media profiles and devices, non-consensual intimate image sharing, threats to share intimate images, surveillance, 'doxing' (putting women's personal information such as home address and phone number online), 'spoofing' and other forms of impersonation, and online grooming.

52. Tech abuse has a significant and, in many cases, long term impact on the lives of survivors. Many of the women that Refuge works with said the tech abuse felt constant, suffocating, and that there was no escape, no matter what they did. Many women we support feel that they have no choice but to delete all social media accounts and reduce their use of the internet as much as possible. Unsurprisingly, they report that this can make them feel silenced, isolated and left out and can make day-to-day tasks more difficult. We would encourage this to be considered when freedom of expression arguments are presented as

reasons why social media and other tech companies should not be subject to additional regulation. In our experience, the current online landscape means that women's freedom of expression is severely curtailed in many instances. Refuge works to help empower women to use the internet safely and not have to censor themselves due to the abuse being perpetrated against them. However, it is undeniable that the scale and severity of tech abuse is silencing women and forcing them to minimise their participation in online life

53. Refuge would therefore welcome increased accountability for social media companies, as their platforms are routinely used by many perpetrators of abuse to control, harass, and isolate women. Refuge supports the increased regulation of social media companies, which would require them to take significantly more proactive action in tackling tech abuse and online forms of VAWG

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand: 55 Refuge strongly supports the proposal to introduce a 'stirring up' offence for misogyny hate crime. As the Law Commission noted in the consultation document, the 'incel' movement has grown in prominence over the past few years, resulting in real life mass homicides targeted against women, which in some cases have been charged as terror offences. The apparent growing popularity of the 'incel' movement and 'manosphere' should be a cause for serious alarm and serve as a definitive argument for why stirring up offences for misogyny hate crime should be introduced, in line with the existing stirring up offences. Anything less would place misogyny hate crimes on a lower position on a hate crime hierarchy

Question 50: 57. We would like to draw attention to our answer to question 32. As we noted in our answer to question 32, Refuge strongly supports the law being capable of recognising intersectional hate crime in the law. However, we again reserve judgement on the best mechanism to do so this, as it is not our area of expertise.

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: 59. Refuge acknowledges that there is significant debate about the potential tension between the rights and safety of transgender women and the safety of cisgender women that are residents in specialist single-sex refuges. Refuge believes that it is critically important that there is a forum to discuss these issues that is free from potential legal action, given the seriousness of issues being discussed, namely, the safety of both trans women and cis women. As such, whatever the mechanism for doing so, Refuge strongly supports the safeguarding of this space for the free exchange of ideas regarding critical issues such as this one.

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: 61 Refuge broadly supports the introduction of a Hate Crime Commissioner. A Hate Crime Commissioner could play a key role in investigating and highlighting gaps in support service provision, promote best practice, oversee the collection of data, and ensure minimum quality standards are met across different support services. However, Refuge believes that the introduction of a Hate Crime Commissioner would require further consultation to properly define its role, to explore and define the Commissioner's remit and powers, to establish how the role would interact with, e.g. the Victims Commissioner and Domestic Abuse Commissioner, to understand how the role would apply to, or interact with, the devolved nations, and to ensure that the role is as effective as possible. Refuge would welcome further consultation on this proposal.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: People react strongly to even mild statements made with no intended malice in the current hypersensitive climate. This is hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised.

It is a dangerous idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed. The existing 2 stage test ensures only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught.

Question 46: No

Expand: In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If proof of intention to stir up hatred is not necessary, it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion.

Question 47: No

Expand: Conversations taking place in homes are private and should never be subjected to hate crime laws. People in a democratic society must be able to express opinions in their own dwellings.

It is not appropriate to extend hate crime offences to private dwellings as they form part of public order law. That is oppressive, leaving people vulnerable to those who choose to take exception to something that is said. This would then involve police witness statements, frightening for our younger generations. Would this not be dangerous and damaging?

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and Transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong to present them as a package requiring a yes or no answer.

Transgender ideology is a subject of major political debate and hate speech laws covering this topic would clamp down on necessary debate.

This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss his development.

Women who have had 'sex changes' are the strongest critics of the trans movement as they now regret having undergone the change. They, as 'detransitioners' could then be prosecuted for speaking out

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial such as religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights

A person potentially facing up to seven years in prison for spoken words requires strong safeguards at the highest level.

The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament and therefore more easily held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation: Not applicable

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I am a private individual Please treat my submission as confidential and protect my privacy. I do not feel that I have freedom to publicly express opinions on these matters

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: See below

Question 11 Part 2: See below

Question 12: See below

Question 13: No

Expand: I am not certain that this consultation is open to the general public but I have accessed it through a link provided by a current affairs website. I am a private member of the public and I have no relevant expertise but I do have some familiarity with the statistics which I will rely on and they are taken, in any case, from information which is readily available to the public

I am opposed to the proposals to categorise VAWG as being a hate crime motivated by misogyny. I do not believe that proposals to extend hate-crime legislation to include the category of misogyny (or any more neutrally worded category intended primarily to include misogyny) should go ahead. In what follows I have raised objections to claims that you have made in paragraphs 12.78 and 12.81.

At 12.78 in the document, on page 248, you claim that 'For the most part, sexual offenses or domestic abuse cases which involve a male victim also involve a male perpetrator'. I believe that this claim in respect to domestic abuse is false and that government statistics on domestic abuse show that it is false

Current government statistics on domestic abuse, available on the Office of National Statistics (ONS) website, show that male victims of partner abuse (2.44% of males based on a last year measure) made up more than a third of all male victims of domestic abuse (3.60% of all males) in the year ending March 2020. Domestic abuse includes partner abuse but it is a wider category which also includes abuse by someone other than a partner. The statistics show that abuse rates were slightly higher amongst gay men than straight, and highest of all for bisexuals. However, based on ONS population data in respect to sexual orientation, and making conservative assumptions in order to avoid over-stating female perpetration, it is possible to calculate the proportion of male partner abuse victims who are in heterosexual relationships. I have done this calculation and the details are included in the note below. The calculation shows that 93% of male victims of partner abuse are abused by female perpetrators in the context heterosexual relationships. Secondly it shows that this same group of victims makes up 63% of the population of male victims of the wider category of domestic abuse. That is to say, contrary to what you claim at paragraph 12.78, most male victims of domestic abuse are abused by a female perpetrator. The total proportion of male victims abused by a female perpetrator will be higher than 63% because some, at least, of the perpetrators of domestic abuse perpetrated by someone other than a partner will also be female.

I realise that this is not conclusive, but there is enough margin for error in these calculations to show, at the very least, that a majority of male victims of domestic abuse are abused by a female perpetrator, and I am very sceptical, therefore, that you could justify your claim at 12.78 that this is not the case. The evidence that you cite in support of your claim at 12.80 (2) relates to prosecutions. But the ONS statistics which I have used are intended to represent the phenomenon of domestic abuse as a whole. Given that most cases do not result in prosecutions I believe that the statistics that I have used are likely to be more representative.

At 12.81, page 249, you claim that male abuse towards female victims is explained by "...the fact that social norms and practices accept and sustain male domination and female subordination". But if this is the case, then it would be necessary to explain abuse in homosexual relationships on some entirely different basis. This seems implausible. It would be more natural to suppose that the same kinds of factors would have the potential to lead to abuse in both heterosexual and homosexual relationships. According to the ONS dataset, rates of abuse are lowest in heterosexual relationships. The rates are higher for gay men than for straight men and the rates in lesbian relationships are higher still (and this was the case the preceding year also). If misogyny and social acceptance of the subordination of females by males are primary explanations of domestic abuse then I would expect homosexual relationships to exhibit lower rates of abuse, but this does not seem to be the case. In support of your claim at 12.81 you cite a 2008 United Nations report which was concerned with power relations between men and women globally. It contains highlight

sections relating to specific topics in the context of South Africa, Jamaica, Pakistan, Zambia, Turkey, Costa Rica, India, Sweden, Egypt, Brazil and Mexico. But the social norms in these societies are not the same as the social norms in the UK. I do not believe that what you state at 12.81 represents an accurate description of social norms in the UK.

Note on calculations and sources.

In what follows I have made conservative assumptions, that is to say assumptions which will tend to understate, rather than overstate the proportion of female perpetrators. Firstly, the ONS statistical bulletin 'Sexual orientation, UK: 2018 (Latest release)', states the proportions of the male population, in 2018, by sexual orientation: 94.4% heterosexual, 1.9% gay and 0.6% bisexual. This does not sum to 100% because 3.1% either do not know or do not wish to state their sexual orientation. In what follows I have added these 3.1% to the gay and bisexual categories while maintaining the same ratio between gay and bisexual. The percentages I have used are therefore 94.4% heterosexual, 4.3% gay and 1.3% bisexual.

The Office of National Statistics website www.ons.gov.uk, under the heading 'Domestic abuse prevalence and victim characteristics - Appendix tables', contains a link to the 'Year ending March 2020 edition of this dataset'. Table 6 of this dataset includes headline statistics for the proportion of males, in the age-group 16 to 74 subject to various types of domestic abuse in the last year, taken from the Crime Survey for England and Wales. The statistics distinguish between 'partner abuse' and the wider category of 'domestic abuse' which includes partner abuse but also includes other forms of abuse. Table 6 of the dataset states that 2.44% of male respondents had been victims of partner abuse and 3.60% had been victims of domestic abuse in the year to March 2020 (and so 1.16% had been victims of domestic abuse but not victims of partner abuse).

Table 6 of the ONS dataset also provides abuse rates for subsets of the population, including by sexual orientation. The victimisation rates for male victims of partner abuse were 2.41% for heterosexuals, 2.84% for homosexuals and 5.02% for bisexuals. Based on these percentages I would expect an average population of 100 males to include 2.28 heterosexual victims (2.41% out of a population of 94.4 people), 0.12 gay victims (2.84% out of a population of 4.3 people) and 0.07 bisexual victims (5.02% out of a population of 1.3 people), a grand total of 2.46 victims. (This is slightly greater than the rate for all male victims of partner abuse stated in the dataset (2.44) because the proportion of heterosexuals within the population of survey respondents (96.4%) was higher than the proportion of heterosexuals in the population data for the UK population as a whole (94.4%)). Assuming that the heterosexual victims were the only victims who were abused by a female perpetrator (which is another conservative assumption since some of the bisexual victims may have been abused by a female perpetrator) it follows that the victims of partner abuse who were abused by a female perpetrator represent 93% (2.28/2.46) of the total population of victims of partner abuse. This also represents 63% of all the victims of the wider category of male victims of domestic abuse (2.28/3.62). In this last ratio the denominator is adjusted for the difference between the 2.44 aggregate partner abuse victims stated in the dataset and the 2.46 aggregate calculated based on the proportion of heterosexuals in the UK population as a whole.

Reference is also made to the ratios between rates of abuse within heterosexual and homosexual relationships including the ratios for the year ending March 2019. In the dataset for that year the relevant table is table 6a.

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Arthur Lewis

Name of Organisation: Islington Council

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Islington Council is in favour of specified protected characteristics for the purposes of hate crime laws. The Council believes that specifying the protected characteristic associated with a hate crime helps to log and monitor incidents of hostility towards targeted groups. Tracking, detecting and preventing these crimes improves the safety of those targeted groups.

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Including migration and asylum status to the definition of race in hate crime laws will improve the strength of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that, as well as affecting the prosecution of hate crimes, extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and

tracking of hate crimes, help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Islington Council implores the Law Commission to recommend the strengthening of hate crime legislation and making misogyny a hate crime. In doing so it would enable police forces to log and monitor incidents of hostility towards women and girls, as they do with other forms of hatred. It would help to change not only the prosecution and detection of such crimes but the culture of acceptance of this abuse too, as well as making women and girls feel safer and more comfortable.

Making misogyny a hate crime would help track, detect and prevent these crimes and so improve the protection of women and girls from abuse. As a result, courts will have the power to take into account this behaviour when someone is sentenced for such a crime.

Making misogyny a hate crime acknowledges that women are targeted simply because they are women and make it clear that this is unacceptable in any circumstances.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Islington Council is strongly in favour of making misogyny a hate crime and strengthening hate crime legislation. While both men and women may experience incidents of abuse and harassment, women are considerably more likely to experience repeated incidents of targeted crimes based on their gender. That is why it is so important to name and centre misogyny as a defined hate crime in recognition that women are targeted because they are women.

Question 13: No

Expand: Islington Council supports the introduction of misogyny as a hate crime as recognising misogyny provides the opportunity to challenge the common underlying basis of gender-based targeting within our communities. It will raise awareness of the seriousness of these incidents and encourage more women to report them. Making misogyny a hate crime would mean police forces would log and monitor incidents of hostility towards women and

girls, as they do with other forms of hatred. Islington Council notes the adoption of misogyny as a hate crime has been successfully implemented in Nottingham, where analysis has shown an increase in reporting as well as an increase in the use of wider services. It has also shown that the vast majority of local people wanted the scheme to continue.

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Including age as a hate crime category will increase the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that, as well as affecting the prosecution of hate crimes, extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes, help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 16:

Question 17: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Including sex workers as a hate crime category will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Sex workers are at a greater risk of being subject to crime, including sexual and physical violence, harassment, stalking and coercion. This will help to protect sex workers and encourage them to report hate crimes against them. Islington Council notes that, as well as affecting the prosecution of hate crimes, extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes, help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 18: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Including alternative subcultures as a hate crime category will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that, as well as affecting the prosecution of hate crimes, extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes, help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 19: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Including people experiencing homelessness as a hate crime category will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that, as well as affecting the prosecution of hate crimes, extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes, help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 20: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Including philosophical beliefs as a hate crime category will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that, as well as affecting the prosecution of hate crimes, extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes, help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Expanding the motivation test to include prejudice as well as hostility will expand the legal scope to classify, and therefore the strength of, hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that, as well as affecting the prosecution of hate crimes, extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes, help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. If aggravated offences form part of future hate crime laws, extending the characteristics protected by aggravated offences will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council is in support of misogyny becoming a hate crime and, as such, supports the extension of characteristics protected by aggravated offences to include those which would be targeted by misogyny. Islington Council notes that, as well as affecting the prosecution of hate crimes, extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes, help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. If aggravated offences form part of future hate crime laws, extending their scope to include aggravated versions of communications offences will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that, as well as affecting the prosecution of hate crimes, extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes, help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer. Online platforms are increasingly used to perpetrate domestic abuse and this will assist in raising awareness and increase the safety of survivors.

Question 28: Yes

Expand: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. If aggravated offences form part of future hate crime laws, extending their scope to include aggravated grievous bodily harm with intent and Arson with intent or reckless as to whether life is endangered will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 29: No

Expand: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws, and therefore not in favour of this proposal. If aggravated offences form part of future hate crime laws, removing offences against the person will decrease the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 30: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. If aggravated offences form part of future hate crime laws, extending their scope to include property and fraud offences will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer

Question 31: No

Expand: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. If aggravated offences form part of future hate crime laws, extending their scope to include sexual offences will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand: Islington Council believes that the acknowledgement of hate crimes challenges a culture of acceptance of abuse and makes victims of hate crime feel safer and more comfortable

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws Extending 'written' material to all material in the context of stirring up offences will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Removing the necessity to demonstrate that words used to stir up hatred were threatening, abusive or insulting will increase the strength of hate crime laws

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Yes

Expand: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Extending stirring up hatred to cover hatred on the grounds of transgender identity and disability will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 49: Yes

Expand: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws and the introduction of misogyny as a hate crime. Extending stirring up hatred to cover hatred on the grounds of sex or gender will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 50: Islington Council believes that the acknowledgement of hate crimes challenges a culture of acceptance of abuse and makes victims of hate crime feel safer and more comfortable. Where more than one protected characteristic is targeted, including all characteristics in the stirring up offence will help to challenge and track multiple, intersecting hate crimes. Studies have also shown that the intersectional nature of discrimination means that women with additional protected characteristics, such as those who are BAME, disabled or LGBT+, are even more likely to experience harassment, discrimination and abuse

Question 51: Yes

Expand: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Removing the exclusion of words or behaviour used as a dwelling from stirring up offences will increase the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Extending the Football Offences Act 1991 to cover chanting based on sexual orientation will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer. Islington Council supports the extension of the offence to cover all protected characteristics for the same reasons. Islington Council works closely with Arsenal FC, who are based in the borough, and the police to reduce any offensive or abusive chanting connected to football games. The types of chanting seen varies depending on the opposition but we agree that any form of offensive chanting should be included as a crime.

Question 57 Part 2: Islington Council supports the extension of the offence to cover all protected characteristics for the same reasons. Islington Council works closely with Arsenal FC, who are based in the borough, and the police to reduce any offensive or abusive chanting connected to football games. The types of chanting seen varies depending on the opposition but we agree that any form of offensive chanting should be included as a crime.

Question 58: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Extending the Football Offences Act 1991 to cover gestures and missile throwing will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 59: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Extending the Football Offences Act 1991 to cover journeys to and from a designated football match will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 60: Islington Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws. Amending the Football Offences Act 1991 to include association and perceived characteristics will improve the legal scope, and therefore the strength, of hate crime laws. Islington Council notes that extending hate crime laws can help to improve monitoring and tracking of hate crimes which in turn can help to challenge a culture of acceptance and make victims feel safer.

Question 61:

Question 62: Islington Council is in favour of introducing a Hate Crime Commissioner. The Council is strongly in favour of strengthening hate crime laws and believes that the introduction of a Hate Crime Commissioner will increase the focus and attention paid to tackling hate crime as has been seen with other similar Commissioner roles.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: Simply that if confidentiality is breached there is a possibility of being targeted by those people who consider it their right to harass, harm and intimidate those who just disagree with their views.

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: It is illogical and worrying that there is a proposal to conflate the terms 'sex' and 'gender' as these are not the same thing

One of these, sex, is a binary term that is rooted in the biology of an individual and the other 'gender' is a less precise term with a greater range of meaning(s), including social and cultural differences, as distinct from the biological

The conflation of se two terms under law is nonsensical as it conflates a precise biologically based term with two meanings, with a social term that has a vast and undefined array of meanings, subject to the whim of the user

Any inference in law that these two terms are interchangeable is fraught with potential problems, not the least of which is that some may be tempted to continually re-define their own gender in order to cause frivolous application of the law to other individuals, simply based on a desire to cause mischief or worse, some personal harm. This is hardly a sound basis for an equitable society

There is also the worrying trend of underhanded misogyny being perpetrated by those with a strictly political agenda, that is, as opposed to a genuine desire for equality of opportunity for all

For example; the insistence of a man, who has self-identified with the female gender, on using female sex only toilets or changing rooms as an exercise in power, intimidation, harassment or worse, as a precursor to assault

To further illustrate this point; women who complain about the erosion of their (hard won) rights, their safety and right to security are subject to the most vile and degrading insults and behaviour by those who have conflated belief they have been offended with a right to mete out violence. This is barely one step removed from mob rule.

Both men and women should be able to discuss such matters and others, openly and without being subject to this kind of trial by social media or by mobs in the streets

It should be remembered that here in the UK we live in one of the most fair and most equitable societies in the world.

This is a both a reason for celebration and an opportunity to remind ourselves that more might be done, particularly in matter of socio-economic opportunity. However, these things must not be done at the expense of a freedom of expression, especially when the criminalisation of such will lie in the hands of those who need not identify themselves to the law nor provide any kind of tangible evidence of such an act.

This last in particular undermines the most fundamental tenet of law, that of innocence until proven guilty 'Guilt assumed with the accusation' enshrined in the law does not seem like a forward step.

I would urge the law commission to re-examine these points and consider their wider implications for society as a whole and particularly in respect of women's rights in our society.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Were it the case that men and women had immutable personality characteristics that are 100% correlated with their sex this might make sense.

However is it the case that even where phenotypes' distributions are different in the overall population of men and women, there is always some overlap.

It follows that the sex based hate crimes should be defined and implemented in the same way for both men and women as victims and men and women as perpetrators.

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: It is illogical and worrying that there is proposal to conflate the terms 'sex' and 'gender' as these are not the same thing.

One of these, sex, is a binary term that is rooted in the biology of an individual and the other 'gender' is a less precise term with a greater range of meaning(s), including social and cultural differences, as distinct from the biological.

The conflation of se two terms under law is nonsensical as if conflates a precise biologically based term with two meanings, with a social term that has a vast and undefined array of meanings, subject to the whim of the user.

Any inference in law that these two terms are interchangeable is fraught with potential problems, not the least of which is that some may be tempted to continually re-define their own gender in order to cause frivolous application of the law to other individuals, simply based on a desire to cause mischief or worse, some personal harm. This is hardly a sound basis for an equitable society.

There is also the worrying trend of underhanded misogyny being perpetrated by those with a strictly political agenda, that is, as opposed to a genuine desire for equality of opportunity for all.

For example; the insistence of a man, who has self-identified with the female gender, on using female sex only toilets or changing rooms as an exercise in power, intimidation, harassment or worse, as a precursor to assault.

To further illustrate this point; women who complain about the erosion of their (hard won) rights, their safety and right to security are subject to the most vile and degrading insults and behaviour by those who have conflated belief they have been offended with a right to mete out violence. This is barely one step removed from mob rule.

Both men and women should be able to discuss such matters and others, openly and without being subject to this kind of trial by social media or by mobs in the streets.

It should be remembered that here in the UK we live in one of the most fair and most equitable societies in the world

This is a both a reason for celebration and an opportunity to remind ourselves that more might be done, particularly in matter of socio-economic opportunity. However, these things must not be done at the expense of a freedom of expression, especially when the criminalisation of such will lie in the hands of those who need not identify themselves to the law nor provide any kind of tangible evidence of such an act

This last in particular undermines the most fundamental tenet of law, that of innocence until proven guilty. 'Guilt assumed with the accusation' enshrined in the law does not seem like a forward step

I would urge the law commission to re-examine these points and consider their wider implications for society as a whole and particularly in respect of women's rights in our society

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: Only if there is sound objective evidence (and not hearsay) for said "hostility or prejudice" towards the protected characteristic.

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: Some of the above categories are sufficiently vague as to open up the possibility of specious accusations and worse are moving the law toward the point where every tiny subgroup is regarded as protected for some reason.

One might for example reach a point where insulting the supporters of the opposing team at a football match is a breach of a protected characteristic

Carried ad absurdum, each individual is then in their own sub-group of a single person This might be best dealt with by law which recognizes all individuals as equally entitled to go about their daily business and lives with being abused and assaulted

Is it also not the case, that such a law is prejudiced against those who identify as being not a member of protected group? That somehow a crime against a member of a protected group perpetrated by a member of a non protected group is worse than a crime committed by a protected group member against a member of a non protected group?

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand: It might be as well to consider that prison sentence have several purposes. Firstly they represent justice for the victims, secondly they represent society's rejection of the

behaviours in question, thirdly they ensure the offender is not able to continue offending and lastly they represent a chance for an offender to be rehabilitated.

I respectfully suggest the UK justice system has become overly concerned with rehabilitation and under concerned with the wishes of society and specifically the victims of crime. The Home Office's own figures show clearly that re-offending is inversely proportional to sunstone length (Ministry of Justice Proven re offending Statistics quarterly: October 2013 September 2014).

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: I would suggest that property and fraud offences that have the potential to cause lasting and life changing harm to the victims (for example the theft of a pension fund) should be considered aggravated

To the layman it can seem as if those who have defrauded individuals of large sums often get sentences that might even be considered a 'pretty good deal' when set against the sums that they have taken and often refused to return.

It might be appropriate in such case to simply keep such offender in jail for a term that is related to the missing funds, for example at the rate of a year in prison per 'year of living wage' until the defrauded sum is discharged. This would also provide a considerable incentive to return any hidden funds.

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32: Intersectionality is far too subjective to be used as the basis for any law.

The intersectionality hypothesis has also attracted considerable criticism and for example psychological studies have shown that the effect of multiplying 'oppressed' identities is not strictly or necessarily additive, and can be subject to complex interactions. [Pedulla, David S. (March 2014) "The positive consequences of negative stereotypes: race, sexual orientation, and the job application process". *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 77 (1): 75–94.]

The use of such a subjective term and the fact that there is existing data that shows the broad hypothesis is not supported, would also undermine the basic premise of presumed innocence.

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand: There is no reason not so to do

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: What materials?

Question 41: No

Expand: It depends on the definition of 'inflammatory' 'The Watchtower' of a parish magazine might be considered so by some.

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: My view is that such companies do have a wider responsibility to remove material that is unlawful in the country of display

It is disingenuous of such companies to make profits using advertising targeted to individuals based on a machine learning algorithms that have studied their posting profiles, habits and derived personality characteristics on the one hand while disclaiming responsibility for or actual knowledge of the content posted by the same users

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: "Likely to" seem a subjective test for a crime

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: In the current climate it seems as if a case for 'the hatred stirred up' might be made by simply organising a 'twitter' campaign against the accused. This doesn't seem like a good basis for law.

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: Only if the offences apply equally to all people: for example men discriminated against by women or either men or women discriminated against by (for example) a transsexual

Also, I refer to my answer to questions 11 and 14 regarding the irrational conflation of sex and gender

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Please see my answers to question 11 and 14 regarding the conflation of sex and gender.

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand: Undecided. I'd prefer those who considered sexual orientation a slur are reminded that it is not a slur

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: Certainly missile throwing A missile is a missile

Gestures are a moveable feast If one were to ban (say) a 'two-fingered salute', another gesture would simply be co-opted to give the same meaning.

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: If the law adequately protects its citizens from abuse and harm, no specific commissioner is required.

My view is that it's better to focus on the law.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: It must be necessary to demonstrate that the words used (by those accused of stirring up hatred) are indeed threatening, abusive or insulting in each specific case. If this were not done, then how could the actions of the defendant be considered to have stirred up hate?

We would be inviting a situation where a person could be accused, arrested and punished for a statement that 'might' have been offensive if only there had been anyone in earshot who 'might' then have been offended by it

Question 46: No

Expand: My primary objection is that this revision seeks to obtain a conviction where the 'intent to stir up hatred' cannot be proven

Whilst I feel we must establish the nature of the language used ((point 1) please also see my response to Q45), I do not agree with points 2, 3 and 4 please see my responses respectively:

2 'that the defendant's words or behaviour were 'likely' to stir up hatred' Again this seems to invite a situation where a defendant could be punished on the basis of an action that 'might' have stirred up hatred but in fact did not

3 & 4. 'that the defendant 'knew or ought to have known that'.' These set a precedent that a person must know (or ought to know) how someone will react to anything they might say which is not realistic and could be open to misuse E.g honest disagreement might be considered 'hateful' by some.

In summary, under these reforms, the defendant's actual intent and the result of their action become wholly irrelevant and their conviction is determined on what might have happened and the possibility that, had it taken place, somebody might dislike it.

(As a by-product, I believe these clauses would also encourage a gagging of free speech and healthy debate)

Question 47: No

Expand: If a single threshold were applied to all protected characteristics it would stifle (or potentially make illegal) free speech on subjective and/or contentious issues I.e disagreeing with a person's chosen lifestyle or faith could be construed as 'hateful' simply because one did not happen to agree with it

My understanding is that such a change would also undermine the current legal distinction between a person's biological characteristics (e.g. race (empirical)) and a person's

lifestyle/beliefs (– e.g. sexuality/religion (subjective)); this proposed change would seem to be a step backwards.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: If the law is to continue to distinguish between empirical characteristics and subjective characteristics, then disability and transgender identity cannot be considered together in this proposal.

E g:

Saying that a man should use the disabled changing room, because he has no legs, is unlikely to be too contentious (and his disability can be demonstrated).

However, saying that a biological man should use the Men's changing room, even though the man believes he is a woman, is contentious (his gender identity is subjective) and not affirming his belief could be viewed as 'hateful' by some.

It is important that subjective issues remain open to free speech and healthy debate

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: I believe most people wish to live in a society where they are able to express their honest opinions (even those considered controversial) in their own homes

The by-product of some of the proposals in this consultation is to restrict freedom of speech in the public sphere (this is not progress); to seek to push these same constraints into the private sphere does not improve the situation

(I would suggest that hate is actually more likely to breed when people's true opinions are quashed/pushed underground; and, as a consequence, such opinions are likely to be more 'severe' when they do rise to the surface)

Question 52: Yes

Expand: My understanding is that 29J and 29JA provide protections for freedom of speech on the subjects of religion, sexual orientation and others; it would be prudent to also protect freedom of speech on issues of gender and transgender identity – on consideration of their controversial and nature

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: My understanding is that the Attorney General's consent is currently required precisely because of the controversial and subjective nature of certain issues; e.g. they provide a crosscheck against inappropriate sentencing by the C P S The Attorney General is also answerable directly to parliament in a way that the Director of Public Prosecutions is not.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would

actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed – and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up – is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit new stirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

I would also add that audience is a much more important issue than literal location.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA

of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. • Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: I am a teacher employed by the Coventry School Foundation, but I am responding in a private capacity

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: Asexuality is not a sexual orientation but a poorly defined identity group. To include asexuality in this category risks devaluing the whole category. It should not be included.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Everyone should be protected in the same way by hate crime legislation. Rather than try and protect certain identity groups, it would be better to cite "gender expression" that could protect anyone who challenged social gender norms

Intersex - variations in biological development - is a completely different issue to transgender an assortment of psychological conditions and should therefore be considered separately.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: The law should protect (and in different situations, prohibit) actions. As such you should protect "gender expression"

It is unsatisfactory to try and protect people according to groups that they may identify with such as "non binary".

Intersex is completely different to transgender and should therefore be considered separately.

Question 8 Part 3: Do not try and protect identity groups that will shift with time. Instead, you should protect specified actions that can be objectively determined For example:

- Gender Reassignment - an action to realign the body with the other sex;
- Gender Expression an action to project an image in ways that may break social norms

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: This should be sex, which is a protected characteristic under the Equality Act and is the root of sexism and sexist discrimination.

Question 11 Part 2: It would be sensible to coordinate the law if sex was protected

Gender is an unsatisfactory category to protect because it is ill defined.

Question 12: It should include anyone on the basis of their sex, like the Equality Act. However, we need to recognise that it is the female sex that suffers the vast majority of sex based hate crime.

Question 13: Yes

Expand: It is important to protect women and girls (i e , human females), without having to define "misogyny".

Question 14: No

Expand: The protected characteristic should be sex It is an observable and objective characteristic. Gender is ill-defined and likely to lead to confusion and uncertainty, especially as understanding and word usage changes in the future.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: No. Women should be protected under sex, while transgender people should be protected under gender reassignment or gender expression No further protection would be needed.

Question 18: No. The notion of an alternative subculture is ill defined and likely to lead to legal arguments

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand: Yes. It must be based on objective - i.e., demonstrable- evidence. It must not be based purely on the subjective testimony of a victim, That would leave the law open to abuse from those who feigned victim-hood

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: You should not use, "transgender, non binary and intersex identity".

Firstly, intersex is not an identity But you should protect people on the basis ob objective characteristics, and do them separately. I propose:

- Gender Reassignment;
- Gender Expression;
- Intersex medical conditions.

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand: I support the use of existing laws, rather than new ones that are only applicable to certain groups. Sexual offences are primarily against a person, not a member of an identity group

Question 32: An offence is an offence against a person. Placing an additional burden of proving intersectionality might prove to be a distraction It is unnecessary

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: This could be misused by those feigning victim-hood.

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: Online platforms should be treated in the same way as online publishers such as newspapers. They have a similar responsibility to their users

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: There must be evidence that the words were threatening or abusive
Otherwise the law could be misused by those feigning victim-hood.

Question 46: No

Expand: This test is too low The law should require proof beyond reasonable doubt that someone intended to threaten or abuse.

Question 47: Yes

Expand: There needs to be consistency

Question 47 Part 2: "Insulting" should not be included It could be misused by those feigning victim-hood.

Question 48: Yes

Expand: There needs to be consistency across protected characteristics.

Question 49: Yes

Expand: There needs to be consistency across protected characteristics

But the protected characteristic should be sex, not gender.

Question 50: There needs to be consistency across protected characteristics.

Question 51: No

Expand: People should be free to speak in their own homes. Removing that exclusion would criminalize what is said in private homes, something that occurs within totalitarian states.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: Yes. parliament and the courts need to be able to debate matters free from the risk of legal challenge

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand: There should be consistency. Racist chanting is racist chanting.

Question 57: Yes

Expand: There should be consistency across protected characteristics.

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Member of public

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: I believe that this will limit free speech. People can react to comments and assume that the speaker was intending to stir up hatred when it was not intended.

Question 46: No

Expand: I believe that this will limit free speech. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion.

Question 47: No

Expand: I believe that this will limit free speech. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Women seeking to protect single sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: I believe that this will limit free speech. Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: I believe that otherwise this will limit free speech.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: I believe that the Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the Director of Public Prosecutions. Also, the Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1 threatening words or behaviour; 2 intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being in court if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild

statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because ‘everybody knows you can’t say that’ This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up is hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up – is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention

Question 46: No

Expand: Staring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone’s life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today’s climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shutdown religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit new stirring up of offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive conduct Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is “abusive” is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling affect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people A surge in girls been referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had “sex changes” but now regret it These “Detransitioners” could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring people to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to predict the debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. Any offence covering transgender identity today must explicitly protect: using a person's birth name and pronoun, saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringement of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecution sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, in his or her own policies. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: Concerned that the new Bill will bring in new additional laws to suppress freedom of speech or opinion.

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: No. Race should be sufficient. Concerned that change would be used to suppress opposition to illegal immigration/immigrants. Objections and protests are concerned with abuses of the system which seems to reward people for acting illegally and not entering or applying to stay in UK through the proper channels. This sends the wrong message to those applying legally. Police are already heavy handed with those protestors, when all they want is for the laws to be applied evenly to protect the Country and those already living here - and yet they are called racist or far right by the media and police.

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No strong views

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Yes

Question 10: No comment.

Question 11: Yes

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Both.

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: Yes

Question 18:

Question 19: If UK residents are homeless then they should be protected I do not think that people here illegally should be protected as they should not be here in the first place.

Question 20:

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: In principle I would not have a problem with that, but I suspect it would be abused on the basis that there is currently a severe lack of trust in the police and the justice system.

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand: See earlier comment.

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: If social media platforms are used to incite hatred that is upheld in a court of law then the platform should also be held liable.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand: If a case is brought then intent should be proven or the matter discounted.

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Yes

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Other (please expand)

Expand: Agree that racist chanting should be an offence. However, booing, jeering, or verbal objections to things like players "taking the knee" should NOT be an offence - it is merely expressing an opinion.

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: Yes

Question 59: Yes, although not sure how that would be enforced.

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No. Position could be abused.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Inferred intent is always a dangerous foundation on which to base an accusation, this needs more objective evidence. If this proposal was adopted it would make it easier for the offence to be committed and hugely damage freedom of speech which we value so highly in our democracy.

Question 46: No

Expand: It is very difficult to prove an offence on the basis of words or behaviour, these can be wrongly interpreted by the claimant especially on sensitive issues such as religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity. The proof should be on threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It must be clear that the action was deliberate. If this proposal is adopted it would make it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion thereby endangering freedom of speech.

Question 47: No

Expand: It is impossible to have one threshold to cover every eventuality; under the present law race which is an inherited trait is distinguished from the characteristics of religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity which are about beliefs and behaviour. If there is disagreement around these last subjects it can be seen as stirring up hatred and so have a chilling effect on our freedom to discuss and share beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: These are two completely different issues and should be treated as such. Stirring up offences should not include transgender ideology which is a controversial issue and needs to be allowed to be discussed openly and without fear of being accused of stirring up hatred by those who may be opposed to it.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: hate crime offences form part of the public order law which does not include the private dwelling where one hopes to be able to express ones views, values and beliefs and should be respected by any who may have differing views Surely it is within the family setting that discussions should be taking place as part of the nurture and upbringing of our children. This would be difficult to police and could put children in a difficult position in having to make statements about the adults present including their own parents which would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: The law must have strong protection for free speech to protect debate on such matters as religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity.

Question 52 Part 2: Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect; using a person's birth name and pronoun
saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa,
saying that there are only two sexes

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the Director of Public Prosecutions and is directly answerable to Parliament making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions to democratically elected representatives The Attorney General is able to give a more robust check in matters concerning freedom of speech which much of these matters cover

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The

existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words

or behaviour; 2 intention to stir up hatred If you only require proof of one of these elements, it

would make it easier to commit the offence An intention requirement does not guarantee that the

accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from

the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic

discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism The offence

would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild

statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding

that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'.

This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing

two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is

caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up

hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean

the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender

identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to

accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be

committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to

shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit

newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales

should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual

orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive

conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening

conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction

between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a

neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated

in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that

disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is

subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and

discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this

question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be

extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws

covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to

protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring

up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender

ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned

Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans

movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could

be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society

people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government

has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence.

Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form

part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive

move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to

something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the

accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender

identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the

Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA

of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the

stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. • Any offence covering transgender identity

must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a

woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was

included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human

rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious

penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from

the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown

Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct

any errors in his or her own policies The Attorney General can provide a more robust check The

Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex not gender

Question 11 Part 2: Sex not gender

Question 12: Limited to females

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Female sex only

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex not gender

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: Females need to retain their sex based rights Sex not gender

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Not transgender identity Sex based only

Question 49: No

Expand: Sex not gender

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Definitely not

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: I believe that the hate crime laws comprising the areas of aggravated offences and enhanced sentencing should be brought together in a single Act. Reading the consultation documentation it was hard to understand why there is a separation and different conditions except on the basis of laws growing piecemeal over time.

As for the area of stirring up hatred offences this should be in a separate Act because of the tensions between this and the very important area of Freedom of Speech

In summary, there should be 2 separate new Acts, though they should share the same definitions for the protected characteristics

Question 2: Yes

Expand: If protection is given to specified characteristics there will be continuing pressure to extend them

If it is to "any group" as in any identifiable group it will be prone to endless ultimately fruitless courtroom drama.

On balance I think it has to be to specified groups The current list is too short however If sensible additions are made at this stage it should be possible to defend against pressure to extend.

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: It is good to have criteria for judging what can go in to the law.

1) However the evidence that the crime is prevalent is hard to determine when the data is not collected which is very often the case at the moment

2) Additional harm is very subjective. I do not see how it can be demonstrated, or has been demonstrated.

3) Agreed This criterion must always be satisfied

Question 4: I could not find the place in the consultation where it states what the current definition is in England and Wales, but it does say that the one used in Scotland is essentially the same That is

"race, colour, nationality (including citizenship), or ethnic or national origins"

Therefore my answer to the question is no, because the definition specified above covers all that is needed to include migrants and asylum status and language

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: It is not clear to me , from the consultation documentation, what the current definition of religion for the purposes of hate crime laws is

My position is that the definition must cover those who do not believe in any religion, agnostics and atheists. It must be the case that if a hate crime is committed against an atheist because of their atheism then the punishment must be the same as a crime against a religious person because of their religion.

Question 6: Other (please expand)

Expand: I can see how sectarian groups would be covered

However, where is the protection for the individual who leaves a religious group, or is expelled by the group. It seems only logical to me that someone who is attacked for this reason is the victim of a hate crime based on religion, whether they join a new religion, or become agnostic or atheist, or indeed whether they have not decided what they are.

Question 7: No problem with this, it seems a simple, non-confusing addition

Question 8: Other (please expand)

Question 8 Part 1: Firstly Do not include intersex. It is a very rare medical condition and can only be diagnosed by doctors. I think it highly unlikely that a person would be presumed to be intersex in everyday life. An intersex person might be assumed to be transgender or non-binary gender.

Secondly In the Glossary you use a definition of transgender from Stonewall. It includes the phrase "the sex they were assigned at birth". In fact sex is determined long before birth, at conception. Humans with a Y chromosome are male, humans without a Y chromosome are female

As far as the question goes I interpret it as being about hate crimes related to a person's gender identity. There are many of these, there are Trans gender identities, non-binary gender identities and so on. I do not think that the law will be able to keep up with all of them.

I therefore propose the revised definition of

People who are or are presumed to be of trans, non-binary, or non-traditional gender identity.

I am here using the phrase "non-traditional" to include the consultation's cross-dressing category and further developments of gender identity

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: I propose the revised category title of

Trans, non-binary, or non-traditional gender identity

And once again, do not include the name of a specific medical condition (intersex) in the legislation

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: I don't think that this is the provision of hate crime laws. The situation that this question covers is where someone commits a crime because they think that the victim is breaking the rules to gain personal advantage. Hate crime laws are complicated enough without this

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Do not muddy the water by referring to gender in this question.

Sex is the unambiguous term

I am in favour of Sex being a protected characteristic. I come to this conclusion based on a number of things.

Women suffer abuse and harassment on account of their sex and it is hard, particularly for children, young women, pregnant women, and women with babies.

Online, women get abuse specific to their sex.

Similarly men get a lot of abuse online specific to their sex

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: There is no downside to including both men and women. There is benefit to it in the sense of fair treatment being seen to be done There is also benefit in highlighting the amount of hate crime there is against men and boys, purely because of their sex.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: I agree that "women" should be used and not misogyny It could be extended to women and girls to make it clearer.

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: This needlessly complicates things. Sex is clear, gender isn't.

Question 15: The point is made in the consultation documentation that hate crime is more than just selection of a victim by a criminal based on their vulnerability

I speak about crimes against older people because I have no relevant knowledge about crimes against young people.

We do not know what the true prevalence is because I do not believe the data is collected The additional harm done to the victim is great. Older people are much less able to deal with the stress of crime than other adults. Relatives and friends feel powerless to help and this may result in loss of liberty for the older person who may have been quite happy before they were burgled or whatever.

I therefore support strongly the recognition of age as a protected characteristic.

Question 16: Age-based hate crime should be limited to "older people"

Older people passes the test of being workable in practice.

All ages does not

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20: I think it should not Stick to religion and the absence of religion, ie agnosticism and atheism.

I have sympathy to non- formal religious belief systems and philosophical beliefs but there are so many and constructing a definitions that encompasses them would be unworkable if it were attempted

If my view is not followed then I would say that I think that ethical veganism can be regarded as a philosophical belief, but not naturism. Certainly climate change is not a philosophical belief, it is rather an assessment based on science of the likely outcomes of certain activities and actions.

Question 21: Yes

Expand: In my view all protected characteristics including newly added ones should be treated equally in law.

Question 22: No

Expand: I feel that nowadays and with the probable expansion of the number of protected characteristics that this will be practically impossible to implement effectively. It may well have been possible to in the past when only a small number of protected characteristics were defined. Nowadays however, with an expansion of the number of characteristics, and with the greatly expanded insults available, the situation is changing.

Even after reading the consultation document and the summary document it is still not clear to me how hostility towards a protected characteristic of the victim is to be proved. As an example if the accused is known to hold the position "trans women are men", would this be a demonstration of hostility?

Where is the boundary between stating a fact or an opinion and demonstration of hostility?

I support the position described in para 15.30 in the consultation document quoting the New South Wales Law Reform Commission's 2013 Sentencing report. This stated: We do not favour the demonstration of a hostility test. In many cases evidence of the demonstration of hostility immediately before, during or immediately after the offending conduct, for example, through speech, will be available to make good the motivation test. In other cases however that behaviour may be unrelated to the reason for the offence, and involve little more than spontaneous insult.

And finally having a single test, rather than the 2 confusingly different ones alluded to in questions 22 and 23 must make it easier for the public in general to understand.

Question 23: I agree with the substance of this change. However I think that the words "negative prejudice" should be used instead of "prejudice". I suspect that many people use the word prejudice only in a negative way, but in a legal situation it should be spelled out.

My view on Question 22 was that there should be a single test. This test should be the motivation test.

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: I am against the concept of specific aggravated offences with a higher maximum sentence.

If this is not to be changed I believe that the restriction of aggravated offences to race and religion.

Question 26: No

Expand: There completely inadequate data on prevalence of offences that you might consider as candidates for creation of aggravated versions of an offence

Is it the province of this consultation to comment on the adequacy of existing maximum penalties. I think not.

I may have misunderstood, but the fourth point above is shocking. Are you suggesting that it might be difficult to prove to a jury so don't use a jury!

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32: I presume that what you mean by intersectionality is that, of the protected characteristics, some people may belong to more than group

In fact everyone belongs to more than one group We all have a sex, a race, a sexual orientation, etc.

There is no point in recognising "intersectionality"

I think that any victim of a hate crime has no difficult in recognising which group has been targeted.

Question 33:

Question 34: If it is the case that Courts are not able to try the defendant on the base offence at the same time, this should be changed. It is an illogical situation if the cannot.

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: This should be dealt with in separate legislation. It could easily, if pursued in this proposal, divert from the main objectives of changes in the law. It also has ramifications that are wider than hate crime.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: "Likely to" is a vague term. Everything has a likelihood of occurrence.

Likely to should be removed.

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand: You should remove point (2) because of the meaninglessness of likely to.

Similarly point (4) should be removed.

Question 47: Other (please expand)

Expand: Whatever term is used, whether the indefinable "likely to", or a better term, it should be applied to all offences.

Question 47 Part 2: Insulting is such a low bar, that it is useless and unjust.

The term insulting should be dropped.

Question 48: Other (please expand)

Expand: Offences of stirring up hatred should be extended to all protected categories.

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: Offences of stirring up hatred should be extended to all protected categories.

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This is a mad idea, and it is completely unworkable.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand: This is a very complex area. It should therefore be subject to the highest level of oversight and public scrutiny, which is the Attorney General.

Question 55 Part 1: Yes certainly

Question 55 Part 2: I agree with the suggested extensions.

The more that areas of difference are open for debate in public, the better

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I would not support the introduction of a Hate Crime Commissioner. The history of such roles in other areas of life is that they are not successful in anything other than creating bureaucracy

Name: Nicole Pearson

Name of Organisation: The Hate Crime Unit

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand: The Hate Crime Unit stands firmly in favour of a single "Hate Crime Act". Although it may be argued that this will further confuse an already complex area of law, we believe this will bring long term benefits in both 1) the legal and 2) social order

(1) Legal order: In terms of the former, creating a single Hate Crime Act will facilitate the general's public understanding of hate crime law, by removing the need for extensive research and access to many different Acts such as the CDA 1998 and the POA 1986. This will positively improve many aspects of the rule of law previously lacking in this area: clarity, transparency, consistency and access to justice

(2) Social order: In terms of the latter, we believe the increased ease of understanding of a single "Hate Crime Act" may also contribute to increases in hate crime reporting. The lack of

hate incident reporting is something our project is specifically aiming to address and is something which we believe is a massive obstacle to eradication of hate crime in our society. As I'm sure you are well aware, the number of reports of hate crimes has steadily increased over the last decade (The Home Office reported a staggering 11% increase in race-targeting hate crimes, 25% increase in sexual orientation targeting hate crime, and 37% transgender identity targeting hate crime between 2017/18 and 2018/19) However, as with many social issues, hate incidents are likely to be considerably underreported, it becomes difficult to interpret figures: on the one hand it may be that the number of hate incidents are increasing, however it could also be that there has been an increase in reporting by victims, contributing to the steady climb. This is important as it impedes the analysis of how effective the implementation of new hate crime measures is, making it difficult for policy-makers to best tackle to issue through specific campaigns or educational measures We believe that in part, this is due to a lack of confidence in the legal system that making a report will amount to anything (only 10% of violent offences were dealt with a charge or summons), or that they may not be aware of hate crime law entirely, and regard the incidents as trivial due to the frequency in which they occur. Therefore, a "Hate Crime Act", by providing a clearer exposition of hate crime law in the UK, may lead to an increase in reporting, which in turn will bring us closer to a better reflection of the amount of crimes occurring and help policymakers better tackle the issue. We also believe that in terms of trust in the law and political system as a whole, it is important for members of society most targeted by hate crimes to feel safe and protected, especially in the current socio-political climate. To this end, a Hate Crime Act will act as a symbol for the law's continued (and increased) protection of society's most vulnerable

Question 2: Yes

Expand: The Hate Crime Unit firmly agrees with the proposition that the law should continue to specify protected characteristics for the purpose of hate crime laws We have identified several benefits of doing so:

1. Trust/confidence in the law: As mentioned above, we believe that one of the contributing reasons for lack of reporting is the fact that some members of the general public do not believe that the system will protect them. Explicitly listing the characteristics will highlight the fact that the law has directly identified people, and taken steps to protect them.
- 2 Clarity: Similarly to one of the points in question 1, increasing clarity will likely have the effect of increasing victims' confidence in reporting by helping them accurately identify, based on the list of characteristics provided in the law whether they may have been victim of a hate crime, and thus increase their confidence in making a report.
3. Raising awareness (to the general public): We believe that an explicit list of characteristics, instead of a general requirement of "hostility or prejudice" be sufficient, increases awareness to society of which specific groups are most targeted, which in turn lays the foundation for communities to tackle the root of prejudice and hostility.
- 4 Continued pressure on local governments: Echoing the above argument, identifying specific characteristics draws attention to these members of society most vulnerable to be exposed to targeted violence which encourages local governments to put in place specific measures in order to better protect each group

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: While the Hate Crime Unit broadly agrees with this criteria for protected characteristics, we would like to see a clarification of the “demonstrable need” requirement. We would like to see the criteria to be amended to be read as following:

(1) Demonstrable need: evidence that crime based on hostility or prejudice towards this group is disproportionately prevalent in this group.

The reason we suggest this amendment is because we believe that it emphasises the fact that crimes based on hostility or prejudice targeting minority groups will be as adequately protected as larger groups.

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand: The Hate Crime Unit is in favour of conserving the current definition of ‘religion’ for the purpose of hate crime laws for the following reasons:

1. A flexible definition ensures a flexible legal response to hate crime. Religion is recognised as being a complex and subjective concept, its exact definition lying beyond the boundaries of what legal systems can accurately establish. This is particularly the case in England and Wales, where we celebrate our rich cultural and religious diversity. The commission’s use of Lord Toulson’s definition of religion accurately depicts the complexity of the task, he concludes his summary by emphasising his definition ‘is intended to be a description and not a definitive formula’. In maintaining a broad and flexible definition, hate crime laws ensure that varying religious groups are given adequate and flexible protection

2. Lack of religion is included as a protected characteristic, therefore shielding those who have the freedom to ‘change (or abandon) their religion or belief’ under Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights. A reference to religion includes a lack of religious belief. In specifying this, those who do not adhere to a religion or have decided to detach themselves from their religious group are protected by the law. The necessity for this facet of the definition is made evident by the threats made against Humanist UK, which concluded that instances of bullying were caused by the organisation’s perceived association with apostasy. This instance illustrates however that public awareness has to be developed on this particular issue. Humanist UK argues that broadcasting the protection of apostates is crucial if individuals, fearing retribution, are to find the courage to leave their religious group. This issue is at the heart of the Hate Crime Unit’s effort to broaden public awareness about hate crime

3. Equally broad concepts, which exist on the fringes or in parallel to religion, are also defined and given adequate protection under the Equality Act 2010. The definition of religion is therefore optimal, as it exists within a system which protects varying forms of beliefs, convictions and moralities. Indeed, chapter 14 of the Hate Crime Final Report covers substantially notions such as philosophical and political beliefs. It cites the Grainger v Nicholson case, where the Employment Appeal Tribunal established a test to ascertain whether non-religious beliefs could be covered by hate crime laws. The Equality Act 2010 lists ‘religion and belief’ as equally protected characteristics. Religious beliefs do not exist in a legal vacuum, they are supported by legislation which shields other forms of beliefs against abuse. These measures have proven particularly important, in light of the increasing evidence of politically motivated violence following the Brexit referendum, amongst other political movements.

The Hate Crime Unit concludes its analysis by suggesting that a set of uniform tests should be established to identify whether belief, religious or otherwise, is a protected characteristic which causes incidents of hate crime. Comparatively, the importance of religious beliefs has decreased in equal measure as philosophical or political beliefs have grown over our modern history. A standardised set of tests will identify whether crimes have been committed because of what members of our societies believe, regardless of whether that belief might be deemed religious or philosophical. In this vein, we support the set of tests suggested by the Employment Tribunal to establish whether a particular belief is covered by the Equality Act 2010. Furthermore, we would even suggest expanding this set of questions in order for them to potentially be applied to religious beliefs as well. Therefore, all beliefs of significance would potentially be protected by hate crime laws, provided it is established that the belief in question is fundamental to the victim.

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: The Hate Crime Unit firmly agrees with the inclusion of asexuality within the definition of sexual orientation. Asexuality is recognised by both the NHS and the UK Government as a legitimate sexual orientation. There is little legislation to discourage any prejudice against asexuals and, consequently, there is no legal framework to support asexual spectrum people in litigation proceedings.

The asexual community is particularly vulnerable to offences such as corrective rape and sexual violence therefore it displays a legislative neglect to not include them alongside homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality.

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: The Hate Crime Unit firmly agrees with the proposition that gender or sex should be a protected characteristic. We agree with this based on all the reasons given in the report on whether they meet the aforementioned criteria of a protected characteristic, in terms of the prevalence of offences targeting women and their motivation on misogyny.

Question 11 Part 2: However we strongly disagree with the carving out of sexual offences, forced marriage, FGM and crimes committed in the domestic abuse context are needed subsequently to adding sex/gender to the list of protected characteristics. We believe that it is extremely important in terms of deterrence and for protection of women that those offences remain within the bounds of hate crime law. Although we acknowledge that it is difficult to determine whether those offences are motivated by "sex/gender", we believe that it is a matter of principle, that the law does not carve out any offences as this gives the

impression that those which have been are not being taken as seriously or are being neglected.

Further, we'd argue that for FGM & forced marriage, there should be a presumption of hostility or prejudice due to the inseparable link the crime has with the oppression of women. However, in the case of domestic violence and sexual offences, we would argue that although they should not be "carved out", the fact they were motivated by "hostility and prejudice" should still have to be proved, (as there is no presumption).

Question 12: We believe that if the Law Commission decides not to carve out sexual offences, domestic violence, FGM and forced marriage, then the protection should extend to men and women. We fear that if men were excluded from the category, the fact that this would mean similar crimes targeting men would consistently not result in as high a sentence as those targeting women, would contribute to society's harmful portrayal of men as being strong and unable to be the victim of crimes committed by women, such as sexual offences and domestic violence. We further believe that this would result in a contribution to the persistent problem of men not reporting these types of offences, in part because of this societal stigma which would only be seen as "endorsed" by the law, if only women could seek an "enhanced" or "aggravated" sentence

However if the Law Commission decides to carve out the aforementioned offences, then we would argue that as the above problem would not apply, the category should be limited to women only This is because, as argued in question 2 we believe that by identifying "women" as a standalone group disproportionately targeted by prejudice and hostility based crimes, there will be an increased awareness in society which may encourage specific measures to be put in place to protect this group Further, avoiding a category so broad that it would incorporate almost every member of

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: We believe the term "misogyny" may be confusing to some, and especially in relation to the terms used for the rest of the categories which refer to the characteristic or group the hatred targets as opposed to the name of the hatred (for example, "disability" instead of "ableism"), and subsequently may reduce some of the benefits of having said category in terms of clarity and awareness raised by its inclusion.

However, there has been an increasing refusal to use the word "women", which has instead been substituted by "womxn" by some, to be more inclusive of transgender and non binary women as well as avoiding the word "men" appearing in the word, which is seen as sexist. Therefore, we believe that perhaps the term "protected characteristic" should be replaced in order to include the word "misogyny" without creating confusion and incoherence

Question 14: Yes

Expand: We believe that the term "gender" and "sex" alone may create confusion in terms of the "transgender identity" characteristic,, and therefore would agree that "sex or gender" is preferable.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20: The Hate Crime Unit broadly supports the recognition of philosophical beliefs as a hate crime category, under certain conditions

Considerations supporting the recognition of philosophical beliefs:

Consistency within the law: The law has generally moved in such a direction as to recognise philosophical beliefs as a factor of sufficient importance to be protected. Indeed, the Equality Act 2010 (itself drawing from Section 9 of the Human Rights Act 1998) prohibits discrimination on the basis of “any religious or philosophical belief”. To ignore the recognition of philosophical belief as part of one’s identity to the extent that it ought to be protected, would be for hate crime law to be unusually out of step with equalities and human rights legislation as well as case law such as *W v United Kingdom* and *Mr J Casamitjana Costa v The League Against Cruel Sports*.

Lack of inherent distinction between philosophical and religious belief: Freedom of thought is an essential facet of any tolerant and just society, and to quote the recent Employment Tribunal judgment in *Mr J Casamitjana Costa v The League Against Cruel Sports* (concerning the protection of Ethical Veganism under the Equalities Act): “also a precious asset for atheists, agnostics, sceptics and the unconcerned”, as well as religious believers. In situations where, per the explanatory notes explaining the effect of Section 10 of the Equality Act 2010, a belief is “genuinely held” attaining “a certain level of cogency, seriousness, cohesion and importance” and importantly “compatible with human dignity and not conflict with the fundamental rights of others”, there is no reason it should not be offered the same protection as religion. Deeply held ethical positions may be of equal significance to an individual’s identity and way of life as religious beliefs. Consequently, there are strong moral grounds for the protection of philosophical beliefs in any reform of hate crime law.

Evidence of need: There is also empirical evidence of the need to protect philosophical beliefs under hate crime law. Though not specific to the UK, Pew Research have identified a rise in the harassment of religiously unaffiliated people in recent years. Further, regarding the targeting of specific groups, research by *The Times* has suggested that there have been 172 crimes associated with vegans in the past five years. Although there is comparatively little data on such crimes, the law ought to anticipate how the committing of hate crime is likely to evolve. Spikes in the targeting of specific groups is often linked with specific events and current affairs; for instance, harassment of pacifists might only occur in the event of war. Rather than adapt the law to protect such groups in a piecemeal manner, waiting for explicit need, the law ought to protect philosophical groups preemptively rather than wait for sufficient people to fall victim to hate motivated attacks. Even if little statistical data on the prevalence of such crimes exists, this may be due to the difficulty in collecting evidence given the lack of recognition of philosophical belief under hate crime legislation and consequent lack of reports. As such

Further considerations:

It is further worth noting that due to the current character of hate crime, as providing a sentence uplift when an existing crime has been committed, expanding the ambit of the “religious belief” characteristic would preclude its use to stifle legitimate criticism or satirisation of philosophical beliefs (as neither of these would constitute a crime). We feel it important that this ought to accompany any inclusion of philosophical beliefs as a protected characteristic, so as to avoid the public/media perception that the law is somehow stifling free expression.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand: We agree as it is important both in terms of clarity and accessibility to the general public of the law that there is only one type of hate crime offence. Further, it would create parity between the different characteristics and erase any misconception that some characteristics are more valuable and deserving of certain protection over others

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: This needs to be considered very carefully. It may be that a person could intend to, and actually, stir up hatred using words that are not threatening, abusive or insulting. But there must surely be some objective definition of the type of words caught by the offence in addition to intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: The existing regime: requiring intention plus proscribed types of speech is sufficient. To remove intention will erode freedom of speech as people will be constrained for fear of unwittingly falling foul of the law

Question 47: No

Expand: The distinction between the threshold for racial hatred and other types religious, sexual etc, should be retained. If it is removed, discussion of religion and sexual ethics areas in which people's convictions and beliefs are inevitably going to differ, even to be opposed is at risk of being inhibited by the politically motivated. There are already many instances of people with firm and legitimate convictions being 'de-platformed' or hounded online in the name of 'tolerance' - which is actually intolerance. Whatever happens, that kind of intolerance should not be encouraged by, let alone enshrined in, the law

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Transgender identity and disability are entirely different categories. The question of transgender identity is very much under debate at the moment. Many people not just Christians or people of other faiths are concerned at the implications of the arguments of the trans movement, and when they comment, there is often a concerted effort to shut them down and close off debate.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: While the dwelling exclusion could be used as cover for meetings designed to stir up hatred the downside of removing it is too great. There must remain scope for people to express their views, whatever they are, in private, without fear of being shopped by someone who might take offence, or is acting from ulterior motives

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: These offences have the potential to impinge on basic human rights. It is right therefore that prosecutions should require the highest possible sanction. The A-G is obviously more at arms' length than the DPP as the head of the CPS.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: n/a

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: Most of the current accusations of "hate crime" and the pressure for new and wider inclusions come from people who wish to give their own opinions a high moral stance and label any opposition to those opinions as "hate "

This is in practical terms and often by intention an attack on free speech and in particular but not exclusively on the expression of religious opinion.

A "Hate Crime Act" and even more so a "Hate Crime Commissioner" would give those people of prejudice who have driven these changes in popular attitudes even greater motivation and weaponry and a Commissioner would be motivated to look everywhere for "hate crimes" he could find and prosecute

Over the past 50 years the levels of hatred in general society has increase and feelings of "live and let live" have diminished, to everyone's loss. These proposals would exacerbate these trends even more

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: Yes, providing the criticism of immigration and asylum policies are not included as "hate" and neither is the identification of particular nations or groups as sources of problems once they arrive in the UK. Analysis of facts cannot be suppressed by accusations of "hate crime."

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: This is frankly ridiculous. A Nothing cannot have an orientation. This idea contradicts the earlier insistence that issues should be currently relevant, necessary, and logical.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: There is no such thing as "transgender." People either have a Y chromosome, in which case they are male, or they don't, in which case they are female. A very small percentage of people have compromised chromosome copies which may or may not produce physical uncertainties and/or mental or psychological problems. There are others, especially in teenage years, who feel uncomfortable in their gender. All of these are suffering from forms of disability and need help, understanding, and compassion, but identifying them as "transgender" is cruel.

Those who consider themselves "non-binary," or "intersex" have different problems and those who like to cross-dress don't necessarily have a problem at all. To lump all these together as "transgender" would make things even worse.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: They are different categories and should not be lumped together.

Question 8 Part 3: You don't need a revised definition or one at all. You should be able to make an overall definition of Hate Crime that covers all situations. This eagerness to make categories and narrow definitions is actually fuelling the paranoia of those who feel marginalised or under-valued. You are not helping them but hindering.

Question 9: Yes, it should. This definition actually proves my point previously that you do not need all these categories. Certainly some groups will not like to be called "disabled" because they think there is some stigma to the term (which tells us a lot) but their situations are disabilities and it is best and kinder in the long term to treat them as such.

Question 10: This is not well-worded. If you mean "If a person A is found guilty of an offence against a victim who suffers a disability of which A was unaware, should A be extra penalised for a hate crime?" then the answer is obviously "NO." I think that means "Yes" in answer to your clumsy wording.

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Again the meaning of the question is unclear.

Question 11 Part 2: You could use these as examples rather than "gender-specific carve outs." Your whole approach is misaligned. You should be treating the problem as a whole, rather than this nitty-picky approach which will have to be revised again and again.

Question 12: Of course it should be applicable to both genders. I note that your question accepts only two genders which rather undermines your approach on previous questions. Some unintentional self-revelation there?

We have already had judges finding killer-wives not-guilty of murder on spurious grounds, now you want angry lesbians to do whatever they want to men?

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: It should not be so limited .

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: Why cop out? Why not just use "Gender" because it is less ambiguous than "sex"?

Question 15:

Question 16: All ages.

Your lack of explanation of context in these questions is very unhelpful

Question 17: No because you once again reveal the shortcomings of you categories. You don't need them. Define what is a hate crime for all circumstances instead of letting yourselves be intimidated by hysterical pressure groups

Question 18: You prove my point yet again.

Question 19: And again. What about a category for people with big ugly noses? You'll never get an end of this

Question 20: More proof of my position

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand: If it is understood that any disability is a "relevant characteristic

Question 23: "Yes", as immediately above.

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: There are philosophical arguments here A man beats up his wife because she doesn't do as she's told He gets a certain penalty His neighbour beats up a sex-worker because he despises them. He gets a higher sentence. Is there reason or justice is that?

The argument for the higher sentence is to give added protection to certain groups and hopefully in the long term to reduce attacks and prejudice against such people But that means (for example) that wives deserve less protection than sex-workers. Is there reason or justice is that?

Question 25: No

Expand: No categories are needed just disabilities and people in groups or with characteristics suffering general prejudice in society

(I've just realised that this clause could be usefully applied in previous answers)

Question 26: No

Expand: This is very cumbersome and could lead to complicated appeals Only bullet 2 has any value. There really is no need for an aggravated version of an offence when a heavier sentence exists. Why do you have to over-complicate matters?

Question 27: Other (please expand)

Expand: More details and context needed before a balanced answer could be given, but as said above an aggravated version of an offence is unnecessary anyway

Question 28: No

Expand: In view of the maximum sentence this is unnecessary.

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: No, the offences are not ones in which perpetrators are likely to be motivated by the characteristics of the victims with one exception Fraud offences against registered charities should warrant increased sentences.. There is an increasing number of cases of charity workers in positions of trust who embezzle funds so extra protection is needed

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: You suggested previously that the definitions of aggravated versions and enhanced sentences should be the same, so why have the two things?

Question 32: Is this gobbledegook?

Question 33:

Question 34: yes, on the same basis that a charge of murder can be reduced to manslaughter

Question 35:

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: It is aggravated offences that should be abolished enhanced sentencing that should be retained. You should be aiming at simplification in all this, instead you seem committed to over-complication

Question 37: Other (please expand)

Expand: It should be the reason for the enhanced sentence that must be stated in open court

Question 38 Part 1: Yes, as long as the anti-group prejudice or hostility is fully explained.

Question 38 Part 2: a combination of approaches

Question 39: No

Expand: This proves my point about the problems with aggravated versions - they are unnecessary and confusing Enhanced sentencing in itself grants greater flexibility

Question 40: Yes

Expand: In WW2 German media used images of Jews looking like rats to stir up hate - and the American media did exactly the same thing to stir up hatred against the Japanese. This is an example of how more that writing can stir up hatred

Question 41: Yes

Expand: Providing there is clear protection for rational debate.

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: If they fail to remove the material within 24 hours of receiving a complaint, but also if they fail to have robust software of their own which looks for, identifies, and unilaterally removes such material

Question 43 Part 2: The question is unclear, again. but a platform should only be liable if had an intention to stir up or was careless in removing inflammatory material.

Question 44: The phrase "likely to" should be removed altogether from hate crime legislation because it cannot by its very nature meet normal standards of proof. It invites unfounded opinion and manipulation of meaning and has been used in reverse and perverse ways

"Likely to stir up hatred" in whom? The writer? The subject of the criticism? The general public? A particular group? Such a phrase has no place in good law

Good criminal law should be based on intention to commit the crime or negligently allowing the crime to be committed.

It will be a major failure of the Law Commission if it fails to remove this phrase from legislation.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: In the present culture there are many people who are convinced that anyone disagreeing with them on certain subjects are guilty of hatred and disagreement must be shut down and punished. "Transgenderism" is one obvious example at present. In such an atmosphere it is impossible to show that stirring up hatred can be proven where no threatening, abusive, or insulting words were used. .

Your provisional proposal here would be an enormous attack on free speech. It would turn a scholastic explanation of the role chromosomes in determining gender into a crime. It would put a powerful weapon into all sorts of groups who wish to use bullying tactics to impose their opinions on the public.

Question 46: No

Expand: Not (2) or (4) as already explained. If I make a statement of fact about a subject and someone of a different opinion gets very angry about it and hates me, who is the victim? The one who descends into hate or me for stating facts? Have I to avoid factual statements because there may be someone who gets angry over it? Free speech is foundational to much that has made Britain what it is and the Law Commission seems to be aiding the dismantling of that foundation

Question 47: No

Expand: As already explained "likely to" should be removed altogether. The very existence of this phrase threatens the right to express an opinion. It is a bully in itself

Question 47 Part 2: Certainly "insulting" should be removed because to insult has never been a criminal offence and to make it one would be impractical, but the problem here is the "likely to" limb itself

Question 48: No

Expand: The question is ambiguous. Does it mean "transgender identity and disability in general" or "transgender identity and transgender disability"? If the former then you are lumping together two different things which would just add to confusion. Why should

someone confined to a wheelchair be in the same category as someone claiming to be transgender ?

Unless there be one category of "disabled" of course

If the meaning is the latter, there is no difference between the identity and the disability.

Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences

The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This would be madness. It would promote the use of entrapment invite someone around, start an argument, get him/her angry (and drunk?) and then have the victim charged, It would lead to "I said, he said" disputes, it would lead to hidden recorders. Anyway, how could a private conversation in a dwelling stir up hatred other than in those participating in the dispute?

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate

Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion.

Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation

- Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly

protect:

- using a person's birth name and pronoun,

- saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and

- saying that there are only two sexes

Question 53: Yes, of course, free non-abusive non-threatening speech must be protected at all costs

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights

A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech.

The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives

Question 55 Part 1: Yes, of course

Question 55 Part 2: All of the above but additionally any discussion which is presented in a courteous and balanced manner with no abusive or contemptuous language

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: yes

Question 59: yes

Question 60: no, too vague

Question 61:

Question 62: NO. To create a Commissioner with an Office would be to set up a witch hunt. He/she and staff would have to demonstrate their relevance and justify their public cost They would go interfering in all sorts of disputes, looking for hatred. They would create more controversy and multiply the HATE,

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Intersex is not transgender

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Sex is currently protected, as is gender reassignment. Adding gender is irrelevant, and will erase the need for women-only spaces and sex based rights.

Question 11 Part 2: By proposing adding gender into the mix, you are making a nonsense of existing laws. All the above are criminal already.

Question 12: Women only.

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex is a valid category and should remain

Question 15: No.

Question 16:

Question 17: No

Question 18: No.

Question 19: No

Question 20: No

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: Gender reassignment is a valid characteristic. Transgender, non binary and intersex are not

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand: Seriously, have you so much spare time? These are already crimes, the courts are collapsing because of cuts and the prisons are rammed.

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: No.

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand: Gender again Bonkers Stick to sex

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: I am responding in a personal capacity

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I am afraid that I may lose my job for standing up for women's rights

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Sex should be and remain the protected characteristic, not gender. Gender is a very difficult concept to define whereas female people have long been oppressed by virtue of their female bodies. Sex is easy to define scientifically.

Some organisations have been mis informing people that gender is a protected characteristic, not sex This has had very real negative consequences affecting the rights, safety and dignity of women and girls. We are afraid.

Misogyny has never been treated with the same seriousness as other forms of hate crime. It should be! I am truly worried for young girls growing up in today's very misogynistic world How can "rough sex" be an acceptable defense for murder?

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex yes NOT gender Gender is an impossibly woolly concept to base a law upon

Question 11 Part 2: Misogyny is probably the most prevalent hate crime and it should begin to be properly addressed in law and prosecuted in practice. Sexual offences on young girls are depressingly common, including in schools Schools should always provide female only toilets. They are imperative to maintain girls' privacy and dignity, especially when menstruating

Question 12: All hate crime is wrong, but women suffer disproportionately So both men and women should be protected, but the attention should be directed proportionately, i.e. overwhelmingly to protect women who are by far the majority of victims

gender is not an easy to define characteristic. the protections should be sex-based.

Question 13: Yes

Expand: I agree as long as we are talking about sex male people should not be included in the category "women". This causes endless confusion.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex should remain the protected characteristic Gender is unhelpful and vague Gender reassignment should remain a protected characteristic, but women and girls separately need to maintain their rights to single-sex spaces.

It is unbelievably unfair and inappropriate that male to female transgender medical practitioners' wishes come before those of many girls and women who wish intimate care to be provided only by females. The law must uphold women and girls' rights to dignity and privacy

Question 15:

Question 16: Everyone deserves protection under the law. There is much prejudice directed both at older people and younger people Protection should extend to all

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20: Yes, philosophical beliefs and the right to open debate must be protected. Democracy depends on free and fearless expression of ideas.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: Do you propose to drop the other current protected characteristics? You should not

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Other (please expand)

Expand: standing up for women's rights to privacy and dignity should not be interpreted as hatred of transgender identity. It is not.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: sex and disability are the most important of these and cover a large fraction of the population. The long subjugated groups, women and disabled people, must not be sacrificed to the small group of transgender individuals. Everyone should have rights, but none of the groups should be forced to lose their rights and distinctive identity.

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand: protections should also extend to chants directed against female officials.

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: yes it should.

Question 59: yes it should

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: No. The law allows people to do (or not do) certain activities. Someone who is asexual has the same right to experiences that a single (i.e. not in a relationship) person has. Unless being 'single' becomes a protected characteristic, there is no need to include asexuality as a protected characteristic.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: People must be open to be challenged. If a man can wear a dress and then claim extra rights which cannot be challenged, this potentially endangers others. The

current law has safeguards which should not be removed. Cross-dressing should not be included.

Intersex is a separate trait which should not be included in this list

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Whether transgender, non binary or intersex, all people have a legal sex. Most people have some degree of non binary traits (i.e. most people do not fit a stereotyped male or female) and including non-binary as a separate category constrains rather than opens.

Question 8 Part 3: Society's views on transgender and non binary are changing rapidly. Any change is likely to be wrong within a few years. The changes need to be as minimal as possible so that the definition still applies when we have named (or refuted) certain categories

Question 9: Although the suggested changes seem valid, it must be possible to challenge as seemingly able person when they are using disabled facilities, otherwise disabled access becomes open to all and are lost to those who genuinely need them

The current use of sunflower lanyards in shops to excuse the lack of mask is an example. The 'disabled' person can easily acknowledge their need. The disabled person can refuse to wear a lanyard but is then treated as 'able'. However, an 'able' person is unlikely to wear a lanyard just to gain extra privilege.

If able people can use disabled parking spaces / disabled toilets etc and any challenge is against the law, rights become meaningless

Question 10: If someone is presumed non-disabled, they have the right (and need) to be honest. This characteristic must be open to challenge. (See comment on sunflower lanyards above.) However, if the person has been honest about their disability and is still treated as non disabled (e.g. a deaf person who lipreads so is assumed to hear), then the law should apply.

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Yes. This would cover the intersex and non-binary question earlier. However, I am concerned that the courts would fill with discrimination cases based on sex.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Equality demands both although further thought needs to be given about the implications.

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: The legislation must protect women as a sex (being the ones who are generally weaker physically and have most of the childcare responsibilities) separately from transwomen to whom these usually do not apply

Question 15:

Question 16: Equality demands both.

However, does this mean that all the special cheap rates for older people should instead be based on income and apply to younger people on low incomes too?

Question 17: No They should be protected from violence regardless of their named occupation.

Question 18: No. Everyone should be open to be challenged. Discrimination would then be covered by belief (e g veganism)

Question 19: No. Specific categories cannot be picked out but should be covered by other general categories

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Written and disseminated material requires more effort and forethought than a brief outburst (including twitter)

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: The danger is that online media platforms are already removing valid posts where they are anxious that it contravenes certain hate speech. Although they have some responsibility, the guidelines should be clear and should not be suddenly imposed. Examples include medical research (on masks and trans identity in youth) and opinions which are argued rather than stated.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: There is a difference between an argued viewpoint and a stated or imposed viewpoint. 'Likely to' needs further defining but the context is important. A preacher in church has a power which differs from a teacher in school or an adult discussion at home. The first cannot be challenged easily and speaks to adults, the second speaks to children, while the last is open to disagreement.

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand: Motive and knowledge needs to be demonstrated. Some other countries imprison those who are young or mentally immature who were unaware of the impact of their actions. or may not have committed the alleged insult. We should not follow their example.

Question 47: Yes

Expand: Equality demands consistency, although discussion should not be criminalised. Views should be debated and discredited rather than silenced.

Question 47 Part 2: YES Very much. It is easy to claim insult and moderately easy to give unintended insult.

Question 48: Yes

Expand: Equality demands consistency, although discussion should not be criminalised. Views should be debated and discredited rather than silenced.

Question 49: Yes

Expand: Equality demands consistency, although discussion should not be criminalised. Views should be debated and discredited rather than silenced

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Discussion should not be criminalised. Views should be debated and discredited rather than silenced

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: Yes. Genuine discussion should be protected.

Question 55 Part 2: Yes. Genuine discussion should be protected. Valid research (peer reviewed) MUST be allowed to publish otherwise we do not move on and society cannot learn from best practice.

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59: Only if the same protection/offences is given to other large and likely rowdy crowds.

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I am uncertain whether the current desire to focus a role on one person is worth the money.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: Short of incitement to violence, no speech or thought should constitute a crime

Question 5: No

Expand: This would constitute a blasphemy law and should be resisted at all cost

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: There is no clear definition or understanding of the transgender condition (as demonstrated by the framing of the question) and to include it in hate crime laws would limit this research and investigation

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Intersex is a known and demonstrable physical medical condition and co-opting it to push a narrative regarding transgenderism is disingenuous and insulting

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: There should be no protected characteristics. The crime is the act, not the motivation

Question 11 Part 2: We should not be creating a 2 tiered approach to justice. If we agree genital mutilation is a crime, then everyone should have the same protections. Same for all other crimes

Question 12: Of course it should!

Question 13: No

Expand: The crime is the act, not the motivation

Question 14: No

Expand: No protected characteristics

Question 15: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 16: Of course but the act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 17: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 18: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 19: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 20: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 21: No

Expand: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 22: No

Expand: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 23: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 24: No

Expand: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 25: No

Expand: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 26: No

Expand: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 27: No

Expand: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 28: No

Expand: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 29: No

Expand: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 30: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 31: Yes

Expand: The act is the crime, not the motivation

Question 32: The act is the crime, not the motivation. Intersectionality is an ideology and has no place in determining law

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: Incitement to violence only

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation: None

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: To show that someone intentionally intended to stir hatred in a another person would be to put that in the area of a subjective judgement . There must be clear evidence in the words spoken or material printed that hate or violence was intended

Question 46: No

Expand: In some debates there are at least some people that are going to be emotionally offend and result in hate towards the persons in debate or a conversation taking place

Many issues as politics, religion , race or sexually could not be discussed with freedom of speech if one had to avoid the minefield of disagreement resulting in someone being offended, and feeling weaker in their worldview

If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved, it will make it much easier for the law to shut down all valid and meaningful discussions we have in politics and religion we have in our country

Question 47: No

Expand: Issues like sexuality, and religion should not be grouped along side race when viewing discussions ,debates or literature that seek to enter a reasoned discussion of people's views and beliefs. What makes something abusive can be very subjective.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: In a highly sensitive society offensives seen as stirring up hate can be easily misjudged When emotions are used to judge another persons intents, conclusions can be devastating. And the outcome on an innocent speaker ruinous. Un popularised views will be criminalised. People will be prosecuted on their unknown motives. Universities will more and more cease to host open free speech informed debates Our culture will be depleted of understanding on vital issues

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Conversations in people's homes should not be extended to crime laws It is an oppressive move that brings us closer to a Communist State, where individuals experience fear in their own homes and the monitoring of all their behaviours

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: I have serious issues with the whole concept of hate crime.

As a woman, and therefore part of a group subject to more hate crime than almost any other, it seems to me that actual crimes rape, murder, domestic violence are already legislated for but prosecuted insufficiently seriously to keep women safe.

I am also an advocate of free speech, with concerns that people's thoughts can be policed as well as the actions they commit.

Most of the measures that would make protected groups safer do not relate to wielding the sledgehammer of the criminal law (with enhanced sentencing on top). Societal change comes from measures to improve and measure financial and social equality, remove barriers such as overt discrimination, and occasionally to permit positive discrimination.

However, IF there is to be a hate crime law, it should treat women, as a sex class, as equally deserving of protection by it Surely most violence against women involves misogyny?

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Unless and until the Equalities Act is changed, I propose that the criminal law should match the civil law's 9 protected characteristics

I still do not like the concept of hate crime.

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: All of the above are good arguments for civil government action to reduce tension, enhance social cohesion, and protect minority groups e.g. with measures such as better street lighting or CCTV in high risk areas, rather than focusing these in commercial areas with limited risk to personal safety. In my opinion, crime reduction and prevention are a far better use of scarce resources than longer sentences.

Question 4: Perhaps, yes I am not aware of cases where a simpler definition of race would not suffice, but if there are such, then it should be clarified as above.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: This is a tricky one How can a criminal perceive someone's religion? In many cases this is a proxy for race.

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: I have never heard of any discrimination or violence against this group. The legislation risks becoming massively unwieldy

Question 8: Other (please expand)

Question 8 Part 1: Could this section not be expanded to just include people who are gender non-conforming?

Many women are abused or attacked for looking 'butch', so to exclude us with careful phrasing that includes absolutely everyone else but specifically excludes gender-non conforming people often, but not always, lesbian or gay seems perverse

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Gender non conforming would cover all these groups, and more.

Question 8 Part 3: As above

Question 9:

Question 10: I still have problems with hate crime as a concept. Crime is crime. Uplifts should be available for malicious campaigns against an individual or group, whatever the presumed motivation. - it could be just personal dislike that makes a premeditated bullying process more serious than a single crime might be. Surely that is equal in severity to one based on specific protected categories?

Question 11: No

Expand: Absolutely not

Sex and gender are completely different, and legislation should not muddy the boundary any more than it already is.

In fact, every new piece of legislation could be used to clarify the terms, if government were so minded

The Scottish Parliament recently, sensibly, opted to use a definition of sex, rather than gender, in the Forensic Medical Services Bill in Scotland, following a massive lobbying by constituents

Women know our sex matters, and the fact that the loudest lobby groups say that it doesn't matter is shocking. The fact that they are listened to, over ordinary women's voices, is even worse

Question 11 Part 2: FGM and forced marriage are sex-specific, not gender-specific, as is the vast majority of domestic violence and sexual crime.

What would be the purpose of carve-outs?

Should rape by a stranger be worth a higher penalty than rape by a partner? The latter might be part of a longstanding campaign of aggression

This law must be careful not to create a very uneven playing field

Question 12: If something is not statistically a problem, I do not think it warrants inclusion in the legislation

The statute book is already groaning, and new laws should be limited to what is proven to be necessary and useful.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Terms used in the bill need to be clear. If 'women' is used in anything other than the socially accepted meaning as people born female, it needs to be defined as such, so the public can see the extent of drift. Fudging definitions is not working, to date, and any shift needs to be up-front.

However, I still think crimes should carry sufficient sentences to be as deterrent as penalties can be, without requiring a specific thought in the mind of the attacker. Surely uplift can be added for particularly awful aspects of a crime, without needing to look at motivation other than to establish criminal culpability.

Question 14: No

Expand: As above.

I think this is the worst idea suggested by this consultation.

Question 15: Age will make some people more vulnerable (as easier targets), but in general, I think young adult males are the victims of more crime than most other age groups at the hands of other young males.

I am not aware of a serious societal problem with age related attacks, and again propose that legislation should follow a problem, not anticipate one.

Question 16:

Question 17: All women, whether prostituted, trafficked or not, should be protected by the full force of the law.

Prostituted women are more at risk of not being taken seriously when they complain of crime, yet are more likely than other groups of women to be attacked

I suggest that these women could best be helped by other means than by being included in hate crime laws: sensitive policing that responds quickly to complaints would be a good start, and a society that doesn't treat the women as complicit in what happened to them

The lessons of the Sutcliffe era are still being learnt, Rotherham is a blight on our country's conscience, and the work done by Margaret Oliver in this regard was long ignored, in very recent history

Simply prosecuting the many crimes that take place, including rape, of course, would be much better than trying to punish more severely those few criminals who are charged.

I feel it is unnecessary to reference rape prosecution statistics these must be known to government, and are an indictment of our justice system.

Question 18: I think this law risks being unworkable

Question 19: I think this law risks being unworkable

Question 20: I think this law risks being unworkable.

Question 21: No

Expand: I still have issues with using the perpetrator's state of mind to increase the seriousness of the crime.

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: Definitions just seem to get wider and wider. There may be no 'normal' crime left, at this rate

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: There needs to be consistency across all legislation, to the extent that definitions needs to match, and similar groups should be protected, IF there is evidence of a need for protection

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: The last point is troublesome. Does this mean that a lack of evidence in some areas could be made up for by proof of hateful motivation? This would concern me

Question 27: No

Expand: This is tricky, because women are vilely abused on social media, yet we are the ones who most often get removed from the 'quasi public square' that private social media organisations provide.

I think more appropriate laws than hate crime are available already, but are under-used

I also think stronger control of social media, generally, is called for: if a service, de facto, has become an essential tool for communicating outside of social bubbles, governments need to specify terms on which they can operate

Specifically, banning for whimsical reasons should not be permitted, and there needs to be an independent right of appeal.

None of this, however, requires the protection of the criminal law, unless threats are otherwise criminally actionable, such as many of those directed at female politicians and other women in the public eye

Question 28: No

Expand: I fail to see why

Question 29: No

Expand: Why not?

Acid attacks, for example, are often used against women, or used racially.

I would only advocate their inclusion for the sake of consistency

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand: Consistency should be maintained, I suggest.

The main problem with these crimes, however, is not just the lightness of much sentencing but that most are not prosecuted at all, and women have little or no trust in the legal process to prosecute the crime and then protect them from the perpetrator.

Many more resources could be allocated to this area if women are to become safer including in their own homes

Question 32:

Question 33: Sentences need to be assessed in a more holistic way than I am able to.

Included in this would be the efficacy of imprisonment or, rather, lack of it and the need to develop far more adequate alternatives and preventative schemes.

Question 34: This seems to go against natural justice this is rarely used in other criminal cases, I think

Question 35:

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: I am not convinced that there is any strong deterrent effect, whatever the sentence, and that more effective protections exist for communities at risk.

Question 37: Other (please expand)

Expand: I would suggest that some of the perpetrators of hate crime offences have themselves been groomed by more powerful community members.

The effect on rehabilitation should probably be taken into account, as well as the message to a wider community These may be in conflict

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2: This may appear necessary, but I would be very wary of such an undefined element in legislation

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: Established fairness rules need to apply here, as elsewhere in the criminal law.

If there is to be a major change, it should be after considerable thought and debate.

Question 40: Other (please expand)

Expand: Although women are often the victims of such behaviour, I am very wary of widening the criminal law further.

See earlier comments re social media and the need to prosecute existing offences

Question 41: No

Expand: Further criminalising written and spoken opinions is a dangerous route

'Inflammatory' does not immediately seem a very strong measure

Question 42: Yes

Expand: There should be some such protection, yes.

My concern is that many legitimate artistic pursuits have been deemed inflammatory in the past, and definitions here are very prone to societal changes as are all laws, I grant.

But in recent years, there have been so many examples of literature or art, defined broadly, that have fallen foul of criticism, which I do not believe should be subject to criminalisation.

Salman Rushdie's 'Satanic Verses', the Mohammed cartoons etc. should not be at risk of criminalisation simply for being inflammatory to a certain sector

Causing offence and causing hatred are not the same, and the law should make a clear distinction.

Question 43 Part 1: There should be an obligation for social media companies to employ sufficient moderators - and sufficiently well-trained ones - that they catch and remove as much unlawful material as possible.

They should be further obliged to respond in a timely and appropriate manner to complaints, not responding to volume of complaints, but to their actual seriousness.

Women, again, are often removed from platforms because of the ability of misogynist lobby groups to mass-report material that they object to which falls far short of being criminal

Question 43 Part 2: Probably, yes.

Question 44: There should be the greatest clarity possible

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: I expect this could be legitimately useful against, for example, far-right groups, but it would have to be phrased extremely carefully, because I envisage much feminist discourse could be caught by this, in the eyes of trans activists

I greatly fear that women will be among the main ones accused of social-media related 'inflammatory' offences, despite evidence showing the extent to which we are the victims of serious verbal abuse and threats

The police have seemed, recently, to be quite happy to prosecute hate crime and record hate incidents, falling short of crime, despite the massive gap in prosecution of the most serious offences

I find this highly disturbing.

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand: The bar should be high This may be adequate

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Probably, yes

Question 48: No

Expand: So much feminist discourse would be alleged to come under this category that I would have to say 'no' to this

Pro-women speech is generally accused of being anti-trans and the consequences would be severe if this were confirmed in law

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand: I think we are in dangerous territory: even though women as so often victims of such behaviour, I think we would be more often be accused of it

For example, the number of pejorative terms for women is huge compared to any other group, and it continues to grow. 'TERF' and 'Karen' are only recent examples of ways that people find to abuse (mainly older) women

Women giving biology based opinions on social media have been reviewed somewhat in recent case law, and will be so again when Maya Forstater's case comes up for appeal. I fully expect the tribunal decision in her case to be overturned, but fear that suggestions such as the current one could change that Women's attempts to protect single sex categories and spaces must not risk falling foul of criminal penalties.

I consider civil remedies and regulations to be adequate to protect both women and trans groups, for the most part, and the criminal law should not need to be invoked.

Question 50: Hatred is such a strong word. If offences truly had to prove hatred, this would be something of a protection against frivolous accusations

Question 51: No

Expand: This risks becoming Orwellian in scope.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: I would just repeat my concerns, above

Further criminalisation of strongly held views should only be done extremely carefully

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand: This sounds like a reasonable protection

Question 55 Part 1: Probably, yes.

Question 55 Part 2: I would say yes, all of the above, with the possibility of adding other categories via case law.

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I think this would be useful, because the law would need close monitoring and, as in earlier answers, may warrant other types of societal intervention than merely prosecuting individual offences

Someone to take a holistic view and suggest preventative measures could be essential.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand: If someone is genuinely being mistreated, that is wrong regardless of whether it is related to any currently protected characteristic or any other. Bullying someone for supporting Leyton Orient or being bald or wearing glasses is just bad as bullying someone for being a Methodist or being gay.

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: Freedom to criticise religions and all other ideologies, theories etc should be protected. There cannot reasonably be a right not to be offended.

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: The law should stop pandering to daft fashionable nonsense about 'gender'.

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18: This is just getting increasingly silly and authoritarian Do you really want the police and the courts involved if I make some rude remark about goths, hippies, skinheads or druggies?

Question 19:

Question 20: People must be free to comment on ALL ideas. It is absolutely wrong to try to protect ideas from criticism or mockery

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23: It should not matter whether a crime is motivated by hostility to, say, left handedness or just to the particular person who happens to be left handed Thuggery and bullying are wrong regardless of the motivation.

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: None

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Provided that sex remains the protected characteristic, and not the inclusion of gender. If gender is included, it is likely that something as subjective and prone to change and misidentification will result in malicious use of the Act to police other's thoughts and beliefs. Sex cannot change, which means misuse is limited.

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: Yes.

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No Celibacy or abstinence is not something that needs to be included

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1: Why "presumed to be"? This could lead to someone claiming to be something they are not, or someone being offended on behalf of someone else when no crime has been committed.

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: If you absolutely must include gender, please keep it separate from sex and sexual orientation. If someone chooses to present as a gender different to their sex, they should not receive preferential treatment over those of that sex

Question 9: Yes.

Question 10: No

Question 11: No

Expand: Please keep them separate.

Question 11 Part 2: FGM happens because of sex not gender.

Question 12: It should include both men and women, based on their sex Please be extra clear if you are referring to see that you only use "men/women" and not include "non-binary" as that relates to gender

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Misogyny relates to the denigration of women, not to men who identify as women. I do not agree that it has anything to do with gender

Question 14: No

Expand: Please keep them separate.

Question 15: Yes

Question 16: You would need a legal definition of what an "older" person was Any age should be included.

Question 17: No

Question 18: No.

Question 19: Yes.

Question 20: No

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: I think the word "ongoing" or "sustained" should be included. This would limit the ability to bring spurious cases on the basis of a single word, phrase or individual conversation between two parties, particularly if that occurred online.

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: Only where physical assault or abuse occurs

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sexual orientation, disability and intersex conditions should be included

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: It would be clearer it have to specify each separate protected characteristic

Question 33: Yes.

Question 34: Yes

Question 35: No

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: If a custodial sentence is determined, then male offenders must only be housed in male prisons, regardless of which gender they present as.

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: All.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: Yes.

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Yes.

Question 48: Other (please expand)

Expand: Disability, yes

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex only.

Question 50: Yes

Question 51: Yes

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Disability and sex only

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: Yes.

Question 55 Part 2: peer reviewed material in a scientific or academic journal.

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: Yes

Question 59: No

Question 60: No.

Question 61: Yes.

Question 62: No

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The current requirement of showing both intent and threatening words should be retained. Requiring evidence of only one of these seems designed to make it easier to prosecute this offence without consideration of the effect on free speech. Academic discussions and those with a different life experience from a complainant could be affected.

The risk of being accused of hate speech and being phobic when addressing issues which generate heated debate already affects people's freedom to speak. A masters student was not allowed to pursue a study to understand why some of his gender transitioning clients were regretful of their decision. This was not because it was not an important and potentially life saving piece of work but because the university, probably quite accurately, identified it would be inaccurately called transphobic and generate bad publicity. Mild challenges of inaccurate statements can produce very strong reactions, particularly where the inaccuracies have become accepted 'everyone knows x or y'

Retaining the two stage test means that it is much more likely that only behaviour which justifies criminalisation is prosecuted and that the freedom to discuss these contentious areas is retained, however difficult some may find that

Question 46: No

Expand: These offences are serious criminal charges with significant punishments attached which would have a significant effect on and potentially fundamentally damage a person's ability to earn a living. It is therefore essential that the stronger tests are applied to establish whether the law has been broken. It is right that both intent is proved as well as that genuinely threatening statements were made

Without this someone, for example, who expressed a traditional view of marriage as being a heterosexual union might well find themselves being accused of homophobia and hate-speech by those who take a different view. The law must protect the freedom to discuss contentious issues such as religion, sexual orientation and transgenderism. Recent revelations from the GIDs department at the Tavistock has shown the chilling effect of characterising taking a different view of the evidence as to the best treatment for child patients as 'anti-trans'. If it were simply necessary to show that someone should have known that their words would be experienced as threatening or abusive (which activists in this area might well do) no statement, however unfounded, made by someone with a protected characteristic, could be challenged.

Question 47: No

Expand: There is currently a distinction made between race as a neutral, inherited trait and religion, sexual orientation and transgenderism which are open to debate in a way race is not. The seriousness of a conviction for a hate crime is such that in areas of controversy it should be necessary to show actual threatening conduct. Expression of and discussion of dissenting points of view from those put forward by some of those with these protected characteristics is likely to be identified as hateful and abusive by those who are politically motivated. Without a requirement of demonstrable threatening conduct and only the more subjective 'likely to' test the ability for open discussion will be inhibited to the detriment of freedom of speech.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: These are two totally different issues and should not be linked in this way.

Transgender ideology is a highly controversial area, as can be seen by recent court cases; the government's investigation into the sudden dramatic rise in children presenting with this difficulty; the expressions of concern by current and former employees of GIDs as well as the growing number of those who are now questioning their decision to transition. To include it as a protected characteristic would prevent the legitimate exploration of the best medical and psychological approaches to support children who experience this.

It would also have a devastating effect on those trying to protect legitimately all female spaces as well as those who now regret transitioning but would almost certainly be silenced by any such legislation.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Hate crimes come under the law dealing with public order offences and therefore it is not appropriate to expand these crimes to private spaces. How exactly would this be policed? Who thinks creating a crime which would only come to light through family or friends either deciding to report a potentially criminal conversation or discussing a private conversation with a third party who decides to report it is actually going to help in any way? How exactly would evidence be gathered without putting friends and family (potentially children) in intolerable situations of divided loyalty and creating greater polarisation in our society?

We like to think we live in a liberal democracy with freedom of speech but if that is so we have to be able to tolerate ideas and beliefs different from our own, including that which we find unpleasant or hateful. Yet more legislation will not stop some people holding these views but it will polarise our society even further. Tolerance requires tolerance of views with which we disagree, however distasteful. Criminal law should be reserved for actions and activities which there is a sound reason to prevent.

It is not appropriate to seek to criminalise people's private conversations and a cursory review of the effects of Russian and eastern European communist states' secret police

surveillance activities should be sufficient to deter us from enacting such illiberal, divisive laws.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: In applying these protections to the new offence of stirring up hatred must have robust protections for free speech when applied to controversial areas such as religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity Existing protections covering religion in Section 29 J of the 1986 POA must be extended to cover this new offence and protections provided in Section 29JA of the same act in respect of sexual orientation must also apply to this new offence

Question 52 Part 2: Similar protections should be extended with regard to transgender identity for the reasons I have already put forward. This is an area of considerable disagreement between those who seek to support and treat those experiencing these issues as well as those who have experienced a disconnect between their biology and their sense of themselves. Increasing numbers express deep distress, regret and anger about their treatment and decisions and this legislation must not be used to prevent this urgent and necessary debate continuing. Legislation should specifically allow the use of a person's birth name and pronoun; expression of the belief that there are only two sexes (a scientifically supported statement) and also the freedom to say that someone who is genetically female is not a man and vice versa.

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: These offences are of sufficient seriousness with such significant penalties that the Attorney General's consent should still be required The Attorney General's greater independence is essential in this context. The DPP directs the policies of the CPS and therefore is much less likely to identify errors in their own, or the CPS's thinking and application of these laws It is also important that the Attorney General is answerable to Parliament and that any concerns raised with MPs about the application of these laws, particularly in the area of freedom of speech, can be aired and investigated

Question 55 Part 1: It seems appropriate that these types of settings should be unfettered by these offences and that their full proceedings should be able to be reported.

Question 55 Part 2: Given the considerable debate over some of these areas I think it is essential that fair and accurate reporting of local government meetings and scientific and academic journals should continue. The requirement that only peer reviewed material should be exempted is problematic. However considered and scientific a paper might be, I have already noted that even without legislation it has been possible for transgender ideology to silence dissent amongst professionals who have legitimate concerns about the wisdom and efficacy of new approaches to supporting children and young people This can very easily extend to peer reviewing controversial papers with those with appropriate knowledge to provide peer review being deterred by the possible consequences for their own future and career

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I am not in favour of such an an appointment It adds another layer of oversight and the risk that in order to justify such a role it will create pressure to identify evermore sub groups requiring protection, causing ever greater polarisation and distrust. The law is a very blunt instrument when applied to more and more aspects of our public space and conversation. Our police, courts and legal systems are already overstretched and it seems to me to be a failure of vision if we can see no other way to promote a truly liberal (i e one which allows diversity of belief and views rather than one which only tolerates socially liberal views) society in which we can constructively disagree with one another in ways which do not risk infringing each others' right to freedom of thought and speech. As a Christian I have regularly been told that I have no right to object to, or seek to limit, the speech and actions of others no matter how blasphemous, defamatory and offensive they are The motives behind these sorts of activities are questionable and I would say could qualify as aimed at stirring up contempt, if not hatred for Christians However I am not at all sure that seeking their prosecution will in any way improve the situation and create a society where people take responsibility for how they express their views The Charlie Hebdo incident should give us pause especially as the reprinting of the cartoons to show how 'free' we are totally ignored the fact that they were deeply offensive (just for the sake of it?) to millions of Muslims who would never advocate violence, let alone turn to it themselves

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: n/a

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I would like my response to be anonymous

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: I am not sure because this may muddy debate on characteristics which are issues of choice/conscience and characteristics which are nothing to do with choice ie race.

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: I hear speech about refugees which is derogatory eg they are all 'spongers'

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Other (please expand)

Question 8 Part 1: Whilst no one should be subject to bullying or hatred of any form because of presumptions regarding their gender identity, see below for my concern that well meaning presumptions regarding a child or young person's gender identity may actually limit their life outcomes or lead to outcomes which that person may later regret.

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: There is currently great controversy regarding the support for young people who are exploring whether they are transgender or not. The recent case of Keira Bell revealed a climate where anyone who questioned the diagnosis of a child as transgender was perceived and labelled as being 'anti trans' when in fact they had the best interests of the child at heart. I regularly hear transgender activists in the media describing any debate on this issue as damaging/oppositional, even 'killing someone' This is extreme language and is inaccurately holding one person responsible for someone else's reaction to their words. I am concerned that such people will use hate crime law around transgenderism to shut down honest debate about the best interests of children and young people who may or may not be transgender.

Question 9:

Question 10: As a parent of someone with a hidden disability (autism) I understand that this type of activity can happen how ever can it be a crime to make a mistake about someone's lack of disability? Only in certain circumstances eg in employment law one could require employers to check whether there is a hidden disability behind a perceived incompetence.

Question 11: Yes

Expand: It should be recognised that both men and women , boys and girls can be subject to hatred on the basis of their gender

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: It should include both women and men

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: If this increases protection this is a good thing

Question 18: This might be hard to publicise/retain current definitions

Question 19: If this increases protection this is a good thing

Question 20: See my earlier comments, those people who question the transgender ideology are subject to persecution for their beliefs for example those who disagree with them sending multiple false orders of online deliveries.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand: These crimes are particularly relevant to the unborn female who currently still has protection under the offences against the person act. These are relevant to sex selective abortion

Question 30: Relevant to age (older people subject to fraud)

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32: This is worth investigating

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand: One need only look to twitter to see how polarised some debates have become and how almost any statement in a current debate will be taken by some to be 'threatening'/ 'hate'. We see this also in universities where students unions clamp down on debate for example refusing to allow pro-life groups to hold debates because this 'threatens' reproductive rights. There must be room for disagreement and the suggestion that someone 'ought to have known' that their words were threatening runs the risk of criminalising someone because a group of individuals choose to take offence at their opinion on a controversial matter.

Question 47: No

Expand: There is a difference between protected characteristics that are unchangeable eg race and those which are issues of choice, conscience, may change over the course of a person's life and may be debated. There will always be a need to debate the latter in a free society and therefore the law should be more cautious in setting boundaries on these matters, as Rowan Atkinson once explained.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Please see earlier response regarding the Keira Bell case .

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58: Should include wearing eg monkey suits, throwing bananas

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Dr Seamus Taylor CBE

Name of Organisation: Maynooth University, formerly Crown Prosecution Service of England and Wales

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Other (please state)

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand: Hate Crime law in England and Wales is currently relatively complex and spread across a range of statutes. A single Hate Crime Act can potentially be comprehensive, accessible and simple.

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Basing a Hate Crime law on specified protected characteristics recognises that some identities and some groups are targeted for criminal behaviour based on an aspect of

their identity which is not something that they can or would want alter. It provides a basis in law for responding to these particular harms.

Question 3: Yes

Expand: I think the criteria of demonstrable need, additional harm and suitability are appropriate and are very well deployed as an analytical framework throughout the report

Question 4: I think there is a strong case to be made for including migration and asylum status within the protection on the grounds of the race protected characteristic in Hate Crime law. This may raise issues that need then to be considered in relation to the definition of race in wider equality civil law protections including the Equality Act There is evidence of the existence of anti migrant including and asylum seeker prejudice in England and Wales which can manifest in hate crimes. With regard to the issue of language there is also evidence of prejudice based on language This however merits careful teasing through as to whether race as a protected characteristic can be defined solely by reference to language. It is clearly a proxy indicator of race in many instances

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand: Given that groups are already protected on the basis of religion as a protected characteristic there should be no need to add this further distinction based on sectarianism which is in effect religious discrimination I

Question 7: I consider that asexuality should be included in the definition of sexual orientation for the reasons that you identify of the growing evidence of discrimination on this dimension of sexual orientation

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1: I consider that the understanding and subsequent definitions of gender identity and sex characteristics are evolving and have done so in recent recent years

I think that the definition of gender identity should be revised to include the first three groups of people listed above. I think that intersex people should definitely also be protected. I am somewhat unclear as to whether the intersex characteristic is most appropriately described as a sex characteristic or as a dimension of the gender identity characteristic. Intersex organisations in civil society and experts will be better placed to respond on that aspect of your question

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand: I think this broader title will better address the issues to be protected and for the reasons that I flag in answer to the first part of question 8 above

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: I consider based on my research that you should recommend retaining the current definition of disability used in the CJA 2003 I agree with your point and my own research supports this point that the current definition is broad enough and sufficiently flexible to capture the wide range of impairments that warrant protection

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: I think that your consideration of this matter demonstrates a sophisticated and nuanced understanding of the issues raised. There is very clear evidence of demonstrable need and additional harm. I do not consider there is any valid in principle objection to the protection of gender or sex as a characteristic in hate crime law. However there are based on my earlier experience leading the VAW work at the CPS nationally in England and Wales a range of workability challenges. These challenges make the suitability criterion difficult to fully satisfy. There is the potential for mitigation measures to be taken in the form of carve outs for specific offences. However even deploying carve out mitigation measures can raise further challenges.

Question 11 Part 2: I think the issue of gender specific carve outs needs further further careful research and consideration involving prosecutors involved in prosecuting such crimes and organisations of women directly impacted and those supporting women impacted by these crimes

Question 12: I think in terms of formal equality it may be challenging to have a law that protects one gender or one sex only. However that said we recognise that the overwhelming majority of sex or gender based hate crimes are perpetrated by men against women.

Question 13: Yes

Expand: Hate crime laws tend to protect identity characteristics based on which people experience prejudice and discriminatory targeting rather than protection of named specific prejudices. I think retaining this central feature of hate crime laws are appropriate.

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15: I consider that age should be recognised as a protected characteristic for the purposes of hate crime law. I consider that there is a need for such protection targeting the protection of older people. There is evidence of additional harm arising from such crimes as evidenced in the work of Prof Anthea Tinker et al at Kings College, London University. I think in this section of your consultation report there may be some over reliance on the views of one NGO working in the area of Elder Abuse.

Question 16: The evidence indicates that this is an issue particularly impacting older people. Whilst formal equality may warrant protection on the age grounds, substantive equality I would

conclude on the available warrants protection for older people. This raises the challenging issue of what age groups upwards particularly warrant protection, is it 60 plus? is it 65 plus? etc.

Question 17: The available evidence indicates that female sex workers can experience a particularly virulent form of misogyny based on extreme gender prejudice, social stigma and the imposition of social death. Sex workers are particularly at risk of unreported, unrecognised targeted crimes. There also is the risk of targeted crime against male sex workers which complexifies this form of targeted crime and raises issues of situational and occupational risk alongside gender based targeting. There is a clear need for robust legal protection in these circumstances and there is evidence of significant harms of crimes targeted against sex workers. However there is an issue of suitability as to whether these

essential protections should be reflected in hate crime law or in a separate law which gives parity of consideration to these issues as afforded to hate crime victims. I think of the additional characteristics identified for recognition as a hate crime category the case may be strongest in respect of sex workers.

Question 18: The available evidence indicates that some alternative subcultures can experience targeted hostility, prejudice and crime based on their subculture membership or presumed membership. There is a demonstrable need and evidence of additional harm based on a core aspect of a persons groups identity in crimes targeted towards members of alternative subcultures This warrants legal protection and response However there is a question as to the suitability of Hate crime law to protect such targeted crimes or whether protection should be provided in a separate law which gives parity of consideration to these issues as afforded to hate crime victims

Question 19: The available evidence indicates that some homeless people can experience targeted hostility, prejudice and crime based on their status as homeless

There is a demonstrable need and evidence of additional harm in crimes targeted towards homeless people . This warrants legal protection and response. However there is a question as to the suitability of Hate crime law to protect such targeted crimes or whether protection should be provided in a separate law which gives parity of consideration to these issues as afforded to hate crime victims. to include the homeless in hate crime law risks ossifying homelessness in law when surely the policy goal must always be reduction and elimination of homelessness.

Question 20: I consider that based on what your report describes as the available sporadic and anecdotal evidence together with the workability of including philosophical beliefs as a recognised hate crime category that further work is undertaken before a recommendation is made to include philosophical beliefs in this way.

Question 21: Yes

Expand: Having the same legal test between both legal provisions provides for greater, clarity, simplicity and parity

Question 22: Yes

Expand: I strongly agree. Based both on my research and my earlier senior level policy work on Hate Crime at the CPS in England and Wales I consider the maintaining of the demonstration of hostility legal test of proof to be integral to the prosecutorial success of hate crime law in England and Wales. Removal of this legal test of proof would in my research, policy and practice experience fundamentally undermine the effectiveness of hate crime law in England and Wales I think that your proposal in Question 22 is one of the most important of all your proposals to the continued success of Hate Crime law in practice in England and Wales

Question 23: In this section of your consultation paper from 15 7 to 15 101 you set out a very important set of considerations in relation to both the demonstration limb and motivation limbs of the hostility test This primarily addresses the challenges in effectively prosecuting Disability Hate Crime within the limitations of the existing legal framework Based on my PhD research on Disability Hate Crime in England and Wales when I analysed 548 case files in the CPS across England and Wales and based on my previous senior level policy work on the CPS I think that you have outlined the central issues to be considered . I think that you have identified a range of legal options that can better address Disability Hate Crime.

However I think that some of these legal options are better considered in combination rather than as either or options.

The starting point here is that our model of hate crime law including the listed aggravated offences reflects a model based on racial hostility and racial discrimination devised 20 plus years ago when Disability Hate Crime was not on the policy agenda.

Disability hostility and disability discrimination is different Disabled peoples lives are based on different geographies of segregation , exclusion and mistreatment.

We cannot expect a legal framework conceived with one form of hostility in mind to be able to respond effectively to all other minoritised groups experiences

The problem we face does not lie in the nature of the discrimination faced by disabled people. The problem lies in the limitations of the legal framework we are seeking to apply in this area to Disability Hate Crime

Based on my research where I considered 548 cases labelled as Disability Hate Crime I concluded that in order for Disability Hate Crime to be effectively addressed there is a need for :

1. a combination of an animus model and discriminatory selection test of hate crime limited to Disability Hate Crime given the very specific ways in which disability hostility manifests
2. This broader test could be established either by way of ' by reason of ' / 'because of ' disability or perceived disability or motivated by hostility or prejudice towards the persons disability or perceived disability and or involving demonstration of hostility or prejudice at or around the time of offending based on the persons disability or perceived disability.

This is closest to Option 4 as set out in your Consultation Paper , Limit any broader test to Disability Hate Crime

Having analysed the 548 cases I found that only 6 were successful in terms of having a successful conviction with penalty enhancement recorded on the Hearing Record Sheet 1005 of the successful cases involved the demonstration of disability hostility at or around the time of offending usually involving disability slurs together with a base offence. I simultaneously found that the vast majority of cases including very serious cases up to and including targeted enslavement of disabled people, and murders by reason of people being disabled were not considered as disability hate crimes. I found that in many of these cases there was an undue focus on perceived vulnerability of disabled victims , too frequently explained away in court as a 'senseless crime on a vulnerable victim' In everyone of these cases the vulnerability focus obscures recognition of the targeted selection of the victim because they are disabled

If the legal system does not recognise the need to address the specificities of Disability Hate Crime as suggested above and in part by Walters et al (2017) I am of the considered view that this issue will still challenge the legal system to deliver justice for disabled people

A reality that needs to be acknowledged in respect of disability in hate crime law is that disability fundamentally raises the difference principle in law. Disabled people may more often than others need to be treated differently in order to treat disabled people equitably. We see this in reasonable adjustment provisions and special measures all the time Addressing justice for disabled people requires substantive equality measures beyond formal equal treatment measures If that is recognised and accepted then the proposals above in terms of a combined animus and discriminatory selection model can be considered and addressed.

I think one should take pride in such proposals being broader than other jurisdictions and combining a mix of models. Such proposals will help retain Britain's position at the forefront of law and practice on hate crime

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand:

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: I think that with regard to your first point of guidance above I think the issue should be informed more by need rather than numbers. A particular aggravated offence may affect a small minority numerically but made be significantly impactful for that small number of people affected .

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: I consider that some property and fraud offences should be included within the specified aggravated offences as they are disproportionately represented in hate crimes which target disabled people.

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: I am inclined on reflection upon your very careful well articulated arguments to tend towards agreeing with you although somewhat hesitantly given the over representation of sexual offences in Disability Hate Crimes.

Question 32: I think so as set out in para 16 125 of your Consultation Report

Question 33: I broadly think they are appropriate.

Question 34:

Question 35: This is a challenging question to answer in simple either/ or terms

I think there are benefits to the Sussex Reports Hybrid Model in the main the greater simplicity and coherence it could bring to the law. I also think the Sussex proposals in relation to Disability Hate Crime are appropriate and reflect what is required to make real progress on that strand of hate crime. I think the model you propose has the benefit of significant refinement and expansion with a well established legal framework. I think you could retain elements of the existing framework such as the retention of increased maximum penalties and borrow aspects of the Sussex Reports model such as the ' by reason of ' test of hostility in respect of Disability Hate Crime

Question 36: Yes

Expand: Enhanced sentencing model as you set out provides a flexibility and breadth of application that is difficult to achieve with aggravated offences model alone.

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: I consider that a more flexible approach to characteristic protection would be appropriate which could combine aspects of the current models in Canada and new Zealand.

Question 38 Part 2: I consider that the use of a residual category as in Canada and in New Zealand Id be appropriate and that this could potentially be combined with sentencing guidance.

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: I think this is a very challenging question. However I think that what applies in terms of liability in an off line environment should equally apply in terms of liability in an on line environment. What matters in terms of criminal liability is the substantive content rather the medium for conveying that content.

Question 43 Part 2: I am inclined to think so

Question 44: I think it would be helpful of it were to be defined

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand: I wonder about the inclusion of a test of recklessness.

I think that where a defendant's words or behaviour is proven to be reckless as to their impact on inciting hatred that should be included as an addition to the list cited in 1 to 4 above .

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Yes

Expand: There is available evidence on incitement to hatred both on the grounds of gender identity and on the grounds of disability. See work of Professor Mark Sherry 2019 on disability hate speech

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Yes

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand: It will further enhance the independence of public prosecutions in this area

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: I consider the offence should be extended to cover all protected characteristics.

Question 58: Yes , I consider it should be extended in this regard

Question 59: Yes , I consider it should be so extended.

Question 60: Yes.

Question 61: No

Question 62: Yes , provided they have a clear basis in statute and have realisable legal powers, are adequately resourced and staffed.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Existing characteristics should remain protected

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4: English as a second language should be used in respect of harassment But exempt from job listings where there is a need for good english

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: No, transgenderism should not be included. In matters where gender intersects with sex, it should not supersede sex, and female rights should be protected

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand: Gender is a fluid, ever changing thing. How do you propose that's protected???
Sex, yes Gender no

Question 11 Part 2: FGM is not gender specific or is sex specific. Stop conflating the two.

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Females who are trying to protect their rights are being asked to submit them to appease transwomen. Speaking up about this concern is not “stirring up hatred” as many trans activists allege. It’s not hatred, but this would be used to charge women for simply not buying in to the “trans women are women” trope

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50: Very important point! As I said above, I want trans women to have love, support, dignity, healthcare, etc. The fact that I reject that they are women does not mean I hate them.

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Alex Ferrigno

Name of Organisation: TransActual UK CIC

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Having read the evidence and rationale set out in the consultation paper, we agree that the law should continue to specify protected characteristics.

We believe it is important that certain characteristics, especially those often marginalised in society, are specifically protected in law. As your consultation paper has shown, hate crime legislation has symbolic as well as practical importance, and without certain characteristics being specified this symbolic aspect would be lost entirely. We believe that having these characteristics enshrined in law helps people feel more protected by the legal system and government itself.

Further, we believe that all characteristics should have parity of protection. The current system has led to a hierarchy of hate, whereby certain characteristics have greater protection than others. This hierarchy should be dismantled, such that all characteristics protected under law receive the same level of protection.

Question 3: Yes

Expand: Yes, we believe that these are suitable criteria.

We would like to highlight in particular the proposed criterion of 'additional harm', as it is clear that there is often a severe amount of additional harm caused to victims of hate crime. We would suggest that combatting this harm should be seen as one of the primary reasons for specific hate crime legislation existing.

In support of this, we include the below testimonies, reports and statistics regarding victims of hate crime.

Various testimonies:

"Yes [hate crime against trans sex workers] happens all the time. I know a girl who was beaten up by two [men] and they tried to hold her down and cut her down below. I also know another girl who was held at gunpoint in south east London in her apartment by a young man. He tied her up with electrical cables and asked her for all her money. Her friend came inside and hit the guy over the head with a baseball bat. Luckily, he didn't shoot or anything, he just ran away" Transgender Woman, 26, London

"I experienced a lot of hate, a lot of fear. There was a couple of times where I was followed home and a couple of times where I could feel things being thrown at me. I did not have any desire to be alive at all and I was hospitalised after a number of suicide attempts." Transgender Man, 19, London (source: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-54644266>)

"In May 2019, I was violently assaulted by three men, in an unprovoked attack which was both homophobic and transphobic in nature. Since then, I felt the urgent need to relocate from the area, especially in light of the fact that the case has still not gone to court." Transgender person (source: <https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/victims-face-years-of-delays-to-court-cases>)

Case study of a transgender man (source: http://www.galop.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Hate_Crimes_against_LGBTI_Persons_Training_Manual.pdf)

J is a transgender man [...] He recently made a police report about [...] young men [engaging in antisocial behaviour].

Several days later, two of the young men come to J's door and confront him about the complaint in a threatening way, saying he is 'really a girl' and asking intrusive questions about his genitals. He is shocked and thinks the housing officer must have told them that he is trans.

Over the following weeks he is harassed by the men when he enters and leaves his home. They call him 'disgusting' and throw things at him, and one on occasion someone tries to take his bag. He has rubbish pushed through his letter box, along with a sexually threatening note. The young men repeatedly push the buzzer on his intercom during the night.

J has some history of mental health issues caused by trauma from previous transphobic attacks []. He becomes very anxious about the prospect of violence from the men and has begun self-harming and over-using medication as a means of coping. He has stopped inviting people to his home and now avoids going out [whenever possible].

Case study of a transgender woman (source: http://www.galop.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Hate_Crimes_against_LGBTI_Persons_Training_Manual.pdf):

N is a transgender woman who is currently homeless. She has been staying on a variety of friends' sofas. She went to the home of a man she met on a night out. The man started to sexually assault her, at which point he discovered she is transgender. He repeatedly hit her in the head with an object until she lost consciousness. N escaped when she regained consciousness and called the police. The perpetrator was arrested at the scene and N was taken to hospital.

The following testimonies and analysis are taken from Galop's Online Hate Crime Report 2020 http://www.galop.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Online-Crime-2020_0.pdf:

There were also differences across groups under the LGBT+ umbrella as transgender victims were more likely to experience online abuse (93%) compared to cisgender victims (70%) Page 5

"He would post photos of these trans women from before and after transition, and publicly invite people to post abuse at them for being trans and how they look" Page 11

"As a trans woman online, [people] have called me (and often all trans women) rapists and paedophiles hundreds of times. The worst incidents involved threats to report me to the police on fabricated charges as "a man and a rapist" Page 14

"It's led to me having doubts about my identity and feeling guilty for being a trans man. It also made me feel gross and ashamed" Galop on the after effects of online abuse, Page 17

"I have read a lot of nasty hate comments directed at trans people in general. I feel like I can't click on any post online for there is so much hate and making fun of trans, which hurts so much" Page 21

The following testimonies are taken from the Leicester Hate Crime Project <https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/fc-full-report>:

"It's the name-calling and things like that. You never really know with people how far they would go and how fast things can escalate. What could be somebody asking a question, or name calling, or anything like that, can easily turn to violence in less than a minute. It isolates you." Transgender Woman

"The most dangerous part of my daily life is using washrooms in public places like restaurants and bars and pubs and hotels, clubs and all these things. That is really, really dangerous for me." Transgender Woman

"If I went to the police to report every single incident, I wouldn't be doing anything else. I would be spending half my day being insulted and humiliated. Then the other half a day I would spend in the police station reporting things." Transgender Woman

Home Office Statistics:

2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	% change
2015/2016 to 2019/20					

Race:

2015/16: 45,440

2016/17: 58,294

2017/18: 64,829

2018/19: 72,041

2019/20: 76,070

% change 2015/16 to 2019/20: 67

Sexual orientation:

2015/16: 6,700

2016/17: 8,569

2017/18: 10,670

2018/19: 13,314

2019/20: 15,835

% change 2015/16 to 2019/20: 136

Transgender:

2015/16: 820

2016/17: 1,195

2017/18: 1,615

2018/19: 2,183

2019/20: 2,540

% change 2015/16 to 2019/20: 210

Total number of offences:

2015/16: 57,676

2016/17: 74,967

2017/18: 86,254

2018/19: 97,446

2019/20: 105,090

% change 2015/16 to 2019/20: 82

(source: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hate-crime-england-and-wales-2019-to-2020/hate-crime-england-and-wales-2019-to-2020>)

Key here is the fact that, overall, reported hate crime has grown by 8% in the last year, while hate crime against transgender people has risen by 16% in that same period

Further, reported hate crime against transgender people has grown by 210% since 2015/16. This figure alone is horrific, and we urge you to take this into account and ensure that any legislation has the aim of reducing this figure

As you will note from our full response, we are concerned about the way in which marginalised individuals/those with multiple protected characteristics face increased

discrimination. While the above statistics do not show how many people are both trans and BAME, or trans and not heterosexual, it is important that you are aware of the intersection of these characteristics and the way in which, in particular, BAME individuals face even higher rates of violence and discrimination amongst the trans and LGBTQ communities.

Any changes to the law must be mindful of this and ensure that those with multiple protected characteristics are adequately protected. A necessary starting point is that such information is recorded for all hate crime incidents.

Galop's report on transphobic hate crime (source: <http://www.galop.org.uk/transphobic-hate-crime-report-2020/>):

- 80% of trans people have experienced hate crime in the last 12 months;
- 25% of trans people have experienced physical assault or threat of physical assault;
- 70% of victims felt that the police could not help them

Key takeaways from Galop's report are that the majority of trans people have experienced hate crime due to their identity

Further, only a very small percentage of trans people report hate crimes at all. This is because many trans people do not believe that the police can or will help them. Even when a report does progress, the victims must then navigate further misunderstanding and prejudices with prosecution lawyers, magistrates or judges, and potentially juries. These problems are broadly caused by a lack of proper training given to police and magistrates and the resultant institutional and societal transphobia, which in turn leads to a lack of trust amongst the trans community.

As such, in line with our responses to questions 2 and 8, we are strongly supportive of all forms of hate crime being given equal protection under the law, and transgender people being afforded the protection from hate crime necessary in the current climate.

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: We suggest that asexual people should be consulted specifically on this point. We do not presume to speak for them, but it is possible that they may see asexuality as sitting outside of sexual orientation entirely

However, were someone to be a victim of crime motivated by their being asexual, we believe that they should be given equal protection under the law as other minorities who already have, or are proposed to have, their characteristics specified and protected under hate crime law.

Question 8: Other (please expand)

Question 8 Part 1: We agree with the first three proposed inclusions, namely: people who are or are presumed to be transgender; people who are or are presumed to be non binary; people who cross dress (or are presumed to cross dress)

We are supportive of the word 'presumed' being used in particular. We believe that such a definition would assist in ensuring that all crimes motivated by hate towards transgender and gender-diverse people are covered by any proposed legislation

We believe that this would particularly assist in extending protection to non-binary people and others who may be targeted specifically for the reason that their appearance or presumed sex and/or gender does not appear 'normal' to the perpetrator

We are supportive of the inclusion of people who cross dress or are presumed to cross dress. We believe that this will, as above, ensure greater likelihood of protection to those who are non-binary or otherwise gender-diverse in their appearance. We believe that this will also assist those who do not subscribe to particular labels in still being able to seek protection under the law

Regarding the fourth proposed inclusion, we suggest that intersex people should be consulted. While there is overlap in our communities, and as discussed it is the presumption or perception which is often more relevant to the phenomenon of hate crime, intersex status is as distinct from transgender or non binary status as sexual orientation is. Per the Intersex Society of North America, "Intersex is a general term used for a variety of conditions in which a person is born with a reproductive or sexual anatomy that doesn't seem to fit the typical definitions of female or male." This is distinct from gender identity. We do not presume to speak for the community, but it is possible that they would not wish to be included under the umbrella term "transgender" and should instead be given their own category. This recommendation pertains to sensitivity and symbolism, rather than legal concerns.

Regardless of whether intersex people would wish to be included under the umbrella characteristic of "transgender" or not, were someone to be a victim of crime motivated by their being intersex, we believe that they should be given equal protection under the law as other minorities who already have, or are proposed to have, their characteristics specified and protected under hate crime law

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Regarding the proposed broader title for the category of "transgender, non binary or intersex", we are broadly in agreement with this proposal. We emphasise our points above regarding the inclusion of intersex people in the same category as trans and non-binary people.

Further, we cannot see a single clear and suitable term which could unite these groups without the legal terminology being at odds with the self-identity of members of all of the minorities being grouped. These are distinct but overlapping communities. Some but not all members of each would identify as transgender or non binary, and each community contains people who would not wish to be identified as such. Therefore, we support the wider title of the category which will allow for greater and easier recognition of some of the different groups within our community

Experience from, for example, the GRA and Equality Act 2010 indicate that, provided laws remain functional, the trans community is less concerned by the symbolic aspects of categorisation and more with the practical aspects of equal protection under the law.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Regarding whether sex or gender should be a protected characteristic:

We agree that people should be protected from discrimination and hate with regards to the following (non-exhaustive):

- o Employment opportunities;
- o Healthcare access and treatment;
- o Reproductive rights;
- o Housing;
- o Daily enjoyment of life

We note that the wording used implies that perhaps the two are interchangeable. While there should not be a legal distinction made between sex and gender in this context, they do represent different and often emotive concepts and the choice of one or the other may have consequences for the interpretation, enforcement, and symbolism of the law.

Therefore, we support the use of the proposal in question 14 of a unified category of "sex or gender" (or, as we suggest, "sex and/or gender"), as opposed to separate categories of "sex" and "gender". This would mirror the bundling of the separate characteristics of transgender, non binary and crossdressing into one functional category as discussed in question 8.

It is our experience of anti LGBT+ hate crime that at a phenomenon level, perpetrators do not target or abuse with a distinct focus on sex but not gender, or on gender but not sex. We cannot understand hate crime through a lens of only gender or only sex, and therefore should not create this binary or attempt to prosecute hate crime using it. Sex and gender are mutually co-constitutive ways of understanding a person, and the law should reflect that.

Whether the proposed edits to the phraseology are taken on board or not, we agree that this should be a protected characteristic.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: We cannot see the benefit in limiting hate crime protection to one group in particular within any specified characteristic. While it is clear that hate crime targeting women is far more prevalent than hate crime targeting men, there does not seem to be any clear benefit to not providing universal protection for all victims of such crime.

The consultation proposes including non binary people within hate crime under the definition of transgender, and yet here refers to only men or women. We would propose that non binary people should be included in any protection for people who suffer hate crime as a result of their gender and/or sex or presumed gender and/or sex. For this reason also, we would reject any limitations of protection to only certain groups within any characteristic.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Further to our answer to question 12 above, we reiterate that we cannot see any benefit in limiting the proposed protection further within certain categories. We are concerned that such limitation to "women" or "misogyny" would confuse and problematise the path to recourse for trans people who may be perceived to be cisgender women by a perpetrator but do not identify as such.

However, short of a more universal approach, hate crime law targeting “misogyny” may offer wider protection to a greater number of people than the category of “women”. This would ensure protection for, amongst others, trans and non binary people who do not identify with the term women, but regardless face hate due to misogyny and misogynistic views of their identities.

Question 14: Yes

Expand: In line with our answer to question 11 above, we are of the view that “gender” and “sex” are mutually and intrinsically linked ways of understanding a person and not terms which should have legal distinction between them

Practically, and for the purpose of hate crime laws, it must be understood that when hate crime is motivated by transphobia, misogyny, or homophobia, it is not important to the perpetrator the specifics of the victim’s gender or sex. The perpetrator is viewing them through a lens of hate and therefore to choose between one of “gender” or “sex” would lessen protection under the proposed changes to the law and increase the difficulties already faced by those seeking protection under hate crime legislation

As such, we strongly welcome the proposal of a unified category which would not force a choice between the two in the legislation

It is clear that both “sex” and “gender” are capable of meeting the criteria proposed in question 3 of the consultation, however as previously noted: “While there should not be a legal distinction made between sex and gender in this context, they do represent different and often emotive concepts and the choice of one or the other words may have consequences for the interpretation, enforcement and symbolism of the law.” As such we strongly support the proposal of “sex and/or gender”; we believe this would be the most flexible, functional and future-proof category.

Further to our answer to question 12 above, we wish to make it clear that we believe non binary people should be protected under such a category too, and that neither “sex” nor “gender” should have any binary limitations to their reading under the law.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: We respond to this question due to the disproportionate number of trans people who are sex workers and because the criteria proposed under question 3 are clearly and strongly met for the category of “sex workers”

As mentioned in our answer to question 2, we are concerned about the way in which marginalised individuals/those with multiple protected characteristics face increased discrimination. Sex workers are one of the most marginalised groups within society, and as such face increased levels of violence and harm on a daily basis. The law should work towards a more intersectional understanding so that these people can be protected

We believe it is important not just that sex workers are protected as a specific category under the proposed hate crime laws, but the laws and rationale of this intersectionality are communicated to law enforcement, relevant public bodies and the general UK population

Regarding intersections, it must be understood that there is a difference of risk associated with different intersections of hate. Some intersections have massive spikes in increased risk, and it is for this reason that sex workers are often the victims of hate crime, and in particular Black trans sex workers, who are at the intersection of the following forms of hate:

misogyny, racism and transphobia. This intersection has one of the biggest risk spikes and this is what leads to Black trans sex workers being impacted more than any other group of society and leads to the shockingly high levels of violence they face

The criteria proposed under question 3 are clearly and strongly met for the category of “sex workers”.

To evidence the demonstrable need and harm caused by a hatred of “sex workers”, please see the below testimony.

Testimony:

"Oh I've had a few instances with work, I once had two guys try and push their way into my apartment, I screamed my head off and managed to push the door closed, another time a client paid then after took out a knife and told me if I didn't give the money back he would stab me, I'm extremely selective with who I see these days because of it" Transgender Woman, 42, London

"Yes [hate crime against trans sex workers] happens all the time... I know a girl who was beaten up by two [men] and they tried to hold her down and cut her down below I also know another girl who was held at gunpoint in south east London in her apartment by a young man He tied her up with electrical cables and asked her for all her money Her friend came inside and hit the guy over the head with a baseball bat. Luckily, he didn't shoot or anything, he just ran away" Transgender Woman, 26, London

Question 18: In line with our answers to questions above, we are of the broad view that universalism and a widening of protections will be a good thing.

We would suggest that an “alternative subcultures” category could be recognised, so long as each individual subculture also met the three criteria for protection under the law as proposed in question 3 of the consultation paper.

However, we do note the discussions within the paper regarding the law in New South Wales, which has at point been held to be so wide as to include paedophiles a clearly perverse result and entirely against the spirit of the law. We share concerns that there is scope for similar bad faith attempts at invoking such a protection.

We would suggest in particular that no group or individual should be protected if they discriminate against or cause harm to others, as this could allow them to then seek enhanced legal protection themselves. As such, any right to a certain subculture being protected by law should stop at the point where the individual or the subculture seeks to or in fact does inflict harm on others.

This is of particular concern to us, given the rise in transphobic hate crime by various groups who might seek to have themselves recognised as “alternative subcultures”, and/or to pursue vexatious and bad faith litigation against the trans community.

The trans community needs to be guarded against any new legislation being exploited for transphobia.

The case of Maya Forstater (Forstater v CGD Europe and Others) is a recent example of such bad faith litigation The Claimant in this case argued that she had been the subject of direct discrimination on the basis of a protected characteristic Specifically, it was argued that her belief that ‘biological males cannot be women’ was a belief that should be protected from discrimination under the characteristic of ‘religion or belief’ While the Employment Tribunal Judge in the matter found her views “not worthy of respect in a democratic society”,

we wish to point out the possibility of such vexatious claims if the proposed changes to hate crime legislation come into force.

Further, we have already seen explicit claims from transphobic hate groups and individuals that trans people's existence itself is harmful to their beliefs. In *The Transsexual Empire* (Janice Raymond, 1980), a foundational text for many strands of the anti trans hate movement, it was famously written "that the very existence of trans women is an abuse that by existing, they rape real women". While this would clearly be a perverse view to be protected and should also be found unworthy of respect in a democratic society, we wish to emphasise our concern regarding this and suggest that any definition for the category of "alternative subcultures" must specifically set out why such views and/or groups would not be protected under this proposed category

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand: We agree with this proposal with regards to extending the protection of aggravated offences to the proposed characteristics

As above, we suggest that intersex people should be consulted. We do not presume to speak for them, but it is possible that they would not wish to be included under the umbrella term, "transgender", as gender identity and intersex status are entirely distinct characteristics, as described in our answer to question 8.

Regardless of whether intersex people would wish to be included under the umbrella characteristic of transgender or not, were someone to be a victim of crime motivated by their being intersex, we believe that they should be given equal protection under the law as other minorities who already have, or are proposed to have, their characteristics specified and protected under hate crime law

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Yes

Expand: We agree with this proposal entirely. We strongly believe in giving parity of protection for transgender identity and disability in the context of stirring up hatred offences. There is no justification for not including these categories while including race, religion and sexual orientation. Further, this addresses a real need given the frequency with which transphobic campaign groups disseminate material which has the intent and/or effect of risking public order and the safety of transgender people.

In particular, we wish to point to the well publicised incident in Manchester when anti trans campaigners spent an evening canvassing taxi drivers and 'gangs of lads' in Manchester. This is the type of incident which we hope would be covered under such stirring up offences, as we imagine it would be were it targeted towards those of a certain race or religion.

As set out in our response to question 2, we believe that all characteristics should have parity of protection. The current system has led to a hierarchy of hate, whereby certain characteristics have greater protection than others. This hierarchy should be dismantled, such that all characteristics protected under law receive the same level of protection.

We are glad to see this finally being proposed and can see no reason for the current hierarchical system to remain in place.

We understand that there is likely to be a 'carve out' to allow for discussion to continue taking place in the interests of freedom of speech. We would be happy to be involved in any discussions or consultation regarding such a carve out and believe it is important that any such clause(s) are drafted with the transgender community's input.

Question 49: Yes

Expand: We agree with this proposal entirely.

As set out in our response to question 2, we believe that all characteristics should have parity of protection. The current system has led to a hierarchy of hate, whereby certain characteristics have greater protection than others. This hierarchy should be dismantled, such that all characteristics protected under law receive the same level of protection.

We are glad to see this finally being proposed and can see no reason for the current hierarchical system to remain in place.

We wish to reiterate our responses to questions 11 and 14, and in particular the following portions:

- We support the use of the proposal in question 14 of a unified category of "sex or gender" (or, as we suggest, "sex and/or gender"), as opposed to separate categories of "sex" and "gender". This would mirror the bundling of the separate characteristics of transgender, non binary and crossdressing into one functional category as discussed in question 8.
- Further to our answer to question 12 above, we wish to make it clear that we believe non binary people should be protected under such a category too, and that neither "sex" nor "gender" should have any binary limitations to their reading under the law.

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: I think the whole concept of hate crime is completely flawed and would all such legislation to be removed

Question 2: No

Expand: See earlier response

Question 3: No

Expand: See earlier

Question 4: Migration and asylum status are even less justifiable than the existing ones

Question 5: No

Expand: See earlier

Question 6: No

Expand: Sectarian is not religious

Question 7: Asexuality is a made up concept.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: See earlier

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: See earlier

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Yes if necessary

Question 10: See earlier

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: No we have too many laws on this area as it is

Question 12: As a woman I do not want hate crime protection, I just want protection from crime. I would like the police and the judiciary to focus on that, not hate crime.

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand: Biological sex is the only category that should be used

Question 15: See earlier

Question 16: If you are going to include such ludicrous categories, of course it would have to be all ages not just older people The question shows how leading this consultation is

Question 17: No, see earlier

Question 18: See earlier

Question 19: See earlier

Question 20: See earlier

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: This is subjective, as is all this type of legislation. In the real world not inhabited by the academics, people are really not interested in this

Question 23: You cannot prove what a crime is motivated by.

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand: Inflammatory who decides that? It is censorship by another name

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: None

Question 43 Part 2: No

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Again, you are trampling all over free speech This will be mis used by people who just do not want unpleasant views heard.

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This is an outrageous proposal. In your own home you should be free to speak however you wish full stop

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2: Well how surprising that local government, or academics should be excluded, but not the man in the street The middle class educated elite need to reflect what the democratic voters would like to see and it isn't this. These proposals have not appeared in any party political manifesto, why have they surfaced and at whose instigation?

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: Leave football supporters to chant. Why is there no proposal to target, say, game shooting, at which I have personally heard some very interesting views on women and Jews.

Question 58: Missile throwing is already covered in legislation. Gestures should be left alone

Question 59: Why are these proposals focussing on football matches?

Question 60: See earlier

Question 61:

Question 62: Absolutely not. It is the last thing we need.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: No because the list would be never ending and involve a myriad of distinctions

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: This would be obsessive. How do you know if someone is asexual?

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: No. The criminal law already covers that a perpetrator must take his victim as he finds him. If you intend to aggravate the offence by imputing that the perpetrator who was unaware that the victim was disabled was therefore automatically motivated to commit the crime because the victim was disabled,, it would be nonsensical and create inequality before the law.

Question 11: No

Expand: This would encourage prejudice by the state and a presumption that any act or statement was motivated by virtue of someone's sex or gender.

Question 11 Part 2: These offences are already gender specific so no change needed

Question 12: Yes

Question 13: No

Expand: Women are half the population and making this discrimination a fundamental legal principle would lead to more adverse discrimination of women and imply a lack of agency in the modern woman

Question 14: No

Expand: This is too wide and vague in practice.

Question 15: What age do you intend to protect? All adults of sound mind should be regarded as adults.

This could pose the danger of depriving senior citizens of their equal rights and agency.

Question 16: On a scale of 0 to 100 years for the supposed life span for humans, how would this work.

It would include everyone.

Question 17: No On the basis that sex work is a choice unless you propose that society recognises a form of sex slavery. Even then, this is not something society should want as it is a crime.

Why should it be any different from any other trade

Question 18: No.

Question 19: No as there are too many variables regarding homeless people. Some are anti social and this would not be justice

Question 20: No. This restricts freedom of speech and thought.

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: If the proof is actual and not presumed or inferred

Question 23: Yes You need to establish clear proof of mens rea

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: This is tantamount to social engineering and social design by the few. Society is not broken so doesn't need fixing

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: This question has too many alternatives for one answer.

I agree with consistency in criminal law is desirable but the other scenarios have too many variables.

Question 27: No

Expand: This would undermine free speech. No one would know what they could say or write.

Creativity would be stifled. Political debate would cease as would justice.

Question 28: No

Expand: This is excessive. What higher penalties do you propose? Gulags?

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: This is completely inconsistent.

Question 30: No.

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: No. This is hair splitting and confusing.

Question 33: Yes

Question 34: No. The Defendant has to be proved to be guilty of the base offence in the first place.

Question 35: Don't know

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: No as this is too vague and lacks objectivity

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: This is too subjective and is already covered by incitement laws.

Question 41: No

Expand: No. This is too vague. What is the definition of inflammatory? Subjective.

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: If the platform knowingly and intentionally promotes or publishes material which it actually knows or ought reasonably to have known was illegal under actual law in its jurisdiction

Question 43 Part 2: No

Question 44: This does require an objective definition.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: This would be absurd and amount to a thought crime. If someone were to say something which is innocent, are you proposing that the law can step in to infer criminal thoughts in the speaker's mind?

Question 46: No

Expand: The court has to find intent Mens Rea

Question 47: No

Expand: The law needs to recognise intent.

Question 47 Part 2: If the law will provide a clear definition of threatening and abusive in this context, it could be considered.

The English language is now so abused that these words have no clear meaning. In matters of devising criminal law, is not absolute certainty a necessity?

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand: This is too far reaching.

Question 50: Maybe

Question 51: No

Expand: This is policing the private space and private thoughts. Abominable consequences could arise from this change in the law. Such measures seek to destroy society and undermine private relations and space

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: I don't share your view of a dystopian society

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: Yes. Freedom of speech must endure along with parliamentary privilege. If the courts are gagged, how could justice be served?

Question 55 Part 2: Yes No current legal activity should be gagged

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59: No. It is covered already by existing law.

Question 60: No

Question 61: No opinion

Question 62: No. This would be a witchfinder general.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: If one of the two, then sex

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Women, as they are the disadvantaged group

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex If gender is included, and gender can be chosen (or identified as), it becomes meaningless

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: Yes

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Yes

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: I don't agree with that "Hate Crimes" should constitute an offence due to their possible contradictions with freedom of speech

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4: No, we already have other laws that protect individuals from threat of, or actual, violence. Again, marking something a "hate crime" may sound agreeable, but in practice there are very real concerns surrounding enforcement and conflict with freedom of speech.

Question 5: No

Expand: Religion is a philosophy, and should be open to discussion or ridicule as with any other personal belief. It should hold no special status.

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Neither agree nor disagree

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Transgenderism is very much up for debate and this may be stifled by its inclusion in legislation such as this.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: It shouldn't be included.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Neither agree nor disagree

Question 10: No. The Public Order Act, amongst others, is already sufficient. Why do the motivations matter?

Question 11: No

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: This does not require being part of "hate crime" laws. It is merely putting a hat on a hat when there is other legislation that would cater for such an offence

Question 12: If legislation is produced there is no question that it should be egalitarian. Everyone should be protected

Question 13: No

Expand: I completely disagree with unequal application of legislation.

Question 14: No

Expand: This categorisation is not scientific fact. It is very much up for debate. Hate Crime legislation should not be used to corner it.

Question 15: No Again this is a possible block to freedom of speech

Question 16: No, I disagree with the entire concept.

Question 17: No. There is already legislation that caters for assault etc.

Question 18: No, again this is a slippery slope which may impinge on freedom of speech

Question 19: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech.

Question 20: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech

Question 23: We already have legislation that protects against these offences. Why is "hostility or prejudice" relevant, if intent is there?

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech.

Question 26: No

Expand: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech

Particularly given the mobilisation of activist groups on social media "Hate Crimes" may appear more prevalent than they actually are.

Question 27: No

Expand: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech.

Question 28: No

Expand: They are already catered for in existing legislation

Question 29: No

Expand: They are already catered for in existing legislation.

Question 30: No, they are already catered for in existing legislation

Question 31: No

Expand: No, they are already catered for in existing legislation.

Question 32: No, this is already catered for in existing legislation

Question 33: Neither agree nor disagree.

Question 34: The base offence is all that really matters and sentencing should reflect that.

Question 35: I don't agree with "hate crime" laws due to possible impingement on freedom of speech

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech and create a bias. The offence itself is all that matters.

Question 38 Part 1: I don't agree with defining characteristics for this purpose

Question 38 Part 2: I would ask that existing legislation be used as much as possible rather than obsessing over "hate" specifically, due to the implications for free debate in the UK

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech.

Question 41: No

Expand: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech

Question 42: No

Expand: This should not even be a consideration due to possible conflicts with freedom of speech

Question 43 Part 1: Never

Question 43 Part 2: I disagree with the concept of this.

Question 44: No, this shouldn't even be a consideration due to possible impingements on freedom of speech.

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1: This shouldn't be an offence due to possible impingements on freedom of speech.

Question 46: No

Expand: There is already legislation which can cater for this. The "Hate crime" element is unnecessary.

Question 47: No

Expand: I disagree with the concept of this because of implications towards freedoms of speech.

Question 47 Part 2: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech.

Question 48: No

Expand: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech.

Question 49: No

Expand: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech

Question 50: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech.

Question 51: No

Expand: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand: I disagree with the concept of "hate crime" legislation

Question 52 Part 2: No, this may impinge on freedom of speech

Question 53: I disagree with the concept of "hate crime" legislation.

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand: I don't think anyone should have this level of authority on such subjective matters

Question 55 Part 1: It should.

But then "hate" shouldn't be an offence in itself

Question 55 Part 2: I disagree with the concept of "hate crime" legislation.

Question 56: No

Expand: Who is defines what is "racist"?

Question 57: No

Expand: No, who defines these offences?

Question 57 Part 2: Who is defines these transgressions? This legislation is far too subjective and is going to be a real problem to enforce.

Question 58: This is already covered in existing legislation.

Question 59: Neither agree nor disagree

Question 60: Again woolly and subjective definitions. It's a 'no' from me.

Question 61: Who defines what is "racist" or "indecent"?

Question 62: Absolutely not. This is a self perpetuating role Hugely subjective and potentially extremely problematic.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: UK citizen

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Other (please expand)

Expand: I have no legal expertise. I do not have sufficient detail on what the current provisions are.

Question 2: No

Expand: Why no protected characteristic of sex? Females face misogyny throughout their lives, from a very young age, including verbal and physical assault. Hate for females is no less damaging than hate directed at other groups in society. More than 2 women per week are victims of femicide.

With a current consultation on violence against women and girls this seems especially relevant at this time

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: Agree the criteria but:

Why no protected characteristic of sex? Females face misogyny throughout their lives, from a very young age, including verbal and physical assault. Hate for females is no less damaging than hate directed at other groups in society. More than 2 women per week are victims of femicide

With a current consultation on violence against women and girls this seems especially relevant at this time

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Why no protected characteristic of sex? Females face misogyny throughout their lives, from a very young age, including verbal and physical assault. Hate for females is no less damaging than hate directed at other groups in society. More than 2 women per week are victims of femicide

With a current consultation on violence against women and girls this seems especially relevant at this time.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Why no protected characteristic of sex? Females face misogyny throughout their lives, from a very young age, including verbal and physical assault. Hate for females is no less damaging than hate directed at other groups in society. More than 2 women per week are victims of femicide.

With a current consultation on violence against women and girls this seems especially relevant at this time

Question 8 Part 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Why no protected characteristic of sex? Females face misogyny throughout their lives, from a very young age, including verbal and physical assault. Hate for females is no less damaging than hate directed at other groups in society. More than 2 women per week are victims of femicide

With a current consultation on violence against women and girls this seems especially relevant at this time.

Question 8 Part 3: Why no protected characteristic of sex? Females face misogyny throughout their lives, from a very young age, including verbal and physical assault. Hate for females is no less damaging than hate directed at other groups in society. More than 2 women per week are victims of femicide

With a current consultation on violence against women and girls this seems especially relevant at this time.

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: This is unclear to me:

Does this mean a SINGLE characteristic of "sex OR gender".

OR

Does this mean 2 separate characteristics, "sex" OR "gender"? If the latter they cannot be conflated, they are entirely separate things.

Sex is a binary physical state which we are born into

Gender cannot be accurately (or legally) defined, it is about how a person "presents" or how they "feel".

Question 11 Part 2: This is unclear to me:

Does this mean a SINGLE characteristic of "sex OR gender".

OR

Does this mean 2 separate characteristics, "sex" OR "gender"? If the latter they cannot be conflated, they are entirely separate things.

Sex is a binary physical state which we are born into.

Gender cannot be accurately (or legally) defined, it is about how a person "presents" or how they "feel".

Question 12: This is unclear to me:

Does this mean a SINGLE characteristic of "sex OR gender"

OR

Does this mean 2 separate characteristics, "sex" OR "gender"? If the latter they cannot be conflated, they are entirely separate things

Sex is a binary physical state which we are born into.

Gender cannot be accurately (or legally) defined, it is about how a person "presents" or how they "feel"

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand: This is unclear to me:

Does this mean a SINGLE characteristic of "sex OR gender".

OR

Does this mean 2 separate characteristics, "sex" OR "gender"? If the latter they cannot be conflated, they are entirely separate things.

Sex is a binary physical state which we are born into

Gender cannot be accurately (or legally) defined, it is about how a person "presents" or how they "feel".

Question 14: No

Expand: No. Sex and gender are entirely separate things.

Sex is a binary physical state which we are born into

Gender cannot be accurately (or legally) defined, it is about how a person "presents" or how they "feel". Some men are perceived as feminine, some women are considered masculine. It is hugely variable

The hate that women experience is not anything they "identify" into.

Question 15: Yes.

Question 16: Limit to older people

Not aware of any examples of hate based on youth. Many directed at older people.

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: No detailed legal expertise so no opinion

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: No detailed legal expertise so no opinion

Question 23: No detailed legal expertise so no opinion

Question 24: Other (please expand)

Expand: No detailed legal expertise so no opinion

Question 25: No

Expand: Why no protected characteristic of sex? Females face misogyny throughout their lives, from a very young age, including verbal and physical assault. Hate for females is no less damaging than hate directed at other groups in society. More than 2 women per week are victims of femicide

With a current consultation on violence against women and girls this seems especially relevant at this time.

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 27: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 28: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 29: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 30:

Question 31: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 37: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 40: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Reads as subjective / open to interpretation

Question 46: No

Expand: Subjective

Question 47: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: No.

Why single out this subset when no protected characteristic of sex?

Females face misogyny throughout their lives, from a very young age, including verbal and physical assault. Hate for females is no less damaging than hate directed at other groups in society. More than 2 women per week are victims of femicide.

With a current consultation on violence against women and girls this seems especially relevant at this time.

Question 49: No

Expand: No. Sex and gender are entirely separate things.

Sex is a binary physical state which we are born into.

Gender cannot be accurately (or legally) defined, it is about how a person "presents" or how they "feel". Some are perceived as feminine, some women are considered masculine. It is hugely variable.

The hate that women experience is not anything they "identify" into.

Question 50:

Question 51: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 52 Part 2: No. Sex and gender are entirely separate things.

Sex is a binary physical state which we are born into.

Gender cannot be accurately (or legally) defined, it is about how a person "presents" or how they "feel". Some are perceived as feminine, some women are considered masculine. It is hugely variable.

The hate that women experience is not anything they "identify" into.

Question 53:

Question 54: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 57: Other (please expand)

Expand: No legal expertise, no opinion

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: My views are for general consideration as part of this consultation and are not intended to fuel any contra debate. If they do then perhaps it will highlight where the real issues are, that of freedom of thought and expression which this issue is likely to curtail to the detriment of our democracy.

Question 1: No

Expand: Current laws are clear enough, and there is a great danger in lumping together the important issues of Race and Disability with other matters in which there is and should remain the freedom to disagree, such as that of Transgender Ideology

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: See Q1

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Freedom of expression remains a long established and hard fought treasure in our highly thought of democracy and must not be squandered in seeking to appease those who seek to enforce their opinions through forceful means, silencing any reasonable opportunity for debate.

Question 46: No

Expand: A person's settled and carefully expressed belief should not automatically be taken as likely to stir up hatred

Question 47: No

Expand: A sensible distinction needs to be maintained between the various categories.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: This category is a very different one.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Where is privacy? A person would have no protection against alternative-motivated complaints.

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Freedom of expression on issues like these remains of great importance

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: The greater the independence, the better

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Because each of the protected characteristics groups face different types of hate and therefore need the relevant/right response to those

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: Yes Migrant groups and asylum seekers are likely to experience hate crime and therefore need to know they are protected in law.

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand: The broader title allows for non-binary and intersex people to feel acknowledged and protected.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: Sex is currently not a protected characteristic and yet misogyny is endemic. Women need further protection from abuse, harm and violence directed at them for purely being female

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Women only. Figures show that women are victims of violence and abuse on a disproportionate level and so it's vital that they are allowed the same protection in law as the other protected characteristics.

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: Sex workers are likely to experience harm, violence and abuse, so yes it should be recognised

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I would support this.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Not Answered

Confidentiality Request: N/A

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: I wholeheartedly agree that gender and sex are characteristics that URGENTLY need protection. As a woman, I find it frightening that myself and my friends/family/colleagues are not currently protected by hate crime law because of our gender. It is incredibly frustrating and disheartening to repeatedly hear stories from other women as victims of sexual harassment who are time and time again told to report the offence to the police, only to be told that sexual harassment and misogyny is not currently considered a hate crime. I have heard countless stories like this, and so has every other woman I know. I personally believe that this shouldn't even be up for discussion, gender and sex should already be a protected characteristic for the purposes of hate crime law, and quite frankly I find it disgusting that we are still having the conversation in 2020 that women deserve to be treated as equals to men, and that includes feeling safe and being protected by the law.

Question 11 Part 2: I understand that obviously when reporting a hate crime there is a certain amount of context needed, in order for the crime to be processed and dealt with accordingly. However, I think it is important to note that there is a line on what is considered necessary for police investigation, and what can be considered as further harassment. It is vital that whenever a woman reports a gender-based hate crime (or anyone for that matter) that they are believed and trusted that something negative has happened to them; and that they are not doubted and questioned further due to the common misconception that women are lying in order to receive attention. To summarise: yes it is important to establish a base level of context in order to understand the severity of the hate crime, but also: believe women

Question 12: The vast majority of gender-based hate crime are against women, therefore it is only logical that gender-based hate crime protection serves to protect women. The reason many people will be filling out this consultation is out of frustration that women are not currently protected by law from hate crimes. I believe that gender-based hate crime protection should not cover men also, given that there is statistical evidence demonstrating that gender-based hate crimes are most commonly carried out by men. However, it is incredibly important that this hate crime protection also covers both trans men and women and non-binary individuals. The notion that only cis women should be protected from gender based hate crimes is incredibly and horrifically transphobic, and I hope that in the future gender-based hate crime protection would work to protect all the above categories I have mentioned (women, trans, and non binary individuals)

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: This question is not explicit as to whether the Law Commission currently protects transgender women and non binary individuals under this protected category of misogyny. I strongly believe that it should not just be cisgendered women who are protected under this protected category, as this puts both transgender women and non binary individuals at a risk of greater harm. As I mentioned in the above answer, it is vital that hate crime protection protects all of these categories (cisgendered women, transgender women, non binary individuals) from the heinous acts committed most commonly by cisgendered males. My main concern is that currently misogyny is not a hate crime punishable by law, and as a woman it is incredibly frightening that I am not protected by the government from any gender-based criminal offences, and that in the eyes of the Law I am considered less than simply because of my gender.

Question 14: Yes

Expand: I think this would be a good approach, given that it protects all sexualities, genders and sexes as mentioned in my previous answers

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Yes

Expand: Yes - why aren't these people protected already??

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand: Aggravated sexual offences are incredibly serious and should be dealt with as such, if there is a new way of sentencing that could be introduced in order to further help protect victims of sexual offences, then it is vital that this new scheme is introduced

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Yes

Expand: Yes, this sounds like a good approach.

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Kim McGuire

Name of Organisation: University of Central Lancashire

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: no, do not amend utilise the existing, otherwise it will be a departure from the existing characteristics.

perhaps migration and asylum status can be better protected, elsewhere?

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Is this not currently covered here? even if implicitly i would imagine that it is already covered and that there is no need to explicitly mention.

asexuality could also be covered if gender was a protected characteristic since there are intersections.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: would gender not cover these?

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: Yes, keep the current definition.

Question 10: no, because this would not be a demonstration of hostility, or motivated by hostility to a protected characteristic.

Question 11: Yes

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2: some offences would be better protected with specific offences - sexual harassment, domestic violence, but with the caveat to be enhanced by hostility towards the protected characteristic of gender

Question 12: gender based is preferred to sex, but either of these would include both women and men (and those who see themselves as neither).

Question 13: Yes

Expand: I agree, but prefer gender and that it is not limited to the female sex, since it would cover misogyny, but also gender based hostility towards males

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: not as a separate characteristic, no.

Question 18: no, this would be far too broad and a widening of the concept

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: no, keep hostility, prejudice is far too wide a concept to add anything to identification of the bias.

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: i would prefer identification of the specific characteristic, otherwise the overarching bias maybe lost. whilst there may be many factors in play, it is likely that there will be a predominant bias

Question 33: yes

Question 34: yes, but i would hope this would not lead to plea bargaining.

Question 35:

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: The difficulty with flexibility can be a variation in responses, there is a need for clarity and to send the appropriate message to potential offenders.

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand: Yes, but only if prosecutors and courts are utilising the aggravated offences as envisaged.

Question 40: Yes

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: when they are aware, should have been aware, or are made aware it is being hosted, and they do not remove when made aware.

Question 43 Part 2: yes

Question 44: This is a low threshold, although in practice it seems to be little used, perhaps some definition is needed:

perhaps using an objective reasonable person approach?

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand: yes, but an objective test will need to be made explicit.

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: it would perhaps cause problems to prosecute abusive, but not insulting many would not see the difference.

we need to allow the opportunity for freedom of speech, critique and discussion

Question 48: Yes

Expand: but with the proviso of the restrictions currently for religion and sexual orientation in the case of transgender

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50: no, this would be too vague and lose the opportunity to identify a primary locus of bias.

Question 51: Yes

Expand: but there would need to be guidelines.

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Yes, this would be a useful introduction, and perhaps offer some clarity and some gravitas to the protected characteristics and the use of hate crime legislation

Name: Cllr Evelyn Akoto & Cllr Alice Macdonald

Name of Organisation: Southwark Council

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand: Yes. Southwark Council supports the creation of a single hate crime act to bring together various strands of existing law to deal with the recent trends in this area

Since the 2016 referendum on the UK's membership of the European Union, our nation has experienced a stark trend: an immense surge in the number of reported hate crimes. Whilst there is no single definitive measure of hate crime, we can obtain a clear picture of the scale of this increase using the Crime Survey for England and Wales and police statistics of recorded crime.

In 2016/17, there were 80,393 offences recorded by the police in which one or more protected characteristics were deemed to be a motivating factor. This represents an increase of 29 per cent compared with the 62,518 hate crimes recorded in 2015/16, the largest percentage increase seen since the series began in 2011/12.

Further increases in police recorded hate crime were observed following the Westminster Bridge terrorist attack (22 March 2017) and the London Bridge terrorist attack (29 November 2019), the latter incident tragically taking place within our borough boundaries.

These increases do not appear to be merely isolated spikes around specific incidents but rather these incidents, whether a referendum or a terrorist attack, have led to accelerated rates of hate crime prevalence in our communities.

According to House of Commons Library December 2020 Hate Crime Report, between 2012 and 2020 we have observed changes in reported hate crime by recognised strand/characteristic:

- 131% increase in hate crimes relating to race.
- 292% increase in hate crimes relating to sexual orientation.
- 374% increase in hate crimes relating to religion
- 405% increase in hate crimes relating to disability
- 758% increase in hate crimes relating to transgender status

Whilst these increases will in part reflect improvements in recording such crimes, these figures paint a worrying picture for modern Britain, a picture that emboldens the case for reviewing this body of law to both assess its effectiveness and explore its application in today's society. It is for these reasons that the case for reviewing and strengthening existing legal provisions is beyond doubt.

As part of the Law Commission's review, they have also specifically highlighted that different categories of protected characteristics experience differing levels of protection and legal application; particularly those relating to the prosecution of hate crimes based on disabilities.

From this perspective, Southwark Council strongly supports exploring the creation of a single Hate Crime Act. Aside from the clear logical arguments for simplifying these strands of law, the wide disparities in reported hate crime call for closer legal analysis and scrutiny. Bringing forward comprehensive legislative proposals would allow parliament to explore these trends and review existing legislation to ensure it provides equitable legal protection to groups with recognised characteristics.

Southwark Council also strongly supports broadening the scope of existing legislation to recognise additional characteristics and ensure that such groups receive equitable protection in the law. The inclusion of women, gender or sex and specific recognition of misogyny as a hate crime in its own right are the most obvious examples of this.

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Yes.

Southwark Council strongly supports retaining the 'protected characteristics' categories. Incorporating these strands into a single legal act, as outlined previously, would help provide a more workable framework for equitably tackling hate crimes in the criminal justice system. Retaining these categories also provides a workable framework for exploring which other groups may benefit from inclusion in hate crime legislation.

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: Southwark Council supports the exploration of including migration and asylum status into hate crime laws.

As outlined previously, we have sadly observed sharp spikes in recorded hate crimes based around race and ethnicity since the 2016 referendum. The public debate over the UK's membership of the EU was dominated by narratives around immigration. The relationship between these two trends warrants further analysis, the results of which may well justify special provision in law for hate crimes against these specific categories.

More recently, the refugee crisis emanating out of the Syria, has brought the status of those fleeing civil war and persecution into the national spotlight once again. The need for further analysis to explore this dimension is also clear.

Southwark Council has committed to make our borough one of sanctuary – working with community groups and partners to help and support refugee, migrant and asylum seekers in Southwark, and campaign to end the Hostile Environment. Tackling hate crime is an important part of that ambition. This goal would benefit from further discussion on the amending existing legislation to include the migration or asylum status of individuals when acts of abuse are clearly motivated by such characteristics.

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand: Yes

It is a fact that women continue to experience extreme sexism and misogyny across all sections of society. According to evidence from the Fawcett Society, 64% of women have experienced unwanted sexual harassment in public, and half of women have been sexually harassed at work. One in five women over 16 have experienced sexual assault.

Indeed, in many cases a woman's sex or gender becomes a specific or aggravating factor in acts of hate or abuse. For example, according to research by the Anti-Semitism Policy Trust, Jewish women frequently experience higher levels of recorded online abuse – a dual attack on both for their religious background and their gender.

Further research from the Citizens UK report 'Overcoming everyday hate in the UK' concludes that hate motivated by gender is already a factor in 33.5% of all existing hate crime – and yet gender is not currently recognised as a protected characteristic under hate crime law.

In cases where ethnicity or sexual orientation are identified as aggravating factors in crimes of hate or abuse, the nature of the case and frequently the punishment imposed are greatly affected. There is clear evidence that women experience similar and often worse abuse because of the fact they are women – this makes the case for recognising gender/sex obvious and necessary. Extending existing legislation to include gender/sex would remedy the lack of legal cover and ensure that acts of hate motivated by gender/sex receive fair and proportionate responses, just as acts committed against other protected characteristics receive.

As the inquiry notes, there are already policing authorities recognising gender-based hate crime. Nottinghamshire Police was the first to introduce a female harassment and misogyny hate crime policy in April 2016. The impact of the policy was formally evaluated following a two-year pilot in June 2018. Most significantly, the vast majority of local people who participated in the research thought the policy was a good idea and should be continued, whilst only 6.5% of local people felt it should be scrapped.

The study also made a series of recommendations for how the policy could be improved, which London could learn from. It highlighted, for example, that under-reporting and lack of awareness were still significant issues after the two-year pilot period – demonstrating the importance of coupling the policy with a robust communications campaign so that local people are aware of it and feel empowered to use it.

Building on the successful policy change in Nottinghamshire, there is also clear evidence of public and stakeholder support for such a national change in policy. The Mayor of London has backed the calls for such change and in November 2020, Southwark Council passed a

motion calling on the Metropolitan Police to record the harassment of women as a hate crime. In terms of public engagement, 84.1% of all participants in the national Citizens UK study expressed support for an intersectional approach to hate crime. For example, such an approach would enable an individual to report an attack that was both racist and misogynistic.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Southwark Council supports the exploration of this question with public and stakeholder representatives.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Southwark Council strongly supports strengthening and extending existing legislation to ensure women receive equitable protection in law, just as other groups holding 'protected characteristics' enjoy. A core part of driving that change is exploring how such acts of abuse manifest in public life and crucially how to reflect that reality through language in law. As such, we do not hold an absolute view on whether "women" is a more suitable term than "misogyny" for legal purposes but we strongly support close engagement with relevant public and stakeholder groups to ensure an informed view on this issue is reached.

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: Whilst Southwark Council does not hold an absolute view on whether "sex or gender" is a more appropriate phrase than resting on one of these terms. We would push for a change that is inclusive as possible – one which crucially reflects the different ways in which women experience abuse. In line with our previous answer, we strongly support close engagement with relevant public and stakeholder groups to ensure an informed view on this issue is reached.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23: The Crown Prosecution Service already recognise hate crimes as "any criminal offence which is perceived by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by hostility or prejudice, based on a person's disability or perceived disability; race or perceived race; or religion or perceived religion; or sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation or transgender identity or perceived transgender identity." Given this fact, it appears there is a logical case to explore the framing of the motivation test using these terms. Southwark Council supports such an exploration with the CPS and other relevant stakeholder groups.

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Accountability is central to the functioning of our democracy, and transparent and effective public offices are an important part of that thesis. Southwark Council supports the exploring the creation of a Hate Crime Commissioner with a number of important points of consideration:

- Ensuring that the creation of such an office would not create unnecessary duplication of work streams
- Ensuring that creation of such an office would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of delivering justice in such cases
- Ensuring that the creation of such an office has the support of key stakeholder groups and is informed by public consultation.
- Ensuring that the creation of such an office represents an effective use of public funds.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: This is my personal view and should remain private

Question 1: No

Expand: They are fine as they are

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Keep as they are

Question 3: No

Expand: Leave laws as they are

Question 4: Leave as it is now

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No, leave as it is now

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: No, leave as is now

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Leave as it is now

Question 8 Part 3: There is no other sexuality other than male and female, anything else is pure fantasy

Question 9: Yes it should stay as it is now

Question 10: Leave as it is now

Question 11: No

Expand: There are only 2 sexes, male or female, anything else is pure fantasy

Question 11 Part 2: Forced marriage, FGM and crimes committed in the domestic abuse context are needed

Question 12: Both men and women

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand: The words 'male' or 'female' would be more accurate and clearer

Question 15: Should be left as it is now

Question 16: All ages

Question 17: Leave as it is now

Question 18: No, stop these woke idiotic ideas

Question 19: No

Question 20: No

Question 21: No

Expand: Stop this stupidity

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: No, leave as it is now

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: Leave as it is now

Question 26: No

Expand: Leave as it is now

Question 27: No

Expand: No, leave as it is now

Question 28: No

Expand: Leave as they are now

Question 29: No

Expand: Leave as they are now

Question 30: Leave as they are now

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: Stop messing about with the law, it works ok now

Question 33: Increase by 10%

Question 34: Stop messing with current laws that work

Question 35: Leave things as they are now

Question 36: Yes

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Leave things as they are now

Question 38 Part 2: Leave as they are now

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: Leave as is now

Question 41: No

Expand: Leave as is now

Question 42: No

Expand: Leave things as they are now

Question 43 Part 1: It should be the person uploading such information to be dealt with, not social media companies, they simply can't check every single thing that is uploaded

Question 43 Part 2: Leave as is now

Question 44: Leave as is now

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Leave as is now

Question 46: No

Expand: Leave as is now

Question 47: No

Expand: Leave as is now

Question 47 Part 2: Leave as is now

Question 48: No

Expand: Leave as is now

Question 49: No

Expand: Leave as is now

Question 50: Leave as is now

Question 51: No

Expand: Leave as is now

Question 52: No

Expand: Leave as is now

Question 52 Part 2: No, not needed

Question 53: Leave as is now

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1: Leave as is now

Question 55 Part 2: Leave as is now

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand: So long as it clearly states male and female

Question 57 Part 2: So long as it clearly states male and female

Question 58: Yes

Question 59: Yes

Question 60: Leave as is now

Question 61: Yes, this is sufficient

Question 62: NO, absolutely not, this would be a waste of tax payers money

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: None

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: The category of hate crime should be abolished

Question 2: No

Expand: The list is potentially endless

Question 3: No

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: No

Expand: There should be No protection for religion or any other belief system

Question 6: No

Expand:

Question 7: Utter nonsense

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: This is another belief system. Men believe they are women

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: There are two sexes

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: No such thing as gender, other than as a fantasy

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: Intersectionality is nonsense

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: This is an attack on freedom of speech

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: No such thing as transgender identity

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Ridiculous idea

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: The so-called 'hate crime' legislation encroaches on the civil rights of citizens to free expression. Most of what is designated as 'hate' is simply disagreement, where a person has a different opinion from the alleged victim crying 'hate crime'

We already have laws banning incitement to violence or harassment. We do not need laws that criminalise an opinion.

Question 2: No

Expand:

Question 3: No

Expand: 'Hate crime' legislation is ill judged, as it does not require the alleged victim to prove any evidence of actual harm.

The new proposals do not resolve this question. There is still no requirement for evidence of actual harm (eg violence, serious and medically treated psychological harm)

It is still possible for anyone to say they have been a victim of hate, without having to provide either a definition of hate or evidence of harm.

This is really dangerous, and illiberal

Question 4: No.

'Race' has already been re-defined to mean 'any group'. Originally 'racial hate' meant serious discrimination against people of another race (eg against blacks in Alabama)

Now it is defined as an reference to a national group, not a race. Tony Blair was investigated for making a joke about Welsh people. The Welsh are not a race.

The concept needs re-defining more narrowly, as does the concept 'hate' itself

Question 5: No

Expand: We must be free to criticise religion.

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: No. This is too vague. How does anyone know whether they should 'presume' that another person is in one of these categories before they speak to them or about them? On the basis of what evidence?

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: No See above

A wrongly presumed lack of disability is a lack of evidence.

People cannot be criminalised for not knowing something about another person if it is not visibly apparent

Question 11: No

Expand: Sex is already a protected characteristic.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: No

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18: No

Question 19: No.

Question 20: No

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: Define 'demonstration of hostility'.

Is that the same as 'hate'?

Is it not just an opinion?

If I say 'I don't like X,' is that a demonstration of hostility?

Question 23: All these terms are too vague, and end up criminalizing an opinion

In a free society people must be allowed to dislike any thing or any person if they wish

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand: We do not wish to criminalise free speech, unless it incites violence

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: No

Question 33: No

Question 34: No

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: No

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: None

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: In a free society citizens must be free to insult each other.

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: This is an outright totalitarian measure, lifted from Orwell's 1984.

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2: In a free society, publications must be free to express opinions

I cite the US 1st Amendment:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

These entire proposals should be replaced by a UK First Amendment along similar lines

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Not an Organisation

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: Post op Transsexual Full GRS 25 years HRT

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand: Protected characteristics to remain as per the Equality Act

Eq Act 2010 Protects Gender Re-Assignment surgery

NOT Gender identity you are opening the door to amongst others transvestites who are predominantly men and have no intention of having surgery

GI will them expect to access female SEX single spaces.

You cannot expect females to open their access to men "identifying" only as women

I have the GRC I am legally a woman to gain the GRC it involves commitment the only commitment you are asking of these TV's is to identify only

Question 3: No

Expand: The Equality Act has the protected characteristics only why have yet another one?

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: utter nonsense

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: People who cross dress (or are presumed to cross dress)??

You want to include Men with a sexual fetish to be protected are you serious?

Transgender includes transvestites

WHERE are the protections for women?

I am a post op transsexual woman I have undergone GRS and Im biologically male

Where are my protections all I see is this consultation aiming to protect men who have a fetish.

Non Binary doesnt exist it was created in 1992 in San Francisco by the binary 1/0 system it is make believe. Identifying as NB doesnt make you NB..

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Intersex is NOT Transgender its a medical condition

TG includes Transvestites again a male fetish

Question 8 Part 3: Transgender is too general it includes cross dressers/ transvestites a hate crime to protect men with a sexual fetish so far I havent seen anything that protects women or transsexuals like me

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand: SEX only

There are two sexes male and female

I am a post operative transsexual woman and I an Biologically male and thats a fact not a feeling not an identity fact

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Sex based only not "gender"

Question 13: Yes

Expand: Female SEX only

Question 14: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex only

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: Basic on actual proof physical not thinking

Question 23: Basic on actual proof physical not thinking

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: Absolutely no

TG Too general including Transvestites a fetish

Where is TRANSSEXUAL why am I not included I am NOT transgender

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32: Where is TRANSSEXUAL why am I not included I am NOT transgender

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: you mean the right to argue or disagree is stirring up no not at all impossible to say what someone thinks is stirring up

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand: Sex only

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Sex and Disability only

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Only if he/she is independent not from a political party

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Freelancer

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand: The and any Law or changes to it should clearly state the difference between an immutable provable fact like Sex [which every person has] and a "belief system" like religion (e.g. Christianity) or genderism ideology

Question 3: No

Expand: No.

People lie about a supposed 'prevalence' of "hostility".

A Male-Sexed person is a Male and it is Not a "Hate Incident" to say a provable fact is hate. Incidents of Compelled speech (coercing people to lie) is not acceptable in a Free Liberal Democracy.

Reports of hate should be evidenced

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: NO, asexuality is not a sexual orientation. Not finding anyone or someone attractive is just life

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1: NO I disagree

People should never be 'Presumed' to be any of the listed descriptions.

Gender is a meaningless construct based on Sex-based stereotypes and nothing more.

Every Human has a Sex. Not every Human has a 'gender' or 'religion', both of which are unprovable.

Intersex people who have a Variation of Sex Development Disorder (VSD) are either Female or Male and not necessarily trans anything

Non-Binary are just attention-seeking heterosexuals.

Crossdressers/Transvestites are people with a Sexual Fetish who should be free to do their fetish in the privacy of their own home or a Special club, not in the workplace

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: NO I don't agree.

Intersex is a Variation of Sex Development Disorder (VSD), is not some made-up identity, it is a physical and evidenced developmental disorder and must never be considered or treated as a part of the transgender ideology.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: NO idea what the current definition of disability used in the Criminal Justice Act 2003 is.

Question 10: The wording of this question is deliberately constructed to confuse the consulted.

Offending behaviour based on incorrectly assessing, thinking or regarding the presence of a disability or lack of disability (of a victim) should NOT fall within hate crime laws

Question 11: No

Expand: Sex has a clear definition and is already a Protected characteristic in Law and should continue to remain so.

As Gender (which is no more than a Notion in a few peoples heads) does not have a clear specific definition, and should not be a protected characteristic for the purposes of hate crime law.

Question 11 Part 2: There are NOT gender-specific carve-outs You are referring to SEX specific carve-outs for Sexual offences. By attempting to conflate immutable SEX with the notion of gender, this form survey seeks to deliberately confuse the consulted.

Any law or Hate Crime Law must clearly have regard for immutable SEX, when referring to Sexual offences, forced marriage, FEMALE Genital Mutilation (which FEMALES experience) and domestic abuse context crimes

Question 12: Sex-based hate crime protection must include both Females and Males

Sex which undeniably EVERY human has, should be used in a Law because it is a) provable, b) can be evidenced and c) is consistent (e.g. unchangeable before birth, all during life and after death).

To use the word 'Gender' in any meaning full way in any Law, the word 'gender' must be clearly defined, the word Gender is not clearly defined Because gender can't be defined, because it is simply a 'Feeling' in a few people's head As such should have NO Place in any law, hate crime or otherwise.

Question 13: No

Expand: No I definitely don't agree. Misogyny specifically addresses the hate towards Females for being Female Sexed. This word should never ever include Male-sexed people as it is impossible for them to be Female Sexed A Male in attire ordinarily used by women is never ever a Female and in no way can prove to be Female Sex and gender should never be conflated.

Question 14: No

Expand: All and any Hate crime protection category of Sex should remain as is. Sex and Gender should never be conflated, ever.

Every human has a provable Sex and sex is binary There is no Human sex producing a third sexual gamete.

The use of the word gender removes safeguarding for both Female Children and Female Adults

Gender is a notion of a feeling in the head of a few people.

Question 15: In specific circumstances. However, it must be noted full-grown Adult men who want to identify as or have the identity and profess to be a 4-year-old girl should not be allowed anywhere near children. Child Safe Guarding is a priority before everything and protection measure is not a hate crime

Question 16: No Age-based crimes should not be limited to 'Older People', particularly if no specific age is referred to. Older Please, is a relative term. A twenty-year-old is not usually regarded as an older person However, a twenty-year-old Man to a 14yearold teenage girl is an older person. Twenty-year-olds do groom teenagers online.

Question 17: The term should be 'Those who are sexually Exploited' . There is not such thing as Child sex work/workers as children can not give sexual consent. Thus, Children in a hate crime category should be specifically referred to or as Children of Sexual Exploitation (CSE).

Question 18: No. Alternative subcultures exist such as Paedophiles should never be a protected hate crime category

Question 19:

Question 20: Yes, "Philosophical beliefs" MUST be a protected category in Hate crime law. Freedom of belief and Freedom of thought is crucial and worthy and at the core of a Free Liberal Democracy.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand: Yes, it must be demonstrable that a hate crime has in fact happened

All categories of hate crime must be clearly defined.

Question 23: No, the current motivation test should not be amended to a point that is subjective (hostility), relative

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex, Sexual orientation and disability should all be added characteristics protected by aggravated offences. Notional and unprovable identities such as transgender should never be added

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: No, this should not be guided by the listed items. Because people lie.

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand: Very vague question. This should have specific examples as to the intention and effect

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No With limited resources, hospitals, the economy and poverty should be the priority.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: None

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: No

Expand: Protected characteristics have been subject to widespread & deliberate misrepresentation in practice, specifically that of "Gender Reassignment", while the protected characteristic of Sex is not even mentioned There must be a clear legal definition of Gender, its fundamental difference from biological Sex & overt protection to enjoy life free from harassment/violence within the characteristic of biological Sex, such as but not limited

to the right to name the correct biological sex of oneself & recognise it in others, to restrict access/entry to others on the basis of biological Sex & to do so without the threat of legal action being taken To make the acknowledgement of basic material reality a "crime" is an appalling step for any society to take.

Question 3: No

Expand: Several Police forces already make copious reports of what they term "hate incidents" which in general amount to the level of someone having called a man who self identifies as a woman "he". These "non-crimes" are pointed to as evidence of a snowballing of supposed hate towards those who believe in gender ideology & should form no basis for legislation. It is on a par with my looking to have people arrested for calling me fat, which I am, and hurting my feelings

Calling a man "he" or a woman "she" causes no harm, additional or otherwise, to any individual & most certainly not to society as a whole. It is a grave safeguarding concern that children are not being taught the fundamental differences between the 2 & only 2 biological sexes & given the proper vocabulary to express their experiences of danger & harm

There is no logic to the current use of Gender within the law as it stands. Proper legal definition is urgently required. It must be named before it can be assigned protections & those protections cannot be at the expense of recognition of basic reality. It is grossly inconsistent with the rights of others when, for example, a woman is compelled BY A JUDGE to lie under oath & call her male rapist a woman & refer to him as "she"

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: No, it should not Sexual orientation in humans is either heterosexual or homosexual. Adding various "new" categories is both unnecessary & potentially problematic. There is a concerted push from those who ascribe to gender ideology to normalise "kinks" within society & law These kinks can be anything from exposing oneself/masturbating in public places to "furries" who enjoy spreading excrement in public facilities for sexual gratification

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Most importantly, intersex is NOT a transgender condition. It is a purely medical condition & the various organisations set up for those born with a DSD condition have repeatedly & consistently refused to be associated with transgender It is insulting to attempt to include this in law.

It is detrimental to the whole of society to allow what amounts to a free for all when it comes to conflicting rights A man should not be subjected to violence/serious verbal abuse if he wears a dress, but nor should it be a "hate crime" to bar him from places where the safety, privacy & dignity of women & girls is required It is not a "hate crime" to firmly tell a man that women don't have penises & that we don't wish to have him in specific places.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Gender Reassignment is the protected characteristic in this case. The Gender Recognition Act has proved itself to be unworkable as it conflicts directly with women's Sex based rights & expanding this category would be madness, which will lead to serious public disorder. As a woman I can tell you that I & most women have reached the end of our tether. The best course of action for this or any government would be to repeal the GRA as its raison d'etre has been superseded by subsequent same sex legislation

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex should be a protected characteristic. The level of violence, resulting in the deaths of approx 2 women every week in the UK, is a national disgrace & the omission of Sex from any hate crime legislation is unconscionable.

"Gender" is a term that has no definite meaning, no definite presentation & no basis in science. It is an ideology arising from post modernist theory. It is not the equivalent of biological sex & it CANNOT be accorded the rights & protections of SEX, otherwise government may as well legislate on the basis of someone's horoscope.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: SEX based hate crime is more relevant in the case of women. As I mentioned in an answer above it is 2 WOMEN each week who are killed by men, not 2 men. Legislation is for protection which gives police forces something to act upon. Women are more vulnerable physically than men & are in need of greater protection from the law.

Question 13: Yes

Expand: This is why a clear legal understanding of the difference between "gender" & "sex" is essential. Legislation which is clearly intended for the necessary protection of biological women cannot be extended to men, simply because they "identify" as women. Women are a distinct biological, social & legal class. We are over 51% of the population. We are entitled to our own unique considerations. This is impossible if "gender" continues to be erroneously conflated with "sex". A legal fiction does not alter reality. A man with a Gender Recognition Certificate is a man with a piece of paper. The case however is that few if any even bother to get the piece of paper yet are being allowed to encroach on & terrorise women.

Question 14: No

Expand: We women are not an add-on to any category of men. We deserve & demand our own clear demarcation in law. It is no more right or logical to include "gender" in legislation around sex based rights than it would be to include race & disability & declare them similar enough for the purpose of law.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: No. Nor should prostitution be officially recognised as "work". The preponderance of trafficked women & children in prostitution is horrendous & is something the government needs to address with the utmost vigour.

Question 18: No. At this rate of going there will be 60 million hate crime categories, one for every person in the UK.

Question 19: Yes Homeless people are among the most vulnerable in society There have been too many cases of people burning, beating & otherwise inflicting grievous injury on the homeless.

Question 20: No This strays too far into the realm of thought policing

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: No. These terms are too vague to have any real meaning & are insufficient for a court of law

Question 23: No

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand: It is the clear modus operandi of those within the transgender ideology to brand virtually everything "transphobic", thereby criminalising the vast majority of the population. The dictionary definition of woman is deemed transphobic A sign saying "I Love JKR" is deemed transphobic Barring men from competing against women is deemed transphobic It is preposterous to decide verdicts & sentences on the basis of this scattergun approach to the normal lives of the majority of the population

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Yes

Expand: If the courts are going to hand down sentences because someone recognises & states a biological reality then they certainly need to state that in open court, where the correct level of ridicule can be applied.

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Yes

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: When the legal definition of criminal offences is becoming the purely subjective opinions of individuals it is ridiculous to further add insult to injury to our collective common sense by adding a category of "stirring up", whether the material is written or not. The government may as well order the burning of all books, music & artwork as someone somewhere will find anything that "offends" them.

Question 41: No

Expand: This is an unwarranted assault on freedom of speech/expression.

Question 42: No

Expand: There is no consensus in our society on what constitutes inflammatory, hate or its stirring up. This would be unworkable & more importantly unacceptable. It is not unlikely that such legislation would lead to civil unrest/disobedience on a very large scale.

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: It should be very clearly defined, as should the protected characteristics which are unworkably vague & open to abuse.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Is this serious? It's the equivalent of getting out the crystal ball

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No.

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation: None

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: I don't agree with the concept of hate crime.

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: See above

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: Asexuality is not a sexual orientation so should not be included

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: Transgender is far too broad a definition

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Gender is a social construct Sex is a biological fact Women are discriminated against on grounds of their sex, not their gender. The two terms must not be conflated.

Question 11 Part 2: See above Concepts of gender change over time Girls and women need protection because of their sex.

Question 12:

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: There is no such thing as a female gender. The term female applies only to the sex in both humans and animals. If transgender men are to be termed "women", there will be serious clashes between the rights of women and those of trans-identifying men

Question 14: No

Expand: See above.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: No view.

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: Under these proposals almost anything can be a hate crime

Question 23: How can you tell?

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: If transgender people are added to the hate crimes list, why aren't women?

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand: Should be covered by other laws

Question 30:

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Other (please expand)

Expand: Don't know

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: Don't know

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Other (please expand)

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: See above. If hate speech is to be a crime then women should be included.

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: Only sex

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Don't police what we say in our own homes

Question 52: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: See above

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2: See above.

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Maintain free speech

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I think all responses should be treated as confidential so that women are confident about expressing their views. Especially given that misogyny as a hate crime is being discussed, the backlash on women is real.

Question 1: Yes

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4: The definition of race shouldn't include migration and asylum status; and/or language. Xenophobia and racism are separate categories. People can experience one or the other or both.

Question 5: Yes

Expand: Please include the IHRA definition of antisemitism.

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: It's not clear whether people who are presumed to be non binary or transsexual or intersex are experiencing misogyny instead. For example, a hairy woman being taunted for being hairy because women are expected to feel ashamed of their natural hair.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Transgender, non binary and intersex are not interchangeable terms and don't cover the range of genders

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: Yes, it's important to consider hidden disabilities

Question 11: Yes

Expand: I've had men shout bitch at me down the street when I've tried to ignore them. I've been followed home I've come to realise that men expect women to get out the way when I am walking down the street. For example, I have had to come to a stop because a line of men in a row blocked the path as they were coming towards me . They wouldn't move to be single file and I didn't want to walk in the road One of them was aggressive towards me because he expected me to move out of the way, even though there was nowhere to go except for a busy road. I was on my own, they were much bigger than me and it was very frightening as my hands were full of shopping and I couldn't have run easily if I needed to Fortunately another one moved out of the way after his friend's aggression towards me. I still find it scary to walk alone with shopping I would feel safer if men knew misogyny was a hate crime

Question 11 Part 2: Yes, FGM is sex specific.

Question 12: Limited to women Men have no idea what it is like to be afraid to walk through a park, for example. A man would wait in the park and call out to me and every other woman every day as I walked to the bus stop. He never did it to the men. I dreaded it every day but I didn't always have time to walk around the park instead of through it He knew my routine and almost certainly figured out where I lived and it was terrifying It made me so miserable and contributed to the depression I was suffering at the time. I will not walk through a park in the dark because even though this happened during the day with other people around, encountering a man like that at night would probably be the end of me. I would feel more confident about reporting men like that if I knew misogyny was a hate crime.

Question 13: Yes

Expand: It should be limited to female sex, to match the protected characteristic.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex and gender are separate categories and not interchangeable Sex is specifically a protected characteristic and needs to remain that way. For example, FGM is sex specific

Question 15:

Question 16: It should include all ages. How is older people defined? Women are expected to continue to look youthful long after men have become recognisably older

Question 17: No, this is still misogyny

Question 18: No

Question 19: Yes, they experience abuse on the streets specifically for being homeless and can't escape it.

Question 20: No

Question 21: Yes

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Yes

Expand:

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex should be included, which is a protected characteristic

Question 26: Yes

Expand:

Question 27: Yes

Expand:

Question 28: Yes

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32: Yes

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: Online platforms such as social media companies should be treated the same way as news media and advertisers are They behave like both

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Yes

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex, transgender identity and disability

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Sex and gender are not interchangeable terms. Sex is a protected characteristic

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: Yes, it should cover misogynistic chants

Question 58:

Question 59: Yes, large groups of men travelling on trains and the underground to and from football matches are incredibly intimidating

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Yes

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be

operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed – and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up – is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity – which are contentious issues – should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must

be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA

of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation

- Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect:
- using a person's birth name and pronoun,
- saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and
- saying that there are only two sexes

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: The female gender should be included as a protected characteristic for the purposes of hate crime law.

This submission will address the 3 core considerations from the perspective of personal experience as a woman living in England, and that of my friends and family living in England.

1) Demonstrable need: evidence that criminal targeting based on prejudice or hostility towards the group is prevalent

Personal Testimony: Last year, I was running home from my dance studio 5 minutes from my home when a man standing on his doorstep shouted after me calling me a 'sexy chiquita' I ignored the man and continued running He then went on to shout at full volume 'you f****ing bitch', and proceeded to follow me. I sprinted at full speed until I reached a main road. The next evening, I changed my route, and was both honked by a car and wolf whistled on a dual carriage way For the following month I had to have my boyfriend accompany me home from the studio or pay for a taxi. I no longer feel safe being alone after dark as a woman in the square half mile from my home, due to experiencing harassment which is clearly clearly motivated by my gender.

This is one of countless examples of hatred I have experienced due to my gender since being a young girl in this country The first time I travelled to our nation's capital on my own, aged 14, I was harassed due to my gender within minutes of stepping off of the train Being a woman walking in public in London truly feels like you are a walking target for harassment and abuse The harassment is so frequent, and so prevalent, that it feels entirely inevitable every time I leave the house.

Friend 1 aged 26 London I have personally experienced extreme violence at the hands of men, which I believe is rooted in misogynistic attitudes Repeated instances of street harassment followed me as a teenager, with the taunts and jeers of men ringing in my ears long after I had changed out of my school uniform. At the age of thirteen, I was cornered in a train carriage by a group of drunk football fans They pulled at my face to 'make me smile', and one of them forcibly groped me as I desperately tried to escape. Other people in the carriage averted their eyes and said nothing, complicit in the violation of my small body. I cried the whole way home but never told anyone, believing that no one cared

This was nothing, however, to what I had already experienced. I had previously been sexually abused for many years as a child by a male family member Prior to his death, he never faced any consequence for his actions In late summer of 2020, I was raped again

For the first time in my life, I took action against a perpetrator, and reported my rapist to the police. At the time of writing, almost three whole months have passed since I reported being raped The police have yet to bring the perpetrator in for questioning The fact that this area of policing is so under resourced given how wide- spread instances of sexual assault and rape are is alarming Violence against women is clearly not prioritised and it's no wonder that I once again feel, as I did as a child, that no one really cares.

Friend 2 27, Met Police Officer London I personally have experienced abuse and threats as a female police officer that none of my male colleagues had to suffer I've been

sexually assaulted whilst in uniform but expected to laugh it off because he only squeezed my ass so 'don't make a big deal about it'. I've had men threaten to rape me, I've had men try to belittle me with generic stereotypic insults. I was working a protest and a couple of men targeted me as the only female riot officer and started shouting at me to 'get back in the kitchen'.

Friend 4 26 London The majority of times I leave my house (I'd estimate it to be about 80% of the time), I receive unwanted sexual attention; cat calling, horn beeping, people following me down the street because of my gender. Two recent incidents stick out in my mind. Firstly, an incident when I was in the Sainsbury's Local on Brixton Hill. After a man approached me asking "what was wrong with my face", and that "I needed to smile", I politely told him I was choosing my dinner and didn't need to smile to do so. He then asked why I was such a bitch, if I was a lesbian, and when I told him to leave me alone, he raised his voice, screaming at me that I was "a fucking bitch". I moved away to the other end of the store, crying and shaken, whilst he continued to scream at me that I was a stuck up bitch. I hid in the store after he left, scared to walk to my home about 200m away. This was a really frightening experience, but I didn't ring the police. I'm not sure why not. I was intimidated, scared, but ultimately I felt like my complaint would go nowhere. After all, this man hadn't touched me? He hadn't physically abused me so my complaint didn't feel worthy.

Friend 5 25 London Throughout my life, since the young age of 12-13, I have experienced verbal harassment, often of a sexual nature, on the street and at work. The culmination of these events means that every time I am walking down the street, particularly past a group of men, I am on high alert. This results in a feeling of intimidation and high anxiety when these instances occur. In daylight on a busy street this can seem fairly "innocent", however, when this happens at night or in a more secluded location this becomes a lot more sinister. My friends and I have all experienced this continuously throughout our adolescence and into adulthood and it's about time it ends.

Friend 6 female 23 London: One of the first times I was harassed because I was a woman was when I was around 14. I was walking alone and a man around 3 times my age leered out of his car window and made a sexual gesture with his fingers and tongue. I had to ask my friends what this meant. I continue to be harassed frequently 10 years later. On an hour long walk in central London where I live this year, I estimate I was leered at or verbally harassed around 50 times. In response, I look down on the ground with embarrassment.

2) Additional Harm: evidence that criminal targeting based on hostility or prejudice towards the characteristic causes additional harm to the victim, members of the targeted group, and society more widely.

Personal Testimony: The hatred I experience because of my gender makes me feel scared, worthless and ashamed. I am on edge every time I am in public due to my experience of being harassed because of my gender. I now anticipate abuse every time I turn a corner. Sometimes, when I am in public and feel safe due to it being day time, I relax, and then when I am inevitably harassed it acts as a painful reminder that I cannot just 'be' in public because of my gender, and I am always going to be objectified by someone or the recipient of hatred towards women. I know this is an experience and feeling which is shared by thousands of women in England and Wales. It prevents women from participating in public life. It prevents women from participating in community work. It prevents women from using their voice due to fear. It prevents equal participation in society, which harms us all. My gender is something I cannot

hide or change, but it continues - and will continue - to make me and others a target for abuse every day if it not addressed head on and recognised for what it is.

Friend 1: Misogyny is the thread connecting all of these experiences of violence Throughout my life, men have treated my body as disposable, an object unworthy of dignity or respect. I have been viewed as a thing to be subjugated, controlled and diminished of all self worth The burden of such trauma is immense, playing out in a range of physical health conditions related to stress. The toll on my body is nothing, however, compared to that on my mind; I live with PTSD, an eating disorder, depression and anxiety, and sometimes self harm and experience suicidal ideation This is not to mention the personal economic impacts that misogynistic hatred and violence has had on me. Given the complex needs I have, I pay for private therapy, as well as prescriptions for anti-depressants. This costs me in the region of £2,500 per year I don't earn a great deal of money but am fortunate enough that I can economise elsewhere to prioritise this. I know that I am hugely privileged to be able to make such choices, and that for many women this simply isn't an option This in and of itself is deeply wrong Our society has failed to protect us from violence motivated by misogyny, and therefore should offer the comprehensive support needed for women of all backgrounds to cope with the consequences of this

Friend 2: From what I have seen women police officers still feel like some of their feelings aren't valid; like being abused is just something that happens and we have to be more careful It's harm is that women don't feel comfortable working in certain departments within the force- only further fuelling the 'lads club' vibe which in itself encourages hatred of anything different it also affected how they treat and speak to female victims. For people to see hatred directed at female officers encourages others that this hatred is acceptable since it isn't challenged. It also would cause other women to see this and think that this is an acceptable way to be treated and not report it.

Friend 3: I have seen instances of hostility directed towards women of colour engaged in community work from male members of their own community. The abuse directed at them is based on their gender identity as women. Often this takes the form of suggesting instances of inappropriate sexual proximity and behaviour resulting in a reduction and/or toning down of community activity from women.

Friend 4: Looking for solutions to address the harassment I have experienced because of my gender, it has been suggested that he (boyfriend) should come and meet me when I leave the shop and I should leave the house by myself less often. This is no way to live. I would like to enjoy my personal freedom without constant sexual harassment because of my gender, without changing my behaviour or clothing By making this a hate crime, it would give some legal grounding to my complaints.

Friend 6: I have started wearing visible headphones so I feel I have a stronger excuse to ignore the misogynistic comments I receive in public I avoid walking down roads with visible groups of men working or socialising because I feel vulnerable and a target. I have walked past my own home on multiple occasions so the man driving slowly next to me in his car does not know where I live The abuse makes me feel embarrassed, tired and vulnerable I fear my experiences will make me less friendly. I continue to smile at people in the street, but I sometimes I wonder whether this is inviting the harassment

3) Suitability: protection of the characteristic would fit logically

within the broader offences and sentencing framework, prove workable in practice, represent an efficient use of resources, and is consistent with the rights of others

Personal Testimony: Despite these experiences and the clear prevalence of hatred motivated by the female gender, the majority of women in the UK are unable to report their experiences as explicitly related to and as an outcome of hatred for their gender. If that man had attacked me physically as I ran home from the dance studio last year, it would not be on record that I was targeted because of my gender. Having an element of your identity recognised as a protected characteristic is empowering when it comes to reporting and challenging hatred, whether it is within the context of a crime or not. Last month, a close friend was a victim of abuse due to their sexuality, twice within one week. I encouraged them to report their experience to the police as it constituted a hate crime. Whilst I have experienced similar abuse motivated by my gender, I am not - and cannot be - encouraged to report to the police as it would not be considered a hate crime under current laws. Having 'gender' recognised as a protected characteristic would help more generally in empowering women to tackle and address bigotry, prejudice and inequality we experience. However, having the 'female' gender recognised as a protected characteristic would achieve much more in recognising the reality of true extent of misogyny in our society, and the true root of so much of the violence, abuse and harassment born by women in this country every day due to their gender being female.

Friend 1: Just as important though, is addressing the root cause of the issue. The inclusion of misogyny as a hate crime is one step towards dismantling the patriarchal structures that still dictate the experience of women in our society. I know I am not alone in my experiences; we only need to look to the #MeToo movement to see how many women are impacted by misogyny on a daily basis. It is exhausting to keep having to fight this battle. Decisive action must be taken to show women that we are valued in our society, that we will be listened to and that instances of misogynistic violence will not be tolerated. Misogyny must be made a hate crime.

Friend 2: Making hatred against women a hate crime would assist within policing massively. When we arrest people, quite often the threshold for charging some offences is so high due to 'lawful points to prove' that people end up getting away with what they've actually done, but get charged with a lesser offence. In this instance if someone was arrested for a public order offence - threatening a female in the street - the public order offence might not be met but it may fit a hate crime against women. It'd help female officers that want to report such behaviour that their complaint has a base in law rather than be accused of being petty. It would also help and could aid towards the current VISOR program we have (collects info on violent and sexual offenders) as I have no doubt misogyny would closely relate to a lot of those offences.

Friend 3: I can attest to the positive impact that having ethnicity categorised as a characteristic of hate crime has made on me and others in my family. It's not perfect but it provides a level of protection from more of the ways in which racism shows itself in real life. For example, someone may not be physically or verbally abusive to my mother in her workplace but may demonstrate continued hostility. Although my mother has developed ways to manage this kind of behaviour, the current legislation allows me to explain how and why this behaviour is unacceptable and illegal. I can see how a long term result of this continued approach could lead to a shift in perceptions of justice, trust and belonging for minority groups - and would like to see this long-term change apply also to hatred towards women due to their gender in the same way.

Friend 5: Having misogyny as a hate crime would have helped during a particularly upsetting incident when my sister and I were followed by a man down the street after I had bought some sanitary products. I needed to use these sanitary products immediately so we were

looking for a public loo. He followed us and persistently ignored our requests for him to leave us alone. When we got to the shelter of the public loo we thought he would finally leave us alone, however, he ended up waiting outside the loo door for us. After continued requests for him to leave us alone, he finally adhered when my sister's boyfriend met us and told him to leave. This was a vulnerable situation not only because we were being ignored and followed but also because it was during a particularly uncomfortable time being during our menstrual cycle. If we were able to know our rights and threaten the man with legal action and knowledge he may have listened to us sooner and would have given us more confidence to confront him. Alternatively, would have been empowered to call the police to deal with the situation. Having gender recognised as a hate crime would be an invaluable tool for empowering women in these vulnerable situations where women are powerless to the men who are harassing us. This vulnerability comes from the physical advantage that most men have over women, meaning that even the most confident of women are assigned to keeping our heads down for fear of escalation and our own physical safety.

Conclusion: I hope these accounts demonstrate the harmful impact that misogynistic hatred has on women every day, and why our experiences warrant recognition in the UK's hate crime laws. It is a true shame it has taken until 2020 for hatred towards women to be considered seriously alongside hatred against people because of their race, religion, disability status, transgender status or sexual orientation, given it is so widespread and causes harm to half the population. Having the female gender recognised as a protected characteristic would be a genuine breakthrough for women, help build a more accurate and intersectional picture of the impact of misogyny in society and lay the ground work to a future where women are not left to be walking targets for hatred simply due to their gender.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12: Following the current considerations for inclusions of new protected characteristics (prevalence, additional harms, suitability), there would need to be evidence that hatred towards the male gender is widespread and causes harm to society at large for this to be the case. If this evidence does not exist in relation to a hatred of men, then the protection should be limited to women, assuming that the evidence provided sufficiently meets the 3 current criteria being considered.

Question 13: Yes

Expand:

Question 14: No

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Dr Jen Neller

Name of Organisation: Birkbeck University of London

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Yes

Expand: This would strengthen the hate crime offences by enhancing their visibility and accessibility. The ability to access all of the hate crime offences within a single, rationalised statute would make it easier to understand the individual offences as well as how they fit together and which might be the most appropriate in response to a particular situation.

It would also be beneficial to remove the stirring up hatred offences from the Public Order Act 1986, and I advise against continuing the association of these provisions with this framing in any way. The consistent positioning of these provisions as public order offences has encouraged the notion that intervening in hateful propaganda is justified only when 'public order' or 'the peace' is deemed to be jeopardised. While the wording of the stirring up offences does not require such a threat to the peace, their status as public order offences has influenced how they have been understood (or rather, there are certain ways in which they have been understood that have led to their unquestioned positioning as public order offences). This is closely linked to the need to balance legal intervention in expressions of hatred with the protection of free speech. The combination of these concerns has led to a propensity to justify restrictions on free speech in the name of the 'common good' of public order (as though the protection of targeted groups is insufficient justification), and public order, in turn, has been defined in middle class capitalist/consumerist terms as including the right to go shopping or on holiday unimpeded (see the parliamentary debates preceding the enactment of the Public Order Act 1986). The notion of public order, then - as denoting an inegalitarian, neoliberal status quo - is unhelpful for addressing factors such as the stirring up of hatred that lead to alienation and exclusions from public life.

Additionally, the public order framing elides any distinction between different types of public disturbance. While it has been argued that the focus on public order enables a 'content neutral' approach (i.e. it avoids having to pass judgement on the content of speech rather than just determining its likely effects), this affords no assessment of the varying merits of intervening in racist or anti-racist speech, for example. This is most pressingly problematic in relation to other offences under the Public Order Act 1986, such as the lack of distinction in Part 2 between demonstrations that seek to intimidate racial minorities and demonstrations that seek to resist such intimidation. However, it is also consistent with the history of the

stirring up hatred offences, which have consistently been framed as symbolic measures for the mollification of minorities (whose frustrations surrounding hostility and discrimination are deemed a risk to public order) at least as much as they have been framed as measures that will actually be effective in alleviating the stirring up of hatred against them. Thus, it might be hoped that removing the stirring up hatred offences from the Public Order Act 1986 would be a first step towards refocusing them on meaningfully addressing the stirring up of hatred rather than being a superficial risk management exercise in relation to the frustrations of marginalised, harassed and targeted communities

Question 2: Yes

Expand: Yes, insofar as specifying characteristics ensures without doubt that hatred on such grounds will be encompassed. However, in order to avoid being exclusionary or over-deterministic, reference to characteristics should be in relation to perceived categories rather than groups. This is essential in order for the law can recognise axes of difference and different experiences without reinforcing essentialist notions of inherent difference, i.e. so that it can respond to hatred without reinforcing the foundations upon which it is premised.

Question 3: Other (please expand)

Expand: Firstly, I would like to point to the slippage from characteristic to group (or from broad characteristic to specific characteristic) that is demonstrated in the wording of the first criterion. This unduly limits the representation of the offences and how they will be understood, risks suggesting that they serve the interests of a particular group and risks portraying particular groups as especially hated and vulnerable. While it is likely that the need to include a certain characteristic will be demonstrated by reference to the experiences of one or more particular groups, the focus should be on the characteristics of the hatred rather than the characteristics of groups. Otherwise, the justification for the offence can come to rely on the shared experiences and 'true' representation of the group, leading to the essentialisation, crystallisation and gatekeeping of group membership. This was seen, for example, in the parliamentary debates preceding the enactment and amendment of Part 3A of the Public Order Act 1986: advocates of extending the stirring up hatred offences argued that there was a justificatory need to protect Muslims and gay people, while opponents argued that not all Muslims and not all gay people were in favour of the reforms. Thus, there was an expectation or criterion of group unity that detracted from the question of whether there was a demonstrable need to legislate against the stirring up of hatred on *grounds* of religion or sexual orientation. These kinds of logics demand that groups present their identities and their interests as cohesive and unified in order to effectively lobby for protections in ways which often occlude intersectionality and result in the marginalisation of their most vulnerable members. In other words, the criterion should be to demonstrate that crime based on hostility or prejudice in relation to a certain category of hatred is prevalent that the hatred is sufficiently problematic rather than that the victims are sufficiently deserving of protection.

To return to the question asked, the second criterion leaves open the question as to what is encompassed by the term 'harm' (I am thinking here of the extensive discussion on this question included in the Online Communications consultation paper). Moreover, the wording suggests that it is necessary for additional harm to be cause to the victim, members of the targeted group *and* society more widely. This implies a degree of separation between a targeted group and "wider society" and could amount to an 'interest convergence' requirement, i.e. that additional harms against victims and targeted groups only warrant legal attention if it is also in the interests of "society more widely". While I doubt that this is the intended outcome (or at least sincerely hope that it is not), this wording adds a deeply

worrying majoritarianism to the criteria. In order to genuinely address the harms experienced by targeted groups, such harms must not be assessed in relation to society “more widely”. Rather, harms caused to targeted groups must be seen *as always constituting* harm to the society of which they are a part.

Additionally, while I agree that a flexible approach is important, the last criterion appears so broad that it undermines any point in specifying criteria. Any new proposed characteristic will undoubtedly face objections on the grounds that it is ‘unsuitable’, a poor fit with the existing offences, a poor use of criminal justice resources and inconsistent with the rights of others. Indeed, the stirring up religious hatred offences were argued to be all of these things, but now that they have been included they have, by the third criterion, ironically become a benchmark for the inclusion of other characteristics. The malleability of ‘suitability’ as currently defined renders it unhelpful for clarifying or in any way enhancing the methodological rigour of the approach taken to including or excluding characteristics.

What is missing from these criteria is whether inclusion within hate crime legislation is an appropriate and effective response to the harms identified under the second criterion. I do not believe that it should be assumed that this is a corollary of ‘demonstrable need’, as defined by the first criterion: a high prevalence of crime based on hostility or hatred does not necessarily mean that the harms caused by such incidents can best be remedied through amendments to hate crime legislation. In addition to the possibility that such amendments might be ineffective, for example if barriers to reporting are not addressed or if evidentiary thresholds are rarely attainable, there may also be the risk that amendments could be counterproductive, by which I mean that they might inadvertently contribute harms, hostilities or inequalities. This could occur in situations where those who seek to resist hatred against a minority are accused of fuelling hatred against a majority (e.g. anti-racism activists being accused of stirring up anti white hatred), or where prejudice against a particular group leads to disproportionate allegations that they are perpetrating hate crimes (for example where religious minorities might be more likely to be charged with stirring up hatred on grounds of sexual orientation than Christians). Particular sensitivity to the utility and effects of extending the law should be had when it is purportedly for the benefit of groups that have typically been disproportionately harassed, endangered or disregarded by law enforcement.

Question 4: There is a long history of problematic associations between ‘race relations’, immigration law and hate crime provisions (specifically the stirring up racial hatred offences) that must be very carefully attended to here. I discuss these issues at length in chapter six of my doctoral thesis (which I will email separately). It should be considered how political speech might be caught by such an extension, or rather the ways in which political speech has been able to stoke xenophobia and racism without legal consequences. In this way, attention should be paid to the causes and not just the symptoms of the problem, so as to avoid punishing individuals for less articulately expressing the xenophobic ethos underlying various views and policies aired by politicians and public figures.

This issue illustrates very clearly the need to focus on the characteristics of the hatred rather than the characteristics of the targeted group. For a travelling community, for example, experiences of anti-gypsy hatred will be harmful regardless of whether they are actually of gypsy heritage. What is at issue is how they have been perceived and treated on the basis of that perception. This is equally true if a UK citizen speaking Welsh is subjected to hostility on the basis that they were perceived to be foreign. The law should not be concerned with determining whether or not an individual or a group is or is not a ‘racial group’ (the bounded and objective existence of which is dubious at best); to do so is to reinforce the notions of objective difference that hatred, hostility and prejudice are based upon. Thus, the law should

not seek to define a 'racial group' for the purposes of hate crime provisions and more emphasis should be placed on the bracketed 'or presumed' elements of the relevant CDA and CJA provisions. That the hatred, hostility or prejudice is based on the presumed racial otherness of the target is all that is required. It would, however, probably be useful to specify that presumed racial otherness may be indicated by comments related to colour, race, nationality (including citizenship), ethnic or national origins, or language. We might also add attire, as comments related to clothing that is deemed to mark a person as foreign or belonging to a minority ethnic group can also indicate racial hostility. While such clothing is often categorised as religious, this does not preclude it from being treated as a marker of racial difference (indeed, hostility on the basis of racial and religious difference can be inseparable where certain religions are viewed as foreign or are strongly associated with particular races).

Such an approach would probably encompass hatred, hostility and prejudice against immigrants and asylum seekers in most instances. However, there is some risk that hatred against individuals or groups due to their 'illegal' status or presumed cost to public funds might, exceptionally, be communicated without any reference to race. Such instances would seem to fall beyond the purview of any definition of racial hatred, and may instead point to the benefits of providing a non-exhaustive list of characteristics.

Similarly, in relation to the stirring up hatred offences where it is not necessary for there to be any identifiable victim whose identity is known or presumed by an offender, it is sufficient to analyse the content of the material at issue. Thus, if a defendant used racial slurs in abusive descriptions of travelling show people, that should bring the material within Part 3 of the POA, regardless of whether the show people themselves, or anyone else, consider them to be an ethnic group.

Question 5: Yes

Expand: The notion of a (presumed) religious group is more salient than the notion of a (presumed) racial group. Whereas we might talk about racial hatred or racial hostility quite clearly, terms such as religious hatred or religious hostility run the risk of being interpreted as referring to hatred or hostility that stems *from* religious beliefs rather than that is directed *towards* religious beliefs. Additionally, it is more relevant to talk about religion in terms of group membership than race, where it suffices to refer to perceived difference. If the additional harm that hate crime provisions are to redress is the harm inflicted on members of the target community, it makes sense that membership of such a community is at issue in relation to religion (whereas with race it may be a broader issue of persons of colour being targeted more generally). I would like to reiterate, however, that the emphasis should be on an offender's presumptions regarding the target's membership of a religious group, rather than any attempt to determine the 'truth' of such membership.

What may be missed in the reliance on (presumed) membership of a religious group is hatred or hostility based on a target's perceived transgressions of religious precepts. For example, attacks against apostates could conceivably fall through the gaps if the motivation is found to be solely based on the target's renunciation of their religion, rather than either their membership of a religious group or lack of religious belief, per se. While an appropriate legal response is important for the protection of freedom of religion in such instances, perceived transgressions against religious precepts is an intra- rather than inter-religious matter, and therefore perhaps falls beyond the scope of hate crime law.

The current definition of a religious group adds little as it defines a religious group by reference to religious belief without any further insight as to what might or might not qualify

as such. However, I agree that sensible common law guidelines have so far been developed on this matter and that it would not be helpful to remove flexibility by codifying these guidelines within statute

Question 6: Yes

Expand: It seems straightforward enough that sects are, and will continue to be, understood as religious groups

Question 7: The reference to “a group of persons defined by reference to sexual orientation” in the definition is at odds with the lack of reference to group membership within section 146 of the CJA. The CJA refers to hostility towards the sexual orientation or presumed sexual orientation of the victim. Sexual orientation might then more helpfully be defined as the sex or gender to which a person is or is not sexually oriented. This would have the advantage of not only encompassing asexuality, but also pansexuality, attraction to trans persons and non binary orientations, as well as avoiding the notion that sexual orientation can/should be legally divided into three or four cis-normative groups

Question 8: Yes

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: I agree that “transgender, non-binary or intersex” is an improvement. I suggest that a simpler and wider-reaching category could be along the lines of “sex characteristics or gender expression”. This would include all forms of hostility concerned with the enforcement of ‘traditional’ sex and gender divisions as well as misogyny. A non exhaustive list such as that proposed could equally be included within the definition of such a term. Such an open approach avoids attempts to define, classify and categorise individuals on the basis of their sex characteristics and/or gender expression. This has the benefit of enabling the inclusion of identity formations that may escape current designations or that may emerge in the future, as well as ensuring that the focus is on the nature of the offender’s hostility rather than ‘correctly’ labelling the identity of the victim.

I appreciate that bringing misogyny within this category would probably be objectionable to some, but this strikes me as an inclusive means of dealing with both types of hostility while producing minimal overlap with specific areas of law dealing with violence against women and sexual violence. For example, such a category could be used in conjunction with race and/or religion to respond to the targeting of women who wear headscarves, insofar as such attire is an expression of gender identity. Additionally, the category would cover a situation where a man is attacked for being effeminate. Such an instance might currently fall through the gaps if he was neither cross-dressing nor assumed to be homosexual: the hostility would have been based on perceived gender expression rather than perceived sexual orientation or “transgender, non-binary or intersex” identity. As a further aside, the broad category suggested avoids having to determine whether wearing eyeliner, for example, amounts to or was perceived as ‘cross-dressing’; it would suffice that it was perceived as a gender expression by the offender.

Question 9: I wonder if the definition might be extended to any physical or mental impairment, injury or medical condition. This would seem to cover those who do not identify with the label ‘disabled’ listed in paragraph 11.99, as well as persons with skin conditions, scars and other physical but non-impairing irregularities.

I am concerned, however, as to how broader definitions (as well as existing ones) may feature in low level offences, where off hand comments about a person's appearance or mental acuity, for example, will often be quite incidental to the offence

Question 10: While it is not directly hostility towards disability that is at issue in such instances, there seems to be some analogy with attempts to enforce sex/gender binaries and an intolerance of differing abilities. Nevertheless, I do not think that this can be classed as a hate crime, as the hostility is towards perceived dishonesty. Therefore, I believe that this problem can be better dealt with through education and awareness campaigns, and efforts to increase the visibility and positive representation of persons with diverse disabilities in public life.

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: I suggest a category which would ensure that sex and gender are not interpreted as limited to the 'traditional' binary of male or female (provisionally 'sex characteristics and gender expression'). The purpose of this broad category is not to erase the specificity of women's experiences of hostility; rather, such specificity could be detailed in CPS guidelines and would be reflected in the resulting case law.

Question 11 Part 2: It seems to me that the offences that are sought to be exempted are those where *hostility* towards sex/gender would be the most difficult to prove. For this reason, such carve-outs do not appear to be necessary.

I do not believe that these offences should be seen to be undermined in any way by virtue of generally falling outside of the rubric of hate crimes, since they do not, or very rarely, coincide with *hostility* on grounds of sex or gender. They are still very serious offences with very serious penalties attached. In terms of VAWG and domestic violence, then, hate crimes could be seen as supplementary, catching instances that might not otherwise be labelled as sex or gender-based crime, rather than as additional and necessarily overlapping.

Question 12: I do not believe that it should be limited to women, or to women and men. It should cover all sex characteristics and gender expressions.

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Yes

Expand:

Question 15: The harms involved are adequately covered by disability hate crime provisions and sentencing guidelines relating to vulnerability and positions of responsibility.

Question 16:

Question 17: A non-exhaustive list of categories could enable such hostilities to be included where appropriate.

Question 18: A non-exhaustive list of categories could enable such hostilities to be included where appropriate.

Question 19: It seems unlikely that crimes targeting homeless people would be motivated by hostility towards their homelessness. I think that consideration of vulnerability during sentencing decisions would cover crimes against homeless persons in most instances.

However, a non-exhaustive list of categories could enable such hostilities to be included if they were to be at issue.

Question 20: A non-exhaustive list of categories could enable such hostilities to be included where appropriate.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Yes

Expand: There does not seem to be much risk that seriously problematic material would escape criminalisation by virtue of not being 'written', but there also does not seem to be any reason for including such a specification.

Question 41: Other (please expand)

Expand: I agree with the proposed consolidation of the relevant offences. However, careful consideration of the term 'inflammatory' is required. This term does not distinguish between whether material stirs up hatred in an audience *against a group* or whether it provokes the hatred of an audience *against the author/presenter/performer*. In other words, it encompasses both stirring up hatred *against* a racial minority, for example, and stirring up the hatred *of* a racial minority. In my view, only the former is the proper domain of the stirring up hatred offences; the latter is properly dealt with in terms of alarm and distress under Part 1 of the Public Order Act.

The confusion that I describe here, which can be referred to as the elision of incitement and provocation, has permeated debates on the stirring up hatred offences and led to considerable misunderstanding over their aims and scope. This was most keenly demonstrated in relation to the religious hatred offences (where the matter is further confused by the ambiguity of the term 'religious hatred'). These offences were frequently presented as encompassing offence caused to religious groups – i.e. the *provocation* of religious groups – rather than being confined to the incitement of hatred against religious groups – i.e. the *incitement* of religious hatred. Maintaining and placing new emphasis on the description of problematic material as 'inflammatory' risks perpetuating this confusion.

While 'inflammatory' is pithier, using an alternative term such as 'material intended or likely to incite hatred' would help to clarify the scope of the offences and to mitigate their misrepresentation as concerned with the provocation of offence.

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: I recommend referring to the following resource: United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, "Rabat Plan of Action on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence." UN Doc: A/HRC/22/17/Add.4 (2013), http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Opinion/SeminarRabat/Rabat_draft_outcome.pdf

The Rabat Plan of Action sets out six criteria for consideration in the criminalisation of hate speech, which can be summarised as: the social and political context of the expression; the status of the speaker; the intent of the speaker; the content of the expression; the extent and magnitude of the expression; and the likelihood and imminence of harm occurring as a result.

While likelihood and intent should probably remain the only limbs of stirring up hatred offences, it might be beneficial to include the other criteria within CPS and sentencing guidelines, and/or within a provision that clarifies the scope of the stirring up hatred offences. Attention to the status of the speaker in particular might help to shift the focus of enforcement from the punishment of already marginalised outsiders to those who are likely to be more influential in their incitement, even if or perhaps precisely because they and their language appear more 'respectable'.

Question 45: Yes

Question 45 Part 1: However, it is unclear as to the basis on which a prosecution will be able to demonstrate intent to stir up hatred in the absence of such language. It should not be assumed that removing the language criterion will necessarily make the intent limb easier to prosecute

Question 46: Other (please expand)

Expand: I agree with the general approach. The consultation paper does not explain why 'recklessness' would not be a suitable way of expressing the mental element here. E.g. 1) the defendant's words or behaviour were threatening or abusive, 2) the defendant's words or behaviour were likely to stir up hatred and 3) the defendant was reckless as to whether their words or behaviour were threatening or abusive and likely to stir up hatred. Here, recklessness, seems to cover "knew or ought to have known" more succinctly and in a manner that is well established in criminal law

Question 47: Yes

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Yes as outlined in the consultation paper there is no evidence that removing the word insulting actually affects the scope of the provisions, while leaving it in place problematically suggests that the offences are broader than they are.

Question 48: Yes

Expand: The recommendation not to include these categories in the earlier consultation was problematic: it was justified on the basis that there was insufficient evidence of need for such an interference with free speech, but had the categories been added such interference would never have manifested unless there had a need had materialised in a particular instance. While it might be argued that a possible chilling effect would have amounted to interference beyond that need, I do not view the chilling of expressions of hatred and prejudice to be an undesirable side effect. Indeed, it is this very chilling that is alluded to as a benefit in relation to the deterrent and symbolic effects of such legislation

Question 49: Yes

Expand:

Question 50: I do not see a need to specify this. The emphasis should not be on the identity of the target group, but on the basis on which a group is targeted. If hatred is intended or likely to be stirred up on multiple grounds, each should be taken into consideration. At sentencing, it should also be considered whether hatred on multiple grounds combine to produce greater harm than if they were considered individually or cumulatively.

Question 51: Other (please expand)

Expand: While the criterion of 'within a dwelling' seems arbitrary, some protection for private conversation would be prudent in order to ensure adherence to Article 8 ECHR and to reassure critics of the offences that they do not permit the state to intrude upon their private affairs. It does not follow from the fact that there is no such provision in relation to encouraging the commission of an offence under the Serious Crime Act that there should be no such provision in relation to the stirring up offences: the former pertains to a much more direct incitement of criminal activity while the latter pertains to inciting a particular state of mind that may not have any direct or indirect criminal consequences. It is therefore appropriate for there to be an extra safeguard for privacy in relation to stirring up hatred

An exemption for private conversation can also be supported through consideration of the purpose of the offences. If the purpose is viewed through a public order lens (which I do not believe that it should be), there can be no justification for interfering with private conversation that falls short of encouragement to commit a crime. If the purpose is viewed in terms of promoting a fair and just society where groups do not have hatred stirred up against them on the grounds of various characteristics, the justification for interfering in private conversation also seems weak. The inequalities and injustices of society are unlikely to be effectively redressed through the regulation of conversations at the dinner table. I believe that such ends would be far more effectively pursued through attention to public discourse, and especially that of public figures and mass media, which should be held to high standards precisely because of their powers of legitimating and normalising viewpoints, and the wider influence they are subsequently likely to have on both private conversations and more public expressions of prejudice and hostility. It seems quite backwards to be widening the net at the least influential and least harmful end of the spectrum of speech

Private conversation, or some similar alternative exemption, may then be defined appropriately. For example, it may be specified that meetings organised specifically for purposes connected to the stirring up of hatred, and private communications sent or posted to strangers or to a sizeable audience are not included within the exemption.

Question 52: No

Expand: Specifying what is not included in relation to individual categories is contrary to the efforts of this review to make hate crime legislation less piecemeal and more resilient to future developments. A more straightforward and accessible approach would be to provide an indication of the scope of 'stirring up hatred' Here, it could be specified that criticism of the actions of institutions, of specific beliefs, of specific behaviours or of policies will not, by itself, fall within the stirring up hatred offences. This would also be a good place to clarify that stirring up hatred refers to inciting an audience to hate a third party, not provoking or offending a targeted group. Such a definition could also provide a positive clarification, along the lines that suggesting that a protected characteristic renders people less human, less civilised, less valuable to society, less deserving of dignity and respect, less deserving of access to services or more deserving of violence, discrimination or hatred than others will fall within the offences, although it will still need to be proved that the defendant thereby intended or was likely to stir up hatred Such a determination will give regard to the social and political context of the expression; the status of the speaker; the content of the expression; the extent and magnitude of the expression; and the likelihood and imminence of harm occurring as a result (these criteria are drawn from the Rabat Plan of Action).

By clarifying the scope of the offences, it will be considerably easier to defend them against misrepresentation and to assess their compliance with Article 10 ECHR Should the offences be misrepresented, a single provision could be pointed to for correction and clarification.

Question 52 Part 2: I believe that a general statement on the scope of the offences would be more appropriate see my response to Question 52.

Question 53: I believe that a general statement on the scope of the offences would be more appropriate see my response to Question 52.

It is not clear from the source linked in the consultation paper whether Professor Silver reported the then Home Secretary under Part 3 of the Public Order Act. Indeed, the recording of non-crime hate incidents (and police responses such as that at issue in *Miller v College of Policing*) is an entirely separate matter from the stirring up hatred offences. Given the extent to which the enforcement of section 5 of the POA and the recording of hate incidents have erroneously been used in arguments against the stirring up hatred offences in the past, the Law Commission would be well advised to ensure these matters are treated separately and to avoid contributing to such confusions.

Question 54: Yes

Expand: I believe that the main consideration for providing such consent should be whether there is a public interest in bringing a prosecution. Perhaps this is already adequately provided for in CPS guidelines, but I believe that it is an important consideration to guard against the imposition of criminal procedures for minor and unimportant infringements that result in very little risk of harm.

Question 55 Part 1: Such exemptions, if maintained, should be balanced with professional training and the rigorous enforcement of appropriate and sufficiently stringent codes of conduct, which should be reviewed in light of any reforms brought pursuant to this review. It would be deeply problematic if such powerful public figures could say with impunity what an ordinary citizen would be criminalised for saying.

Question 55 Part 2: Such reporting or academic material should not be intended to stir up hatred or reckless as to whether it is likely to, so I do not see a need for further exemptions. If it were intended to stir up hatred or was reckless as to the likelihood of hatred being stirred up, criminal investigation would be appropriate.

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: I believe that there would be a benefit to having an authoritative expert on hate crime law and centralised coordination of non-criminal justice responses to and efforts to prevent hatred, hostility and prejudice. Such a position should work closely with the education secretary, including on matters such as decolonising the curriculum and inclusive personal, social and health education.

An important addition to the list of activities that a Hate Crime Commissioner might perform should be the investigation into and combating of institutional biases and complicities. Thus, there should be concerted attention to the societal causes and drivers of hatred and not only to its effects and responses. A Hate Crime Commissioner should be given adequate authority and support to meaningfully call out the ways in which government discourses and policies contribute to hatred and are, at best, reckless as to the consequences. Without such powers to tackle the institutional causes of hatred and the complicities of the most powerful in society, a Hate Crime Commissioner would be at risk of becoming an empty, tokenistic symbol, or rather a symbol of government unwillingness to disrupt existing power dynamics and address the ways in which it inhibits a safe and fair society.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: I am responding in my capacity as a private individual.

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: This proposal could criminalise the expression of different opinions in debate, and would result in the closing down of free speech. People these days are very thin-skinned, and highly likely to complain that the expression of any opinion with which they disagree is "hate speech". If the person expressing that opinion already knew that someone else did not agree with that opinion, that prior knowledge could be interpreted, wrongly, as "intention to stir up hatred" This proposal is therefore dangerous to freedom of debate

Question 46: No

Expand: In these days, people freely accuse others of "hatred", merely because they express an opinion that they disagree with I do not believe that anyone should have a right not to be offended. People can also refer to the expressions of different opinions "abusive" merely because they do not like those opinions. The term "abusive", if used at all, must be very carefully defined.

Question 47: No

Expand: Some characteristics, such as race, are not characteristics that a person chooses. Others, such as religion or sexual orientation, are chosen. In previous criminal law, the test has been "beyond reasonable doubt". To criminalise someone on the test of "likely to" is novel, and dangerous to freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues. Transgender ideology is highly controversial, and there are good reasons to be opposed to it. This provision would tend to close down justifiable debate.

This proposal could also have the effect of eliminating safe spaces for women. It would also restrict the ability to support those who now regret having "transitioned", and now wish to de-transition.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in private homes should not be subject to criminal law. The Scottish Government has been severely criticised over its attempts to introduce such a provision. Perhaps this kind of thing has a place in repressive regimes such as China, North Korea, Stalinist Russia, Hitler's Germany - but not in Britain.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up offences in relation to controversial matters such as religion and gender theory must have strong free-speech protections built-in.

"Misgendering" must not be a crime - such as using the "wrong" pronouns, or birth name rather than chosen name. Stating the biological fact that there are only 2 sexes must also not be a crime.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Errors on the part of the DPP could have extremely serious consequences for the accused. The AG is answerable to Parliament, and there are therefore more rigorous checks on his / her decisions than there are on the DPP.

Question 55 Part 1: Verbatim reports of what is said in Parliament should be exempt. However, comments made by others should fall within any new offence.

Comments made by judges and magistrates should be similarly privileged. The question of whether an accuser could be considered to have made a criminally-liable "hate speech" offence when testifying against the accused is an interesting concept. Is it possible that the judge could find that the complaint against the accused is motivated by hatred against the accused, and therefore find the accuser guilty of a hate crime, rather than the accused?

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: Katharine Harris

Name of Organisation: LGB Alliance

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Response on behalf of organisation

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: The problem here can be summed up in one word Confusion There is little point in bringing together a single "Hate Crime Act" until there is a set of agreed terms covering key areas under discussion

It is clear from the wording of the Consultation that the Law Commission has already moved away from generally accepted terminology in relation to sex and gender. The Commission seems content to follow the social revolution which has taken place without any public consultation. As examples - the words "sex" and "gender" are conflated; prostitutes are described as "sex workers".

This social revolution seeks to remove the word sex altogether and replace it with gender, or if that is not possible to conflate the two. As far as protected characteristics are concerned, the goal of campaigners is to replace the current characteristic of "gender reassignment" with "gender identity "

These changes, which are at the heart of gender identity theory, have the consequence of eliminating sex-based legal protection for women, girls and same-sex (not same-gender) attracted people

The Government must consult widely on these issues and clarify legislation and all Government guidance and education. Until that happens the proposed changes will be misleading and simply make an already difficult situation worse

We stand for the rights of lesbian, gay and bisexual people and we see these under greater threat now than at any time in the last half century not least from those who most ardently support new hate crime legislation We will refer to examples of this later in our submission

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: There is great confusion between the terminology of the Equality Act 2010 and the criminal law. Whatever the outcome of this consultation we would like to see alignment between the two.

As stated in our answer to Question 1 we encourage the Law Commission to lobby the Government for legal clarity of terms used before taking any other action

Question 3: No

Expand: The key word in this question is "evidence". The key phrase is "workable in practice". For any law to work effectively evidence must be clear and society must be able to understand how the law would work. Neither of these are possible at the moment so the proposal is not helpful

As a group representing lesbians, gays & bisexuals we focus on fact based discussion and campaigning. We need a better understanding of the demands of those who seek to remove sex and sexual orientation as protected characteristics and replace them with gender, gender identity or trans identity.

Gender identity theorists who are strongly supportive of hate crime legislation have a belief in "gender identity" which they wish to be protected, yet "gender identity" has no evidential base.

The word "trans" itself is also hard to define and evidence is confused. Stonewall offers 17 different definitions: "An umbrella term to describe people whose gender is not the same as, or does not sit comfortably with, the sex they were assigned at birth. Trans people may describe themselves using one or more of a wide variety of terms, including (but not limited to) transgender, transsexual, gender-queer (GQ), gender-fluid, non-binary, gender-variant, crossdresser, genderless, agender, nongender, third gender, bi-gender, trans man, trans woman, trans masculine, trans feminine and neutrois". <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/help-advice/faqs-and-glossary/glossary-terms#>

In evidence to the Women & Equalities Select Committee on reform to the Gender Recognition Act on 9th Dec 2020, Professor Alex Sharpe, trans activist, said: "In addition to the obvious delays that Stephen (Whittle) has referred to, which are well known, we should recognise that a diagnosis for gender dysphoria, apart from mythologising and infantilising the whole trans community, runs against the grain of current medical best practice globally." Yet further on in the evidence Dr Ruth Pearce, trans activist, says that 13,000 people are "currently on a (gender clinic) waiting list and more are being added all

the time" Here we need clarity

If there is no medical condition to be diagnosed, why is medical treatment such an urgent necessity or indeed required at all? There appears to be a confusion at the heart of what it is to be transgender:

- Is it a medical condition? Then a careful diagnosis is required in order to decide whether the problem is physical or mental, or both, in order to decide on the appropriate medical pathway
- Is it a lifestyle choice? In that case, it is very reasonable to impose strict conditions, since it is a choice that impacts on other people.

It is hard to avoid concluding that those who speak on behalf of the “trans community” have difficulty defining what it means to be transgender. This needs clarification. A characteristic that has not been defined cannot be inscribed into law

In relation to the specifics of this question - it is impossible to show demonstrable need without being able to specify the characteristic

"Additional harm" is purely subjective which along with the lack of clear definition would make the law completely unworkable in practice.

Question 4: N/A

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 7: SUMMARY ANSWER

In short no. There are three kinds of sexual orientation; heterosexual, homosexual (to include gay men & lesbians) and bisexual Someone who is asexual does not have a sexual orientation hence the name.

It is hard to believe that this is a real question in a Law Commission consultation on hate crime. It seems to confirm our concern, stated in question 1, that the Law Commission has succumbed to the views of proponents of gender identity theory a set of beliefs with no evidence base Could this be related to the fact that the Ministry of Justice, which funds the Law Commission, is a leading Stonewall Diversity Champion, ranking 5th in the 2020 Equality Index? Stonewall has been actively promoting the view that "asexual" or "ace" people must be added to the groups they now represent For 2021 these groups are women (in Stonewall's world view this includes any man who says he is a woman), non-binary and intersex people.

At a time when homosexuality is illegal in many parts of the world, with the death sentence still imposed in Iran, and on the statute books of several other countries, it seems offensive to trivialise the very real challenges of same-sex attracted people with those who are asexual and face none of this

The Kaleidoscope Trust (<https://kaleidoscopetrust.com/>) reported that 'Of the 53 member nations of the Commonwealth, 41 continue to criminalise consensual same-sex activities between adults Over half the countries in the world that criminalise

homosexuality are in the Commonwealth.'

We believe that the Law Commission should focus on the reality of discrimination and suffering of LGB people in the UK and around the world rather than considering a proposition that can only be described as juvenile and offensive.

DETAILED ANSWER

Our view is that "asexuality" should not be included within the definition of sexual orientation as part of hate crime and hate speech legislation.

While "asexuality" might be a part of contemporary academic and sociological discussions about the variations in human sexuality, there is a distinct purpose to the definitions used in hate crime and hate speech legislation

Like race and religion, sexual orientation - specifically same-sex attraction - has historically been a target for forms of extreme hostility and violence by individuals, organisations and nations. Gay men, lesbians and bisexuals in same-sex relationships have been vilified, attacked, flogged, imprisoned, and even executed because of who they have sex with or who they love, and in many parts of the world this is unfortunately still the case

Hate crime and hate speech legislation for sexual orientation is based on this historical legacy of persecution and to deter and criminalise those who display hateful and threatening behaviour or who incite violence towards same-sex attraction today

The Law Commission's own report in 2014 stated that it "had not been provided with evidence to show that individuals suffer hate crime due to being asexual". Has there been a substantial change in the availability of empirical data between 2014 and 2020 to justify a revision of the definition of sexual orientation?

The current Hate Crime consultation report by the Law Commission makes statements like

"However, since this time, awareness of asexuality, and the challenges asexual people face, has grown.";

"There is growing evidence that asexual people experience forms of discrimination in contemporary society, and some evidence that they experience violence and abuse on this basis.".

These are very vague statements and we note there is a distinct lack of numbers, percentages or rough estimates provided in the report as part of supporting evidence in the argument for the inclusion of asexuality. If there are groups that are meant to represent the "ace" community, they have not been specifically referenced nor has there been any mention of research surveys carried out to determine the sort of hate crimes and hate speech targeted towards people who experience no sexual attraction.

The consultation report mentions only two references in the context of asexuality.

One is a research paper (<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1368430212442419>)

This paper is not publicly accessible, which is disappointing because public consultations should be able to provide evidence that is available to the general public to enable them to participate in the process

From the abstract, the research paper seems focused on issues like asexuality being viewed negatively by others and forms of prejudice directed towards asexual people. This is of course unpleasant, but people can experience all kinds of negative behaviours from others based on certain characteristics and through no fault of their own

Vegans and those with unusual dietary requirements might be viewed negatively by the majority who do not share such values or frequently find themselves the target of jokes. People with unusual facial features or physical attributes might experience others making rude comments about them or avoiding them or they may feel a certain level of bias or prejudice in their social interactions.

The abstract doesn't indicate any data or research on hate speech or incitement to hostility and violence towards asexual people.

Poor behaviour from others can be improved on a social level by raising public awareness of asexuality and promoting tolerance even if people may not understand or relate to the asexual experience. This does not seem like a role for hate crime legislation.

The other reference is a news article which expands on the concept of asexuality

(<https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/love-sex/asexuality-what-it-explained-asexual-people-a7582351.html>)

The impression one gets from reading the article is that there seems to be a desire to frame many aspects of normal human behaviour as an identity in society these days. As individuals, human beings come with a wide range of sexual interest and sex drives. There have always been people who are uninterested in dating and having romantic relationships or who view sex as an unimportant facet of life.

It appears that some young people look at their peers and see them pursuing romantic interests and being in numerous serially monogamous relationships within a short timeframe. Since they do not feel the same urge or motivations, or they would rather spend their time in other productive activities, there is an understandable assumption that this must mean they have some sort of different and unique identity because they aren't frequently in a romantic or sexual relationship.

According to the article, asexual people can also engage in sex and enjoy it, as well as form meaningful and loving relationships - it just might be less frequently than most. There isn't anything particularly unusual or unique about this. In today's hyper-sexualised society it can seem like everyone is having lots of sex and easily finding themselves in relationships, however, it is a fact of life that many people can go several years, if not a decade or more, between sexual and romantic partners.

It can feel "shameful" or embarrassing to admit it, which is probably why there is a lack of honest conversations about these issues especially among young people. There really isn't anything unusual or unique in waiting or not actively seeking a partner until you meet someone that you really feel a connection with before deciding to pursue intimacy and companionship with them. The woman in the article describes this perfectly normal human behaviour as first identifying as asexual and then identifying as greysexual when she met someone she liked enough to settle down with.

However, a very important issue highlighted in the article is about incidents of bullying and pressure to have sex or even sexual assault, especially at school. Interestingly, it is the woman who talks about this, not the man. This doesn't indicate some special targeting of 'asexual people' in general, but rather it is further evidence that women's sexual autonomy is frequently disrespected, often by men. Women, on average, are more likely to be pressured into engaging in sexual activity they do not particularly want, with lesbians or women who don't seem 'up for it' targeted by some men as a sort of personal conquest to prove that sexual intercourse can change their mind. It is part of male entitlement and male sexual violence and coercion.

Nothing in the article conveyed a sense of hate crimes or hate speech specifically for being asexual, but it does highlight that there is much to be done on a societal level to ensure boys and men learn to respect a woman's desire not to have sex, irrespective of her reasons.

Women and girls are mocked and harassed for being 'slutty' as well as 'frigid'. These are not new problems simply because some people these days prefer to label it as an identity.

Neither of the references provided by the Law Commission in the consultation paper are convincing arguments for adding "asexuality" within the definition of sexual orientation in the hate crime legislation. If there is suitable empirical evidence in future to support its inclusion then there is always room to re-evaluate the decision

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: No

Since no definitions are provided for any of these categories, it makes no sense to seek to base laws on them.

Without a clear definition of "transgender" the phrase "who are or are presumed to be transgender" is meaningless. As noted in our answer to question 3, the "trans umbrella" on Stonewall's website includes a "non-exhaustive" list of 17 categories, including cross-dressers

The term "non binary" cannot be defined at all, other than as a chosen self definition. Persons who do not consider themselves to be particularly masculine or feminine may, or may not, call themselves "non-binary". Including this undefinable category of people in hate crime laws would introduce an element into legislation that is wholly subjective and in consequence wholly unenforceable.

Since women can wear so-called "men's" clothes without attracting opprobrium, the term "cross dressing" refers to men who wear so-called "women's" clothing. To offer the protection of hate crime legislation to men who choose a particular style of dress, whatever their motives for doing so, trivialises the subject of hate crime legislation.

We oppose extending the protection of hate crime legislation to styles of dress. In addition, it should be noted that according to the glossary on Stonewall's website, cross-dressers come under what it refers to as the "trans umbrella" and would therefore automatically be covered by any provision governing "persons who are or are presumed to be transgender."

The inclusion of a question on "intersex" persons here appears to be based on a misunderstanding. This issue bears no relation to "gender". Although gender identity activists frequently do try to force these issues together, it is unjustifiable. They do so as part of a misguided attempt to argue that there are more than two sexes. This is false. Of the small percentage of persons (approx 1.7%) who have Variations of Sex Characteristics (i.e. intersex medical conditions), roughly 98% are either male or female. See <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3813612?seq=1>

There is no justification whatsoever for including this infinitesimally small section of the population, who are unlikely to be recognizable as such in everyday life, in hate crime legislation.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: See answers above. If there is to be any new hate crime legislation, terminology must be based on fact such as biological sex, race or disability.

Categories used so broadly would not be enforceable in law.

We note that in section 11.78 of the full Consultation document the wording refers to "people who positively identify as a different gender to the one they were assigned".

It is of serious concern that the Law Commission the LAW Commission is going along with one of the most ridiculous statements of gender identity theorists. No one has ever been "assigned a gender". Sex is observed either in utero or at birth. How can we expect useful guidance from the Law Commission if it is unable to use precise terms and adopts the language of unelected campaigners?

Question 8 Part 3: We note that in section 11.78 of the full Consultation document the wording refers to "people who positively identify as a different gender to the one they were assigned".

It is of serious concern that the Law Commission the LAW Commission is going along with one of the most ridiculous statements of gender identity theorists. No one has ever been "assigned a gender". Sex is observed either in utero or at birth. How can we expect useful guidance from the Law Commission if it is unable to use precise terms and adopts the language of minority campaigners?

Definitions must be clear, precise and credible. What is proposed in Question 8 is none of these

Question 9: N/A

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: In section 12.15 of your Consultation document you state that "We recognise that attempts to define the terms sex and gender or speculate on the extent to which they correspond are highly contentious. We also acknowledge that the UK government's definition of gender and sex as two distinct concepts is not universally shared. It is beyond the scope of this consultation paper to explore these extensive debates." This undermines the value of the Consultation. If you are not clear on the meaning of words which you propose to use in legislation you will surely struggle to make any sensible recommendations

We have a clear view, outlined below

The phrase "gender or sex" reflects a fundamental misunderstanding. The word "sex" has a single meaning. It refers to biological sex. There are only two sexes: male or female. Sex-based protections are almost exclusively used to protect women and girls, who suffer a range of disadvantages in society arising from their biological sex

The word "gender" is used in three different ways. This is a problem, especially when the word is used in rules or even legal texts:

1. The word "gender" is widely used as a synonym for "sex" e.g. in phrases such as "gender pay gap".
2. Feminists use "gender" to refer to the systematic pressure exerted on males and females to conform to specific roles: "gender roles". In other words, to feminists, "gender" is a wholly negative concept: it consists of constraints they seek to eradicate.
3. Transactivists use "gender" as a shorthand for "gender identity" something they believe everyone has. This is a highly contentious view

These three meanings are constantly used without any clear understanding of the differences between them. For this reason, we strongly recommend that the word "gender" be removed from all legislation. It certainly has no place in any "hate crime" legislation.

Laws already exist in relation to forced marriage, FGM, and crimes of domestic abuse. The first two of these relate exclusively to girls, so there is no need to specify this. Domestic abuse consists overwhelmingly of crimes committed by men against women. Although we favour strong laws to address violence against women in a domestic setting, we do not believe that adding a provision under hate crime legislation would be an effective way of strengthening the law in this respect.

Question 11 Part 2: N/A

Question 12: The confusion at the root of this question is of deep concern. See answer to q 11.

Question 13: Yes

Expand: Were anything to be included it should be "women" not misogyny. By "women" we mean biological women.

As we have mentioned elsewhere, gender identity theorists have a record of manipulating language to build the world they wish to see where gender replaces sex and thereby removes sex based protections. We see the word "misogyny" broadened to include "transmisogyny" or the perceived hatred of trans women. If misogyny were used instead of women, then we foresee the prioritisation of transwomen over biological women.

Question 14: No

Expand: No.

See our reply to question 11 above. It is our view that because of the different ways in which the word "gender" is used and understood by different sections of society, it must not be included in legislation. The inclusion of this word can only deepen a confusion that has unfortunately permeated much of society, including government bodies. This confusion has had, and continues to have, a profoundly negative effect on the rights of women and girls, and of people with same-sex sexual orientation.

Question 15: We believe that young and old LGB people face specific challenges which could be protected under some kind of legislation. Whether this is hate crime law or a different kind of legal protection needs to be carefully investigated and acted upon.

YOUNG PEOPLE

It is our view that young people who do not conform to gender stereotypes are subject to immense psychological pressure to conform. There is a dominant narrative online and taught in schools by gender identity groups that everyone has a "gender identity". If this "gender identity" differs from the "gender assigned at birth", the child will learn that it may be "born in the wrong body".

As a result, we have seen a 4400% increase over the last decade, in girls being referred to the Gender Identity Services Clinic at the Tavistock Clinic. Recent research demonstrates that of these girls, only 8.5% describe themselves as being exclusively attracted to boys. So what we see is a growing trend where young lesbians are deciding that they are really boys. It is no longer possible to be a girl who does not like traditional "girly" things.

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/bjpsych-bulletin/article/sex-gender-and-gender-identity-a-reevaluation-of-the-evidence/76A3DC54F3BD91E8D631B93397698B1A>

There are few lesbian role models in the media or online. There are no youth groups or clubs or facilities for young lesbians. In LGBT environments it is understood that girls must be open to "relationships" with boys who identify as girls otherwise they are branded transphobic. This is seen by some as child abuse.

As lesbians ourselves, we believe that we too would have likely succumbed to the pressure to conform to regressive gender stereotypes. Instead, we have lived happy lives as lesbians but there is no encouragement at school or in the media for children and young people to think outside the prevailing LGBT narrative. We do need protection under the law, or we may see the disappearance of young lesbians, and over time young gay men.

This is an urgent aspect of legal protection that is missing from the current agenda.

OLD PEOPLE

We believe that old LGB people need protection particularly in terms of housing and social care. Again, we recommend research into the best way of protecting old LGB people who, for example, may have to move to a care home where everyone else is straight and may have prejudices against LGB people. It is time to take steps to ensure that anyone who is LGB can find a place to live or social care in an environment where they will be understood and accepted.

Question 16: see q 15

Question 17: 'Sex work' is a very broad definition to describe methods by which sexual services are sold

and it varies from in-person services such as prostitution and the thinly veiled reference to this by calling it 'escort work' to live sexual performances on 'camming' websites, or live online and static sexual stimulation by Only Fans or live sexual dances in strip clubs. This is too broad a term and it has been used to state "sex work is work"

The sex industry is exploitative, dangerous and mostly illegal in the UK and there is a risk that criticism of the sex trade will be muted, leading to the normalisation of 'sex work' if accusations of 'kink shaming' is to be criminalised via 'hate speech'

For example, earlier this month Leicester University issued a Student Sex Worker Policy and Toolkit (created with the help of the Student Support Services and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion teams) to prevent staff from making a 'moral judgement' of students who make money selling sex or sexual services.

If hate crime were to silence public criticism of this University and question whether this University are doing their students (both females who offer sexual services and the male students who pay for them) a disservice and neglecting their safeguarding duties then the realms of hate crime are encroaching on free speech

Question 18: No. This appears to be an 'umbrella' term as a 'catch all' approach to recognise hate crimes against popular trends which are based on liking a type of music, or a particular way of presenting yourself, such as 'drag'

All forms of preferences in music and clothes should be accepted generally in society and no one should be persecuted for their tastes, but we all have different interests and to be critical or questioning of why someone might have lots of tattoos or wear black is not a hate crime

We all should be able to express why we like or dislike something and whilst of course this should never result in violence or incitement of violence, it is an extreme position to take when considering free speech and how we are all individuals

Despite this being an area where there are now 11 police forces recording hate crimes

based on alternative subcultures, other than the tragic example of Sophie Lancaster, we could find no significant records of this being an issue and particularly not an area where hate crime is increasing. From Freedom of Information Requests, Northamptonshire Police Force who have been recording hate crime since 2014 there has been only one instance of a hate crime against an alternative subculture in 2017

Merseyside Police from 2013 to 2018 recorded 2 and also only 2 for Greater Manchester Police from 23rd June 2015 and 9th October 2016

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 23: N/A

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 25: No

Expand: As stated previously, law must be made using language that people understand. That means that it is pointless to use words like transgender and non binary as they are not defined in law and open to a wide range of different interpretations.

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 30: N/A

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 32: N/A

Question 33: N/A

Question 34: N/A

Question 35: N/A

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 38 Part 1: N/A

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 40: No

Expand: We are strongly opposed to the extension of the offence of “stirring up hatred” beyond its present limited contexts to cover “all material”. “Stirring up” is a vague phrase that is open to wide misinterpretation and that can easily be weaponised by those minded to bully their opponents and suppress views they dislike

Our group has already experienced this bullying and attempted suppression. If this can happen in the current situation, we ask the Law Commission to imagine the mischief that would occur if an offence of “stirring up hatred” were expanded to cover “all material” such as Twitter, for instance. It would be weaponised by activists and ideologues of all sorts to attempt to silence their opponents.

We think it worthwhile to illustrate our point by describing our own experience in some detail. We have faced several petitions in 2020 alone claiming we were a “hate group”. And it’s not just activists who have encouraged this bullying and attempt to “cancel” us. Throughout 2020 John Nicolson MP repeatedly tweeted claims that we were a “sinister hate group” who were funded by the Far Right, even publicly tagging the police and calling on them to investigate us. His own researcher publicly called for our funding websites to be closed down and was applauded online when they were indeed taken down after a petition was mounted. If an MP and his staff are willing to campaign and celebrate an organisation’s defunding, why would they NOT participate or encourage a malicious prosecution using the wider embrace of a provision “stirring up hatred” covering “all material”?

[@ALLIANCELGB](https://twitter.com/MrJohnNicolson/status/1329950461261193216)
www.lgballiance.org.uk 1

On 27 November 2020 Mr Nicolson even retweeted bizarre allegations that we were somehow behind a conspiracy to swing the SNP’s NEC elections. We were nothing to do

with any slate of candidates and are strictly non party-political anyway. In the course of these retweets he again declared publicly that we were a hate group. It was later shown that the claims were nonsense We asked him to remove these claims They remain on his timeline (as at 23 December).

<https://twitter.com/MrJohnNicolson/status/1332472730055282695?s=20>

The former Deputy Leader of the SNP Kirsty Blackman has also tweeted of us “your work is discriminatory, your twitter feed is shocking, and increasingly biphobic in addition to your stated rejection of the existence of trans and non binary people.” We have never rejected the existence of trans people Such a claim is surely tantamount to suggesting we are stirring up hatred. <https://twitter.com/KirstySNP/status/1335531987596161025?s=20>

When we held a meeting in Glasgow to launch our campaign against the Gender Recognition Act Reform in January 2020 the venue was accused of hosting a hateful event organised by a hate group and a boycott was widely promoted. We are being called hateful for no more than rejecting the view that sex is a spectrum, for challenging the notion of “gender identity” and for defending the scientific reality of two sexes Were an offence of “stirring up hatred” to be brought to bear on our statements in social media, for instance, we could face the need to defend ourselves in the courts, costing many thousands of pounds

We believe that the extension of the offence as suggested would be weaponised by our opponents and undermine our ability to express our point of view. It could also be used to limit other organisations or individuals who take a similar position: that is, defending scientific reality and opposing the notion of “gender identity”.

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 43 Part 1: N/A

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: N/A

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1: N/A

Question 46: No

Expand: The framing of this question in terms of what the prosecution would have to prove immediately highlights the problem of such vague accusations of “stirring up hatred”.

Freedom of expression is a priceless asset in a democracy. Compelling people to defend this right in the courts would have a chilling effect on public debate

Existing laws already provide sufficient ways of prosecuting people for incitement to violence or encouraging others to commit a crime. In our experience, many groups currently apply the word “hatred” to statements of fact or assertions that would have been considered perfectly innocuous just a few years ago.

Those who say that “lesbians don’t have penises” or “there are only two sexes” should not need to fight in court for their right to make such factual statements The sheer vagueness of

the phrase "stirring up hatred" would inevitably mean that more cases would have to be resolved in the courts.

This would disadvantage those with limited financial resources which would apply disproportionately to LGB people – besides placing an additional burden on already overstretched courts.

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand: We have already argued above (see our reply to question 40) that the phrase "stirring up" is far too vague and the extension of "stirring up" offences would be weaponised by those seeking to bully their opponents or suppress unwelcome views. We illustrated this point at length.

We have also argued (see our reply to question 14) that "sex or gender" is a muddled phrase that conveys nothing. We maintain that the word "gender" does not belong in legislation because it is used in three different ways and the resulting misunderstandings cause harmful confusion.

Question 50: N/A

Question 51: No

Expand: This is perhaps the most extraordinary question in an incredible consultation. Of course the words should not be removed. What kind of world do we want to live in? Who will police this? Will children be reporting on their parents?

In a free society anyone should be able to say whatever they like in their own home.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: We need every protection possible from prosecutions under a new offence of stirring up hatred so sections 29J and 29JA must be kept. As stated before we object to the new offence being made into law at all, but if it were to be, then these sections will be needed.

Question 52 Part 2: No as stated before there is no legal definition for transgender identity or gender these are social constructs

Sex and disability could be included, and the definitions used in the Equality Act 2010 would be the logical language to use

Question 53: yes

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand: N/A

Question 55 Part 1: N/A

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand: The UK already has legislation against racism under the Football Offences and Disorder Act 1999:

“Engaging or taking part in indecent or racist chanting at a designated football match is a criminal offence under this Act. Chanting is defined as 'the repeated uttering of any words or sounds whether alone or in concert with one or more others'. For this offence to be proved, the chanting must have been either due to the race of one of the players or regarded as indecent.”

This law has evolved over time to include a person chanting on their own rather than being part of a group. There is a long and detailed history of legislation specifically relating to football, from health and safety under the The Football Spectators Act 1989 to the Football Offences Act of 1991 (updated as noted in 1999), that already exists in law and does not need further amending or including in a new hate crime bill

Question 57: Yes

Expand: Stonewall's 2009 survey showed that “most fans said they would like to see homophobia

taken out of football” and the ‘rainbow laces’ campaign started in 2013, however there are still no openly gay male players in the top 4 divisions in 2020.

The FA's "Homophobia in Football" working group, Peter Clayton suggests that this is a commercial decision by clubs to prevent players from ‘coming out’ and the Football Association have been tackling homophobia since 2012.

There have been various campaigns run by the TUC, Kick it Out, the Scottish FA and Stonewall claim that 72% (in a 2009 survey) of fans have heard ‘anti LGBT’ remarks at matches. Recent government figures (September 2020) show that racist chanting has more than doubled from 14 in 2018/2019 to 35 in 2019/2020, but it is down from an all time high at 44 in 2010/2011 and derogatory chanting which is of a sexual orientation in nature has also more than doubled from 37 incidents in 2018/2019 to 78 incidents in 2019/2020. However chanting relating to ‘gender identity’ is down from 2 incidents to one incident respectively

We agree that sexual orientation should be included.

Question 57 Part 2: N/A

Question 58: N/A

Question 59: N/A

Question 60: N/A

Question 61: N/A

Question 62: No. We believe "Hate Crime" is a smoke screen being used to prevent discussion on a number of important issues. For us, the most important issues relate to sexual orientation

The priority of LGB Alliance is to see HM Government clarify current legislation relevant to issues of sex and gender. This includes definitions of words that are in common use but often misunderstood

For the protection of all LGB people, and gender non-conforming children, we must see the removal of the word gender when sex is meant. We must be allowed to reject language which seeks to persuade us that lesbians can have penises. We need the education system to reject the teaching of gender identity theory in schools. As same-sex attracted people we must have the freedom to state clearly that biology is a reality, that sex is immutable, and that it is not transphobic for us to have relationships exclusively with people of our own sex

Hate Crime should be considered only AFTER work has been done across Government to correct legislation and guidance that gives misleading information on the Equality Act and the Gender Recognition Act. Once we have clear language and agreed understanding we can move forward.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: Definitely not. In order for laws to be effective criteria need to be clearly defined. Sexual orientation covers gays, lesbians and bisexuals which are easily and clearly defined in the Equality Act and based in biology. Sex is binary and should not be conflated with gender ideology

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Transgender is protected in the EA under the protected characteristic of Gender Reassignment where it is clearly defined. This does not include male fetishism such as cross dressing, autogynephilia etc. Including non binary would be installing gender ideology into law through the back door something that has recently been rejected by

government. Inter sex people are not transgender they are either male or female with medical DSD's, it is absolutely disgraceful that this is even included as an option

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: As stated above

Question 8 Part 3: Gender ideology has no place in UK law. Sex is immutable and the laws of the UK should reflect this. People should not be forced to conform to laws that contradict scientific evidence. The HC recently ruled against administering puberty blockers to children due to the lack of evidence to support their use and changes to the Gender Reform Act 2004 were also recently denied. Laws are written using words allowing them to be clearly defined do not move away from this practice in order to circumvent established protocols

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Sex and gender should not be conflated. Sex is immutable whereas gender is an ideology. Protected characteristics are set out and clearly defined in the Equality Act. People already conflate sex and gender and this would only confuse the matter more as it would conflict with laws already in place.

Question 11 Part 2: There are only 2 sexes. Crimes should be recorded by biological sex. Research is now showing that the percentage of men who rape, attempt to rape or sexually abuse does not decrease in men who subsequently identify as women. Statistics will be skewed and worthless if crimes were reported based on gender. Gender could be used as a secondary characteristic to allow for additional statistics to be collected.

Women and girls have faced oppression, particularly from males for hundreds of years. FGM, period poverty, pregnancy and the majority of forced marriages all happen to females not transwomen, they deserve to have their rights protected. No changes should be made that will impinge on sex based rights.

Question 12: All hate crime should be sex based including men as well as women. Gender should not be included.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: As long as woman is as defined in the Equality Act i.e. Adult Human Female. The category of women should not include men who chose to identify as one.

Question 14: No

Expand: Laws should not be conflating sex and gender.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18: Alternative subculture could mean anything. Should a subculture of paedophiles be protected? Should a subculture of pornography be protected? Laws should be clearly defined otherwise they are worthless.

Question 19:

Question 20: In the appeals court recently recently Lord justice Bean and justice Warby ruled that “free speech encompasses the right to offend, and indeed to abuse another.

Question 21: No

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: In a recent judgement Lord justice Bean and justice Warby ruled that “free speech encompasses the right to offend, and indeed to abuse another. A precedent has been set

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: No characteristics need to be clearly defined and should not be subjective

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: They should only be liable if they refuse to remove unlawful material once it is reported

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1: Lord justice Bean and justice Warby recently ruled that “free speech encompasses the right to offend, and indeed to abuse another

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2: Threatening and abusive are distinctly different to insulting.

Lord justice Bean and justice Warby recently ruled that “free speech encompasses the right to offend, and indeed to abuse another

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand: The law should not conflate sex and gender

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Someone standing up for their protected characteristic should be protected from hate. For example a woman disagreeing that transwomen are women is not a transphobic bigot, they are a woman standing up for their sex based rights

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words or behaviour; 2. intention to stir up hatred. If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'. This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed – and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up – is dangerous. It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention.

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It

must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity – which are contentious issues – should not prohibit abusive conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation. Race is a neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically-motivated complainants. What is "abusive" is subjective. If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and discuss beliefs.

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity. Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate. Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out.

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA

of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. • Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public

Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: The definition of hate is far too nebulous to be used in law. Specific acts of eg inciting violence etc are required

Question 2: No

Expand: This is inverse discrimination, the UK is not the USA we do not have the same problems

Question 3: No

Expand: Hostility from a protected group that invokes a hostile response, can only result in the original victim being blamed as the victimiser

Question 4: There should be no hate crime laws.

Question 5: No

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No it should not be included

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: Trans gender must be separated from trans sexual in legal definitions. It's absurd to conflate the two very different meanings

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: You have described three very different categories of individuals. Have you consulted with intersex/DSD people from outside of the LGBTQ community? I repeat transgenderism should not be included in any hate law.

Question 8 Part 3: There need be no definition

Question 9: No opinion

Question 10: No

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: This is a disingenuous question, sex and gender are entirely different things and should be recognised and treated as such, and never conflated in law.

Question 11 Part 2: Surely these issues are already covered by law?

Question 12: Biological sex based assessment only.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Woman is a biological sex based category, gender has no biological basis and cannot be defined.

Question 14: Yes

Expand: It must be sex only for the reasons stated above Gender cannot be defined biologically or legally.

Question 15: no

Question 16: na

Question 17: no

Question 18: no

Question 19: no

Question 20: no

Question 21: Other (please expand)

Expand: Insufficiently aware of the process to be able to comment

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23: Hostility or prejudice are not in themselves examples of hate. Hate is a profound response to something, the others can be trivial.

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand: This is ridiculous, the police currently record as hate offences non criminal activity borne out of disagreements Don't make that situation worse

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: No

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: No

Expand:

Question 32: no

Question 33:

Question 34: no

Question 35: no

Question 36: No

Expand:

Question 37: No

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand: This is an abuse of freedom of speech.

Question 42: No

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1: This is an area that requires a forensic examination, are the big tech companies a provider of space for the public to debate, or publisher, with all the responsibilities that comes with that?

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: Presumably a joke!

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: n/a

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements

1. threatening words or behaviour
2. intention to stir up hatred.

If you only require proof of one of these elements, it would make it easier to commit the offence. An intention requirement does not guarantee that the accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism. The offence would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate

People react strongly against even mild statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that' This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised

The existing two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught Freedom of speech is precious Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous It could mean the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion To criminalise disagreement is to shut down free speech.

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer Stirring up offences should not be extended to transgender identity.

Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate.

Women seeking to protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring up offences

This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender ideology on young people. A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned Government and there must be room to discuss this development The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could be prosecuted for speaking out

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws.

In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes.

The Scottish Government has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence. Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression

Hate crime offences form part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere.

It is an oppressive move that would be difficult to police

People could be reported by others who take exception to something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience

Question 52: Yes

Expand: ". Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate.

Section 29J of the Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion

Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in

Question 52 Part 2: Any offence covering transgender identity must explicitly protect:

-

using a person's birth name and pronoun, •

saying that someone born a woman is not a man and vice versa, and

-

saying that there are only two sexes

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words This extremely serious penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level

Downgrading the consent requirement from the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct any errors in his or her own policies

The Attorney General can provide a more robust check The Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: Anonymous please

Question 1: No

Expand: Recent hate crime legislation and consultation processes in Scotland have been influenced by ideological pressure groups behind closed doors to further their agenda. The upshot in Scotland has been to produce a nonsense that puts one group; trans identified people (self identified not defined) above everyone else This is not the right time

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Please ensure you reflect the actual protected characteristics in the Equality Act legislation and GDPR not the undefined terms such as gender and transgender If you mean sex ie male or female say sex. Please dont add to the confusion.

Question 3: Yes

Expand: Actually state the evidence of criminal hostility please dont just cite Stonewall unevidenced slogans. Hurt feelings or someone refusing to think approved Stonewall thought isnt a hate crime. Misgendering. Stating biological facts. Debate. Fighting for womens rights None are hate crimes well not until you cave

Question 4: Possibly if the evidence is there.

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No. Is there any evidence of actual harm rather than this being another nonsense from Stonewall?

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: This is self identification by the back door. Liz Truss has stated this is not the direction of travel for public policy. Your proposal is therefore seriously in advance of written legislation. You are using Stonewall's definition not UK Law. Did you outsource this consultation to Stonewall?

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: I suggest you reflect UK Law as written not how Stonewall wishes it to be. This use of undefined and undefineable umbrella terms is designed to confuse and obfuscate people. It is extremely surprising to me that this questionnaire and consultation is so obviously weighted in favour of an ideology.

Question 8 Part 3: Stop trying to introduce self id by the back door. Try doing some due diligence. Try using defined terms. Try and remember that other people have rights as well as trans identified people. This ends up with you criminalising thought as heresy.

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex not gender

Question 11 Part 2: Yes sex not gender

Question 12: Sex not gender

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex not gender

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex not gender

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: No enforce existing law

Question 18: No enforce existing law

Question 19: No enforce existing law.

Question 20: No

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: You need to protect free speech

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Why did you put the legally undefined term trans gender in with disability here? Q needs to be asked again.

Question 49: No

Expand: Sex not gender

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Im shocked you are even asking this You need to defend free speech

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: No

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2: No

Question 58: No

Question 59: No

Question 60: No

Question 61: Yes

Question 62: No

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: N/A

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Surely definitions of 'gender' and 'sex' must be made crystal clear before discussions about their inclusion as protected characters can continue. The lack of clear definitions has already caused huge problems for all sides of the argument.

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: What is the legal definition of 'female sex' and of 'female gender'? These are not the same thing but the question implies that the words are interchangeable.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex is biological and it is not possible to change sex. Gender is a social construct and people can change their gender at will. They must not be conflated or confused.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: It appears that there is existing legislation that already does this

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Protected characteristics must include 'sex' and not 'gender', as per the Equality Act.

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7: No, this is absurd.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: No, this is too loose in its terminology. People are either male or female, irrespective of how they 'identify'. Sex is the protected characteristic. Sexuality should be protected, as should the transgender category, but the latter must only include transsexuals who have undergone medical and surgical intervention and have a GRC. This must not include cross dressers or be based on self-identification, as this is likely to invite false claims of 'hate'.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: All of these people are either male or female. Sex is the protected characteristic as per the Equality Act. 'Intersex' people or those with DSDs and groups representing them have repeatedly asked not to be invoked in this 'debate'.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: Gender is essentially meaningless. It is purely performative and is regressive and harmful. Sex is the protected characteristic and should therefore remain so for the purpose of a hate crime bill. If sex is removed or diluted in one piece of legislation it sets a precedence for existing or future legislation, which is harmful to women and girls, who face violence and oppression on the basis of their sex. Women and girls also require protection from discrimination that is different to men, due to their reproductive capacity and role in childbearing/rearing. Sex and gender must never be conflated in law.

Question 11 Part 2: These are SEX specific and should remain so. If gender can be self-identified, then anyone can claim to need protection from this legislation. It is only ever biological women and girls who will be victims of FGM, it is overwhelmingly biological women and girls who will be forced to marry and who are victims of sexual violence and domestic abuse. There must be no conflation of sex and gender in any legislation.

Question 12: Misogyny is rife within society and should be a hate crime. Men cannot be victims of misogyny so should not be included. Gender is a harmful concept so should not be included in any legislation. All humans are either male or female, therefore the word sex would be more suitable. If there are any scenarios unique to males (as there are with females eg pregnancy, breastfeeding, menopause, menstruation) then they should have separate categories based on their sex.

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: This will only be appropriate if the word 'women' does not include men who self identify as women. If it does not exclusively apply to adult human females then it is meaningless and women will be excluded and harmed by this erasure. Female gender is meaningless. The legislation should only include the word sex. Misogyny is fine, if the word applies to adult human females. Men should never be allowed to be included in legislation designed to protect women from pervasive misogyny, and should never be allowed to 'identify' into the female sex class.

Question 14: No

Expand: Gender is meaningless and allows people to 'self-identify'. Sex is all that is required as people are only ever male or female. The law should not be concerned with feelings, only facts. Sex must be in its own category. The option of 'gender' is also utterly useless in terms of demographics and data collection.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17: Yes of course, although the term 'sex workers' is misleading in itself. Sex work is not work. It is the exploitation of mainly women and girls by men, and many if not most of these women and girls are victims of abuse, coercion, rape, violence and poverty.

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20: Of course not, this is straying into thought crime territory.

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex must be included. Intersex is not an identity, and non-binary merely means that one does not adhere to rigid and regressive sex stereotypes, making most of the population 'non-binary'. The law should be concerned with facts, not how people feel or identify. The concept of a gender identity is regressive nonsense.

Question 26: No

Expand: Offence is subjective. Who gets to decide how offensive is permissible? How is this effectively policed? Should the police not be focusing on actual crimes rather than monitoring for perceived offence or hate? It is astonishing that this even features in a consultation.

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: This seems as if it would be very subjective

Question 41: No

Expand: Again, this would surely be subjective.

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: It is hard to believe that this is even being considered, it is so absurd.

Question 43 Part 1: All circumstances. Unlawful material should, however, be clearly defined This should include for example, untruths or misinformation affecting public health, or in the case of Twitter, openly allowing paedophiles to discuss the ages of children they prefer, whilst banning women who state that women are indeed adult human females. Hosting of 'porn' involving minors or women who do not consent, revenge porn remaining available on these platforms despite the people featuring in videos requesting their removal etc

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: This is again, completely subjective, and open to abuse.

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Other (please expand)

Expand: Transgender identity is a choice while disability is not. They have nothing in common and should not feature together

Question 49: No

Expand: Sex is all that is required. Gender is meaningless, and its inclusion here is harmful to women and girls

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Gender should not be included at all as it is harmful to women and girls. All humans are either male or female.

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation: Responding in a personal capacity

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request: I am responding as a UK national and I believe my responses to constitute 'personal data' under the terms of the General Data Protection Regulations. As such it is my understanding that you would require my consent to publish this data publicly, which I am not prepared to provide without further clarity of how and where it would be disclosed (although I may be amenable to disclosure upon being made aware of the nature of the disclosure) I am consenting for this data to be processed by yourselves

Question 1: Yes

Expand: Although, as per my responses below, I do not agree with the substance of many parts of this consultation, I do agree that it is a sensible move to bring together disparate areas of law into a single act. This is on the provision that the act is well written and does not generate more question of law for the courts to re-investigate.

Question 2: No

Expand: The concept of protected characteristics is a very problematic one Effectively the law is removing the principle of equality before the law.

There is a high degree of subjectivity as to which immutable characteristics should be classified as protected characteristic, without demonstrable justification why. To refer to the idea that some hostility is more blameworthy as an 'a priori' fact is dangerous as these are inherently political conversations that need to be dealt with democratically The law should not be deciding that a crime is worse because it was motivated by a dislike of someone's gender in comparison to the same crime motivated by the dislike of someone's height. The victim will still have suffered the same harm as they will have been the victim of the same crime motivated by a factor which they cannot control. How can these factors possibly be considered differently in the eyes of the law?

The concept of protected characteristics gives enhanced 'rights' and 'protections' to some members of society, but not all members of society. This also applies for civil issues, such as employment law. This moves our society further away from the basic principle of equality which is a necessity in a democratic society The continued establishment of this as a principle is dangerous because we are effectively creating tiers of citizenship. Whilst this is being done for admirable reasons in this case, the precedent is inherently dangerous and could be used for malicious reasons in future.

Question 3: No

Expand: I disagree with this in the strongest possible terms, for three primary reasons

Firstly, the concept of the 'group' is dangerous. Identifying and isolating groups in law has the potential to foster resentment and actually increase hostility towards them.

Secondly, the definition as of what 'harm' is caused is not defined. For example, what harm is actually caused to the wider society or the targeted group? This needs to be actual harm, not offence or a subjective perception of harm. The subjective view that a group might be harmed is itself problematic and prejudicial. It is the height of prejudice to presume that all members of a group (such as those with protected characteristics) think the same or perceive offence the same. In these circumstances, who from the supposedly harmed group should speak on their behalf? Do all these groups need to elect representatives to speak for them and identify if their group has been harmed? It would be inappropriate to merely consult with self-appointed individuals or lobby groups to identify if a harm has been caused, which may result in a criminal conviction.

Thirdly, in light of the above, do these additions represent a suitable additional use of legal resources (Police, criminal justice system etc). In a period whereby resources are severely stretched and serious crimes such as rape, burglary, violent disorder have very low rates of being solved, are the additional resources warranted and required by wider society (as opposed to small and highly vocal pressure groups). I would suggest wider society would prefer resources to be differently allocated.

Question 4: No. We have already seen that there have been a number of overzealous investigations and prosecutions under hate crime laws which have subsequently been quashed. There is a grey line between what constitutes hate speech and what constitutes legitimate free speech. Adding areas of particular political interest is a very dangerous precedent as it is highly likely to impact the legitimate functioning of debate in a democracy. Controlling what people can and can't discuss in public as part of the political process is highly dangerous. For example, with the precedent set, what is there to stop a future Government deciding that political ideologies should be 'protected characteristics' or fall under 'philosophical beliefs'.

Question 5: Other (please expand)

Expand: I believe this should be removed as a protected characteristic. There is a danger that the misuse of the law here will effectively bring in blasphemy laws in by default (depending on how 'harm' is defined within law for a particular group). This is clearly inappropriate in a free and democratic society.

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: No. There are increasingly subjective perceptions of sexuality and gender with increasing sub-groups within definitions. Any form of criminalising speech regarding these groups based on perceived 'harm' will place undue burden on members of society to keep up with the very latest thinking on what is a subjective and political issue. Society members should not have to study the social sciences to be able to talk to another person. This is incredibly unreasonable.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: How does one legally define presumed? In a real life situation, how should any member of society go about making these presumptions? Would it cause another offence if they presumed incorrectly? What are the definitions being used for transgender, non binary, intersex or cross dress? Who is defining them and on what basis

and authority? These are ill defined categories and highly subjective. It is grossly inappropriate to potentially criminalise people for not being aware of the latest social developments in these areas

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Please see above

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10: This is inappropriate. How is it legitimate to consider criminalising someone for not realising that someone may have a hidden disability?

The only default position is to assume that everyone has a disability, in which case it fails to be a legitimate area for 'protected characteristic' as the group itself will constitute the whole of society.

Question 11: No

Expand: The misapplication of this category may produce the criminalisation of legitimate areas of debate and discussion, for example of feminist theory.

Question 11 Part 2: They will absolutely be needed, which reinforces the point that there should not be a category based on gender or sex. This creates needless complication in law (and associated costs) for minimal definitive benefit.

Question 12: It would have to include both genders. In reference to my previous points regarding creating different rights in law, the combined impact of all the proposed protected characteristics in this consultation would be to provide enhanced rights to all in society except for one particular group, i.e. white, heterosexual, straight, able bodied men. How can it be in any way legitimate to create, in law, a single group who have fewer rights and protections than the rest of society. This would be a very frightening and dangerous state of affairs that has been demonstrated numerous times in history to have devastating consequences

Question 13: No

Expand: Why should women be protected characteristics and not men? Why should misogyny and not misandry? Do men who are the victims of crimes based on their sex/gender suffer less harm than women who are their victims of crime based on theirs? Please see my answer to question 12 above to see the danger of creating a single category in society with reduced rights and protections

Question 14: No

Expand: Please define the difference between sex and gender in non subjective or political terms

Question 15: No.

Question 16: No. Unless there is a definite reason for identifying older people for additional legal protections then it should not be applied (I do not believe your consultation document has shown appropriate justification for this).

Question 17: I fail to understand why this should be singled out as a specific category. This is not an immutable characteristic, albeit there are many reasons why people might end

up as sex workers, from an active lifestyle choice through to truly horrifying causes. Why are other forms of work not also being categorised? There are many occasions whereby people may perceive they have been treated differently due to their work, often in relation to people in lower paid professions. Why should sex workers be protected but other forms of worker not? This does not have any consistent, philosophical basis.

Question 18: This proposal is open to widespread abuse. What constitutes a sub-culture and why do they need protection? What harm are they experiencing and what impact does this have to society? For example, what is the difference between people who are 'goths', people who identify as 'gamers', 'boy racers', or 'young farmers'? All are subcultures and all may face ridicule at points in time, but does this really constitute hate crimes?

As with my response to question 17, these are not immutable characteristics, but active choice members of society make. If someone chooses to be a member of a subculture they are an active party in that process (this proposal effectively denies their agency) and they can always choose to remove themselves from that subculture at some point in the future (as in fact most people will do over time).

Question 19: Please see my points above.

Question 20: This is a very dangerous proposal, and I am surprised that this has been included. The fundamental point is what constitutes a philosophical belief? For example, it could be argued that belief in a 'flat earth' is a philosophical belief, should that be protected at the risk of no longer being able to be criticised or challenged? Abhorrent ideologies, such as Nazism, could fall under this category. Should that be a protected category?

It may be easy to answer the above specific cases and say that they shouldn't fall under the category, but the point is where is the line drawn, but whom and under what justification? These are potentially vital points as the answer to this will define the limits of what is and isn't acceptable in a democratic society. A more challenging example would be do 'socialism' or 'conservatism' fall under philosophical beliefs and if so should they be protected categories under hate speech laws? If they don't, then on what basis are they being excluded in comparison to other beliefs? If they do, then how would our democracy function in future?

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand: At the very least there needs to be a demonstration of hostility towards a group and the intent to target the group because of their group characteristic. The absence of this could potentially criminalise people for mistakes

Question 23: No it should remain at hostility. Hostility is needed in relation to any concept of 'harm'. Prejudice has wider connotations, and particularly with reference to the suggestions of protecting philosophical beliefs is very problematic and it is not unreasonable to be prejudicial against some 'philosophical beliefs', e.g. female genital mutilation or forced marriages

Question 24: No

Expand: No. Please see my previous responses on the dangers of different tiers of rights and protections in society. It would be more appropriate to remove these from current laws

Question 25: No

Expand: No. Please see my previous responses on the dangers of different tiers of rights and protections in society. It would be more appropriate to remove these from current laws

Question 26: No

Expand: No. Please see my previous responses on the dangers of different tiers of rights and protections in society. It would be more appropriate to remove these from current laws

I would add that any additional aggravating factors should require additional burden of proof in proportion to the additional penalty

Any issue with the maximum penalty for the underlying crime should be the point of address rather than compensating with aggravating factors, which do not apply to all people equally.

Question 27: No

Expand: No. Please see my previous responses on the dangers of different tiers of rights and protections in society. With regard to communication offences, this is particularly dangerous in light of the very real issues around freedom of speech within a democracy

Question 28: No

Expand: These are serious crimes which cause real harm regardless of the motivation behind it. In one sense offences under these categories have to be motivated by 'hate' in a wider sense. In what way is the actual harm suffered by a person with protected characteristics under these categories 'worse' than that suffered by someone without those characteristics? In what real way is society harmed more or less than they would be anyway by these serious offences. Again I highlight the danger of creating a tiered justice system in this country.

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: No. Please see my previous responses on the dangers of different tiers of rights and protections in society

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32: No. It is very problematic that the Law Commission is utilising the language (and theories behind it) of intersectionality. This theory fails Karl Popper's falsifiable test and as such is an unproven, and in fact unprovable, hypothesis. It has no place in law.

Question 33:

Question 34: No. All offences should be prosecuted on their own basis.

Question 35:

Question 36: No

Expand: No. Please see my previous responses on the dangers of different tiers of rights and protections in society

Question 37: Yes

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: No. Please see my previous responses on the dangers of different tiers of rights and protections in society

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand: No. This is a very surprising proposal. The reference made to inflammatory cartoons is incredible. This would be a serious affront to freedom of speech and, as previously highlighted, bring in blasphemy laws in by default. Stirring up offences are already highly subject to subjective perceptions. To expand these laws is a hugely dangerous proposition.

To expand, the logical conclusion that this consultation is directing towards is that if the law is expanded to cover other protected characteristic and expanded to cover all material, as highlighted here, then political cartoons would become illegal. Again, this may appear facetious but in order to avoid this a clear line would need to be drawn. Who draws this line and where it is drawn is inherently political not legal

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Other (please expand)

Expand: It should also include any other reasons whereby the defendant did not know that their action would cause offence.

Question 43 Part 1: If the social media platform makes reasonable efforts to manage unlawful postings they that should be a defence. This should apply purely to unlawful material and not 'offensive' material.

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44: Yes to the extent that there are defined points for proof. They should remove elements of subjectivity from the term 'likely to'.

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: These points should still need to be proven. Otherwise, where is the harm element?

Question 46: No

Expand: Intent must be required. The removal of intent would create a situation whereby a person could be prosecuted for something they said, without any intention of what they said causing harm. A third party then decides whether what someone said is offensive or not, regardless of the intent behind it.

This is effectively undemocratic in that it elevates the opinion or perception of one individual over and above the opinion or perception of another. How can this possibly be justified?

Question 47: No

Expand: As per my earlier responses this whole line of proposals needs to be removed.

Question 47 Part 2: Insulting words should not be criminalised. Every person in the country uses language that is potentially insulting or offensive to someone else, every day. It cannot be the case that this is criminalised based on that third party's subjective opinion.

Question 48: No

Expand: Please see previous responses on the dangers of creating a selectively tiered justice system.

Question 49: No

Expand: Please see previous responses on the dangers of creating a selectively tiered justice system.

Question 50: Please see previous responses on the dangers of creating a selectively tiered justice system.

Question 51: No

Expand: This is another very surprising suggestion from the Law Commission

Firstly, by what right does the Government have to intervene in the language and conversation that occurs within private dwellings? It is one thing to have laws to cover public spaces, which are open to wider group and also provide venues whereby incitement could occur. Private dwellings do not have those characteristics and this is an improper imposition on privacy.

Secondly, how would this be policed? The only way it could be is through a form of enhanced surveillance or encouraging informants. This has historic precedent in totalitarian societies, but is inappropriate in free and democratic societies.

Question 52: Yes

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: This is of paramount importance. These 'free speech' exemptions need to be retained and expanded

Question 53: Yes, absolutely. The examples provided in the consultation illustrate the need for these in order to protect legitimate political discussion.

Question 54: No

Expand: There is a serious danger that overzealous prosecutions could cause more harm to society than the potential protection they provide. This level of sensitivity requires the highest level of authority before progressing (i.e. democratic accountability)

Question 55 Part 1: Yes. Democracy and the functioning of society relies on their openness

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: No

Expand:

Question 57: No

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62: No. The nature of any bureaucracy is that it seeks to sustain itself. The creation of a Hate Crime Commissioner is more likely to cause more hatred and division than it solves as the Commissioner will have to seek out (dare I say it generate) appropriate controversies to justify their own existence. None of the benefits listed in the report warrant the duplication of effort and cost from other bodies and would likely only enhance the voices of small, vocal pressure groups who would have a single target for lobbying.

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: In the current very sensitive climate people react very strongly against even mild statements made with no malice. The present two stage test ensures only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is caught. Free speech is precious and must be preserved.

Question 46: No

Expand: In today's climate disagreement can be misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be committed it makes it easier to use the law to shut down religious or political discussion.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered

There is a serious risk that disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically motivated complainants

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it's wrong for this question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer

The strongest critics of the trans movement are women who have had sex changes but now regret it. These people could be prosecuted for speaking out

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity must have strong protection for free-speech built in to protect debate.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney-General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human rights.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex is a protected characteristic in the Equality Act 2010 and should be included in this list

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: The definition is far too wide and simply relies on someone saying they belong in that category. It therefore potentially includes everyone and so is meaningless.

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: There is no overlap with intersex and transgender/ non binary people and so they should not be grouped together as one group.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Other (please expand)

Expand: Gender and Sex have completely different meanings. Sex is specified in the Equality Act 2010 for good reason. Gender means anyone and is meaningless

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: This is very confusing. Is the purpose to protect the female sex or anyone? Misogyny is hate directed at the female sex and so could not be based on gender.

Question 14: No

Expand: It should be sex. Gender is anyone and too general to be a protected characteristic.

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: No

Expand: It is too subjective and broad and could be abused.

Question 23:

Question 24: No

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1: Not appropriate. Flexible suggests the characteristic cannot be defined and therefore should not be a protected characteristic.

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand: Sex should be used. Gender includes potentially everyone and so is meaningless.

Question 50: The characteristics must be very specific. Too open and it becomes open to abuse and meaningless and therefore less able to protect those who it was intended to protect.

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Yes

Expand:

Question 3: Yes

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Yes

Expand:

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: I don't believe that asexuality is a sexual orientation

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: People with intersex medical conditions are not automatically transgender (they can be, but this is unrelated to their medical condition)

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3: Gender identity is a belief so it is already covered under religion

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Yes

Expand: Only sex, as gender identity is a belief

Question 11 Part 2: Yes, these sex specific (not gender) offences should be covered

Question 12: Sex based protection should include both male and female

Question 13: Other (please expand)

Expand: Generally agree but should be adult females and young females

Question 14: No

Expand: Everyone has a sex, not everyone has a gender

Question 15: Cannot see how it can be protected? All ages?

Question 16:

Question 17: No

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Yes

Expand:

Question 23: No, prejudice can be inferred wrongly

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand:

Question 26: No

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: No

Expand:

Question 29: Yes

Expand:

Question 30: No

Question 31: Yes

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: No

Expand:

Question 41: No

Expand:

Question 42: Yes

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: No

Expand:

Question 47: No

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand:

Question 49: No

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand:

Question 52: No

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: Yes

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: XXXXXXXXXX

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: The idea that intention alone should be enough for an offence to be committed is dangerous. The

existing offence on religion and sexual orientation is made up of two elements: 1. threatening words

or behaviour; 2 intention to stir up hatred If you only require proof of one of these elements, it

would make it easier to commit the offence An intention requirement does not guarantee that the

accused did in fact intend to stir up hatred. In most situations intent would have to be inferred from

the evidence. And no hatred would actually have to be stirred up. It could result in purely academic

discussion being caught if the subject generates heated debate, such as transgenderism.
The offence

would be operating in the current hyper-sensitive climate. People react strongly against even mild

statements that are made with no malice. The proposal risks the police and prosecutors concluding

that someone must have intended to stir up hatred, because 'everybody knows you can't say that'

This will be hugely damaging to freedom of speech. Unpopular views will be penalised. The existing

two-stage test for the offence helps make sure only behaviour that deserves criminalisation is

caught. Freedom of speech is precious. Outlawing mild language purely because intention to stir up

hatred is presumed and regardless of whether hatred is stirred up is dangerous. It could mean

the criminalisation of insults or even more trivial words purely on the basis of inferred intention

Question 46: No

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial issues like religion, sexual orientation and transgender

identity should only cover threatening conduct that is intended to stir up hatred. It is very serious to

accuse someone of stirring up hatred. A conviction for a hate crime would ruin someone's life. It must be clear they were doing so deliberately. In today's climate, disagreement can be

misrepresented as hatred. If intent to stir up hatred does not have to be proved for the offence to be

committed (along with proof that the words were threatening), it makes it easier to use the law to

shut down religious or political discussion. In Scotland, the Justice Minister has agreed to limit

newstirring up offences to those where intent to stir up hatred is demonstrated. England and Wales

should not have less protection for free speech. Stirring up hatred offences covering religion, sexual

orientation and transgender identity which are contentious issues should not prohibit abusive

conduct. Abusive behaviour is a more subjective standard and therefore more uncertain and unpredictable. People routinely describe opinions they do not like as abusive.

Question 47: No

Expand: The seriousness of stirring up hatred offences means that, on controversial issues, only threatening

conduct intended to stir up hatred should be covered. The current law makes a sensible distinction

between the characteristic of race and the characteristics of religion or sexual orientation
Race is a

neutral, inherited physical trait. Religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be debated

in a way race cannot because they are about beliefs and behaviour. There is a serious risk that

disagreement will be labelled hatred by politically motivated complainants What is "abusive" is

subjective If discussion around religion, sexual orientation and transgender identity can be

construed as likely to stir up hatred, it could have a chilling effect on the freedom to share and

discuss beliefs

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Disability and transgender identity are two completely different issues, and it is wrong for this

question to present them as a package requiring a yes/no answer. Stirring up offences should not be

extended to transgender identity Transgender ideology is controversial and hate speech laws

covering this area would clamp down on a subject of major political debate Women seeking to

protect single-sex spaces could be particularly affected if transgender identity is covered by stirring

up offences. This type of offence could restrict the freedom to question the impact of transgender

ideology on young people A surge in girls being referred to the gender clinic has concerned

Government and there must be room to discuss this development. The strongest critics of the trans

movement are women who have had 'sex changes' but now regret it. These 'detransitioners' could

be prosecuted for speaking out

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Private conversations in the home should not be subject to hate crime laws. In a democratic society

people must be able to express unfiltered opinions in their own homes. The Scottish Government

has been strongly criticised for seeking to introduce similar offences without a dwelling defence

Senior lawyers have warned that it interferes with freedom of expression. Hate crime offences form

part of public order law. It is inappropriate to extend them to the private sphere. It is an oppressive

move that would be difficult to police. People could be reported by visitors who take exception to

something they say, requiring police to take witness statements from others present, such as the

accused's children. This would be a frightening and degrading experience.

Question 52: Yes

Expand: Stirring up hatred offences on controversial grounds like religion, sexual orientation and transgender

identity must have strong protection for free speech built in to protect debate. Section 29J of the

Public Order Act 1986 must be kept in the stirring up hatred offence covering religion. Section 29JA of the Public Order Act 1986, including the protection for views about marriage, must be kept in the

stirring up hatred offence covering sexual orientation. Any offence covering transgender identity

must explicitly protect: • using a person's birth name and pronoun, • saying that someone born a

woman is not a man and vice versa, and • saying that there are only two sexes.

Question 52 Part 2:

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Requiring the Attorney General's consent is an important check on over-zealous prosecutions. It was

included because stirring up hatred laws have the potential for serious infringements of human

rights. A person could face up to seven years in prison for spoken words. This extremely serious

penalty needs strong safeguards at the highest level. Downgrading the consent requirement from

the Attorney General to the Director of Public Prosecutions sends the wrong signal about the importance of free speech. The Attorney General has greater independence from the Crown Prosecution Service than the DPP. The CPS approach will be set by the DPP, who is unlikely to correct

any errors in his or her own policies. The Attorney General can provide a more robust check. The

Attorney General is directly answerable to Parliament, making it easier for them to be held to account for their decisions by democratically elected representatives.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 3: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 4:

Question 5: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 6: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 7:

Question 8: Not Answered

Question 8 Part 1:

Question 8 Part 2: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9:

Question 10:

Question 11: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 11 Part 2:

Question 12:

Question 13: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 14: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 15:

Question 16:

Question 17:

Question 18:

Question 19:

Question 20:

Question 21: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 22: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 26: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 27: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: Intention is often very difficult to determine without reasonable doubt. Often the only way to determine intent would be to look at evidence such as words and behaviour. Innocent expression of freedom of speech by a caring individual could be interpreted by a sensitive individual as intention to stir up hatred. Objective assessment is essential which would be safeguarded by the dual requirements

Question 46: No

Expand: It must be clear that a person is deliberately being threatening, abusive or stirring up hatred. Many of these issues are super sensitive and disagreement can easily be misinterpreted as hatred. Freedom to disagree inoffensively is no freedom at all. Intent must be proven if the objective is for justice to be done

Question 47: No

Expand: The characteristics are fundamentally different. Race is an inherited physical characteristic which cannot be debated. Religion and sexual orientation are more subjective and liable to debate. The danger is that simple debate can be flagged up as hatred by politically motivated individuals or pressure groups. Freedom to genuinely discuss differing opinions without fear of oppression by the legal system is essential

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: No

Expand: Transgender issues are highly controversial whereas disability issues are not. Bringing the offence of stirring up hatred to bear on controversial transgender issues could result in genuine concerns being wrongly suppressed. Such concerns include a desire to protect single-sex spaces, discussion of trends in referrals to gender clinics and the freedom of detransitioners to speak out

Question 49: Other (please expand)

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: No

Expand: Extending the reach of public order offences to discussions in a private home is a chilling suggestion that should not be entertained in a democratic society. This would be very difficult to police and would risk innocent families being torn apart by baseless accusations

Question 52: Yes

Expand: These protections are essential to ensure that open debate and free speech is protected. For example, the right to hold the view that marriage should only be between a man and a woman and the right to hold the view that there are only two sexes should be protected.

Question 52 Part 2: Protection of views that have been fundamental Christian beliefs for 2000 years are essential if unwarranted suppression of religious belief is to be avoided. The right to express the view that marriage should only be between a man and a woman and the right to express the view that there are only two sexes should be protected.

Question 53:

Question 54: No

Expand: Legislation that has significant potential to criminalise free speech should contain the safeguard of the Attorney General's consent. A potential sentence of 7 years in prison for words spoken about politically charged subjects requires the highest level of scrutiny.

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand:

Question 2: Other (please expand)

Expand: We should specify protected characteristics based on current statistics of who is most victimised in today's society. For example, there are thousands of females raped and hundreds murdered over the course of each year in the UK. (Compared to that for example,

there have been no transwomen murdered in the UK in the past two years). Females should be a protected characteristic in law as they are a vulnerable group.

Question 3: Yes

Expand: Please see my previous answer to Question 2 regarding the need for greater protection for females

Question 4: Yes, because refugees are vulnerable

Question 5: Yes

Expand: You should add 'belief in gender identity' as a religion, because it has no basis in fact. It is not observable and relies on statements of faith. It is very similar to a religion in that many people believe in it despite there being no actual evidence.

Question 6: Yes

Expand:

Question 7: What does it matter if people don't feel sexual desire? It's no business of anyone else who desires who or not, it's a private matter

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: 'Transgender' is too broad a definition to be useful. Similarly, how would you define 'people who cross dress' in law, given that most women wear trousers much of the time, which are traditionally men's clothes?!

We do need to protect people who are in the process of 'gender reassignment' and we should protect 'gender expression' so people can wear whatever clothes they want. That would cover all your four points in the question. There is no need then for separate categories of transgender, non binary, cross dress and intersex. Please stop putting people in boxes in this way!

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: Please see my answer above. The most important category to protect is sex, especially females. Please see my earlier answer about the volume of females assaulted and murdered in the UK.

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: We need to emphasise the importance of support and kindness for people with serious long term mental health conditions

Question 10:

Question 11: No

Expand: We should only use sex and not use gender. Human beings are mammals and can only be one sex or the other. Even intersex people are one or the other. Talk to 'Intersex Facts'. Females in particular are raped and murdered in huge numbers in the UK so we need to protect them.

Question 11 Part 2: We need to be able to continue to monitor the volume of male violence inflicted on females in the domestic abuse sphere. Similarly forced marriage and FGM have victims who are overwhelmingly female. We do not need to monitor gender in this sphere. No one can even agree what gender means so it's a risk even using it in law

Question 12: We should only use sex, not gender. Overwhelmingly, males inflict hate crimes onto females.

Question 13: No

Expand: The protected characteristic should be 'females'.

Question 14: No

Expand: People all disagree about the meaning of 'gender' so this is a term of no use in law. We should only use 'sex' because human beings are a sexually dimorphic species and 'sex' is observable and measurable. Sex is 'real', unlike 'gender' which is a very nebulous term.

Question 15: Yes any child under 16 should be protected and anyone over 65 should be protected. Both these are more vulnerable groups.

Question 16: Please see my previous answer

Question 17:

Question 18: No, 'alternative subcultures' are too many and varied and some of them are deviant.

Question 19: Yes, homeless people should be protected.

Question 20: These are the same as religion in that everyone should be free to believe whatever they want to.

Question 21: No

Expand: Horrible words are nowhere near as serious as physical assault.

Question 22: Other (please expand)

Expand: Hate crime cannot depend on the 'hurt feelings' of the alleged victim, because everyone has a different threshold for offence.

Question 23:

Question 24: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 25: No

Expand: The only characteristics I agree with regarding this question are disability and sexual orientation. These gender identities are far less in need of protection.

Question 26: Other (please expand)

Expand: I gather there is a lot of over-reporting of so-called 'hate speech' such as 'misgendering'. This is a waste of police time. Many trans people don't look like their preferred gender, so people will be reported for simply calling them the 'wrong' pronouns. This is a waste of public money.

Question 27: No

Expand:

Question 28: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 29: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 30:

Question 31: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 32:

Question 33:

Question 34:

Question 35:

Question 36: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 37: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 38 Part 1:

Question 38 Part 2:

Question 39: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 40: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 41: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 42: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 43 Part 1:

Question 43 Part 2:

Question 44:

Question 45: Not Answered

Question 45 Part 1:

Question 46: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 47 Part 2:

Question 48: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 49: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 50:

Question 51: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 52 Part 2: Sex female and disability should be protected Gender is not a useful word as it means so many different things to different people.

Question 53:

Question 54: Not Answered

Expand:

Question 55 Part 1:

Question 55 Part 2:

Question 56: Yes

Expand:

Question 57: Yes

Expand:

Question 57 Part 2:

Question 58:

Question 59:

Question 60:

Question 61:

Question 62:

Name: [REDACTED]

Name of Organisation:

Personal/On behalf of the Organisation: Personal response

Confidentiality Request:

Question 1: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a person's intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that others simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

— United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 2: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a person's intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that others simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

— United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 3: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 4: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 5: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 6: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 7: We do not require reform of hate crime law The current law is adequate The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 8: No

Question 8 Part 1: We do not require reform of hate crime law The current law is adequate The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 8 Part 2: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 8 Part 3:

Question 9: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 10: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 11: No

Expand: If sex is introduced as a protected characteristics surely the offense of rape is a hate crime? Would rapists be awarded harsher sentences accordingly?

We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak

freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 11 Part 2: Sexual offences, forced marriage and FGM are sex specific crimes not gender specific

Question 12: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 13: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be

enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 14: No

Expand: Sex solely should be referred to in statutory law

Question 15: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 16: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 17: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 18: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 19: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 20: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a person's intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that others simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence, statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 21: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a person's intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that others simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 22: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 23: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 24: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 25: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 26: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 27: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 28: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 29: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool

of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 30: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 31: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and

introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 32: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 33: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech

and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 34: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 35: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech

and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with
Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 36: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with
Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 37: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be

enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 38 Part 1: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 38 Part 2: We do not require reform of hate crime law The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based

upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 39: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 40: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a person's intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that others simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence, statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 41: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a person's intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that others simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 42: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 43 Part 1: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 43 Part 2: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 44: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 45: No

Question 45 Part 1: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 46: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 47: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 47 Part 2: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 48: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 49: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 50: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 51: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with.

Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 52: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 52 Part 2: We do not require reform of hate crime law The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak

freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 53: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 54: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting

Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 55 Part 1: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting.

Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 55 Part 2: Everything 'fair and accurate' should be exempt surely.

Question 56: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 57: No

Expand: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding

the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

— United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 57 Part 2: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 58: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages.

Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

— United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law

Question 59: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 60: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages.

Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

— United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence, statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 61: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages. Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting. Without free speech we do not have freedom. Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with. Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely.

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.”

George Orwell

There is no evidence, statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law.

Question 62: We do not require reform of hate crime law. The current law is adequate. The law is designed to promote social cohesion, not to educate or 'signal' moral messages.

Expanding the current hate crime law threatens freedom of speech and opinion. The concept of hate, insult and offence are subjective and as such how can laws based upon such concepts be enforceable? How can you prove a persons intention to insult? As a progressive nation we should be repealing blasphemy laws, not introducing them. Individuals in a democracy should have the right to say things which other people may find offensive or insulting Without free speech we do not have freedom Reforming the law to curtail speech and introduce offences around 'insulting' speech means that people will not be able to speak freely without fear of legal repercussions. Such law can be abused easily and used as a tool of threat and intimidation to silence people with views that other simply disagree with Expanding hate crime law will effect individuals ability to debate issues which effect them freely

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers ”

— United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

“If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear ”

George Orwell

There is no evidence , statistical or otherwise, to support the need for reform of hate crime law