TRANSDELUSION CAMPAIGNERS HAVE TOO MUCH SAY OVER EXPANDING HATE CRIME LAWS, SAYS TOP UK JUDGE





Judge Charles Wide, London

Transdelusion campaigners are being given too great a say over expanding hate crime laws at the expense of the wider public's views, a top UK judge has said. The radical transdelusion campaign goes so far that now, for example in Scotland, a new odious hate crime bill would *criminalize dinner table conversations* in the privacy of one's own home, if their *"offensive"* content is reported to police.

> *"Conversations over the dinner table that incite hatred must be prosecuted under Scotland's hate crime law,"* reports the Times.

Such conversations were previously protected under the Public Order Act 1986, which includes a *"dwelling defense"* that shields conversations that take place in private homes from being prosecuted, however that would be removed under the new law.

The new bill would add an additional crime of *"stirring up hate"* against a protected group by

> *"behaving in a threatening or abusive manner, or communicating threatening or abusive material to another person,"*

as well as the crime of possessing

"inflammatory material."

With these new laws in the making, radical pressure groups like the radicalized elements of the gay movement and the recently emerging transdelusion movement now have a devastating tool to silence all dissidence, be it in public or in private. No one will be safe to oppose the so called *"transgender revolution".*

Critics feel that it is not a revolution, but a "*coup d'état*", an overthrowing of government.



Vera Bergkamp, NL gay extremist

In the Netherlands, for example, the president of the radical gay movement COC, miss Vera Bergkamp, cunningly managed to get herself promoted to House Speaker in May 2021. She represents Dutch radical LGBT activism at the expense of moderates and has written that freedom of speech, religion, Internet, and research must be overthrown in the NL to accommodate the COC agenda. She is pressing for the criminalization of every form of dissidence to her agenda from professionals and religious lay persons.

In the UK, we see someone daring to stand up to those activists who have gained access to parliament to ram it down the throats of others. We see Charles Wide, a former senior Old Bailey judge, saying that the plans drawn up by the Law Commission for the Government to persecute *"hate crimes"* relied too much on a *"narrow"* range of campaign groups espousing *"contentious and controversial"* sociological theories.

In a pamphlet for the think tank Policy Exchange, Judge Wide said that by contrast the views of other groups and members of the public who challenged such theories – often in the face of a vitriolic backlash – had been ignored.

He singled out the apparent influence of the campaign group *'Stonewall'* on the Commission in the controversial debate over claims that gender is a social construct rather than determined by birth alone.

> *"[The Commission's consultation] draws unnecessarily and extensively on contentious and controversial sociological theories, with scant critical evaluation, seemingly unaware of how contentious these theories are. There is a lack of balance," said Judge Wide.*

The UK Government is considering expanding hate crimes. The Commission is consulting on issues including misogyny, age, sex workers, homelessness, alternative subcultures and philosophical beliefs.

Judge Wide said:

> *"No adequate thought seems to have been given to the difficulty of reaching beyond a limited range of academics and organisations to the full variety of academic voices, organisations, commentators, and members of the public who have no organisation to speak for them.*
>
> *"It is indicative that the controversial campaigning organisation Stonewall seems to have been treated more like a consultant than consultee. Views which contest what are presented as orthodoxies were neither sought nor expressed.*
>
> *"People and organisations, ignored thus far, might reasonably lack confidence in the Commission's impartiality and receptiveness to contrary opinions."*

Judge Wide said he was also concerned over the impact on free speech because of the failure to consult people who feared being accused of a hate crime if they challenged current orthodoxies on gender and other subjects.

> *"Rightly, the interests of those who might be protected are considered in detail but little attention has been paid to those who might suffer (or fear suffering) the consequences of laws being too widely drawn or misused,"* he said.
>
> *"The consultation paper displays almost no awareness of an elephant in the room, affecting both the substance of the subject and the conduct of the consultation: the apprehension, even fear, which results in self-censorship.*
>
> *"It is a constant feature of many people's (to coin a phrase) lived experience – those who dare not speak freely for fear that they may be putting their careers at risk, extinguishing their chances of advancement, or even risking dismissal. For many, the fear of the Twitter storm or a visit by the police, as the result of a politically or personally motivated complaint, is enough to silence them."*

In his criticism, judge Wide concludes that

> *"The Law Commission is morphing into an engine of social change, pursuing agendas of its own formulation and exploring contested sociological material in order to formulate policy in a highly-charged, sensitive area of intense political controversy."*

——- ———

To be continued.

Home

Mail our team