

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Legal Affairs and Safety Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on proposed hate crime legislation  
**Date:** Saturday, 3 July 2021 3:50:19 PM

---

To whom it may concern

This submission relates to legislation being considered for specific punishment of “hate crimes” in legislation with the specific example of those based on racial hatred.

I give this idea virtually no chance of achieving any just outcomes because anything to do with race these days would be like trying to legislate to prevent the road toll if you were not allowed to use terms like road, speed, or driver awareness but instead used words like apple, aeroplane and Antarctica!

Unfortunately, all the current terms used, supposedly for racial description, these days are either logical nonsense, incorrect or used incorrectly. In short, they are not fit for the purpose of meaningful discussion of racism, let alone legislation. Actual race terms like Negro and Mongolian are a definite no-no based on unhappy connotations and the term Caucasian is used incorrectly. Some specific examples are below.

“Asian” cannot be a race because about 45 percent of the people of the Asian continent are Mongolian, 45 percent are Caucasian, and 10 percent are Malay or mixtures between the two large groups like Myanmar, Thailand and Malaysia. Asia is a continent, nothing else and an Asian is a person living in Asia.

“White”, used either as a colour or a euphemism for Caucasian, is not a race because there are Mongolians with very pale skin and, thanks to the Indian sub-continent, most Caucasians have obviously pigmented skin.

“Black” is not a race, again either as a colour or a euphemism for Negro, because many Caucasians have as dark or darker pigmentation as some Negroes.

“Africa”, as in Africa-American and African-Australian, is not a sensible replacement for Negro because most of north Africa is Caucasian. Waleed Aly, who fronts The Project on Channel 10, is an African-Australian by immigration but his race is Mediterranean Caucasian.

The Queensland Police Department uses the term Caucasian to describe a person with no obvious skin pigmentation but uses the term “of Pakistani appearance” for Pakistani people when the

quintessential Caucasian type is the current Pakistan Prime Minister, and once world class cricketer, Imran Khan.

The quintessential Caucasian is tall with aquiline facial features brown-purplish skin and a pronounced knot of hair on the back of the head. Nordic Caucasians are a spin-off people who moved north following the herds after the last ice age and lost their pigmentation.

“Anti-Semitism” is another term used incorrectly. The race of the people from nearly all the middle east is Semitic Caucasian. This includes Arabs, Armenians, Israelis, Palestinians, etc. It has no sensible meaning by applying the term just to the Israel nation or the Jewish Faith. Jews are not a race; you can join or leave the faith, but you cannot join or leave your race. The same applies to Islam. A few years ago, a NSW judge had to rule that Islam is not a race!

Another impediment to legislation about race and racism is the fluidity of the terminology. One of the greatest contributors to making up new races is the PBS Newshour in the USA. Under the heading “Race Matters” it regularly comes up with new supposedly racial cohorts like “black and brown” and “people of colour” depending on how they feel on the day.

PBS is full of surprises. One day it got very embarrassing. They were interviewing a woman representing the immigrant Indian community about racism and the interviewer did not know how to describe her. They tried “person of colour” but that was not specific enough. They settled on “South Asian” and created yet another dodgy racial term. Interestingly, the interviewee was talking about racism but did not know her own race. The correct term was, of course, Dravidian Caucasian.

With all this terminological nonsense going on it would be virtually impossible to construct a criminal case of racism against anyone as it would just take a simple question like “Exactly what race are you referring to?” to defend the charge.

A good example is the altercation at the Sydney Cricket Ground last year when the Indian team were playing, and some uncultured drunken yobs called out names relating to colour and heritage. The value signalling Australian Cricket Board called “racism” but the media and police eventually went quiet, probably after legal checks found that both groups were the same race, although a different sub-race. How will criminal legislation handle sub-racism?... probably also badly.

Peter Lloyd (personal submission based on logic and typology)

