

Law Commission's Consultation Paper 173 (Partial Defences to Murder) ManKind's Response to the Provisional Conclusions

The Law Commission has published the results of its consultations on Paper 173 and its provisional conclusions, and is inviting further comments prior to producing its final report. Their conclusions completely disregard our submission and those of other Men's Rights organisations. In view of the Commission's apparent contempt for men's rights, and because of the interest generated by our original submission on the ManKind website, we have decided to respond publicly via our website.

In our submission we commented on the Law Commission's curious focus on the rights of female killers who claim to have been subjected to domestic violence. We predicted that the Commission would propose changes to the law to remove the legal partial defence of provocation currently available to men, whilst at the same time giving women a licence to kill men in a pre-meditated way, on the basis of false allegations of domestic violence.

We were correct on both counts. The Law Commission has pandered to the destructive agenda of a radical feminist minister who appears to be pursuing a spiteful vendetta against men. The Law Commission is willing to collude in a process that further demonises masculinity and seeks to excuse female criminality on the simplistic and erroneous basis that violence arising from anger is immoral, yet violence arising from fear is acceptable. On this particular point the Law Commission has disregarded the expert evidence provided by the Royal College of Psychiatrists.

There can be no doubt that the Law Commission's proposals will be abused by women who seek to justify violent acts against men by making false accusations of domestic violence. The presumption of innocence for men would also be further eroded, by the institutionally sexist assumption (as reflected throughout the Law Commission's paper) that allegations of domestic violence made by women are always true.

In demonising men the Law Commission should know that radical feminism does not reflect the values of mainstream society. On the contrary, society is beginning to question the motives of radical feminists like Harriet Harman, and this is amply reflected

in the response of media social commentators to the Law Commission's provisional conclusions. The sexist double standard is all too evident in the withdrawal of the provocation partial defence to men, and its simultaneous re-definition specifically to favour women. The bias is too obvious for all but the most bigoted feminist to swallow.

That, of course, is how it appears to everyone outside of the Feminist Gulag. The Law Commission seeks to disguise this double standard with half-hearted legal flim-flam, and psycho-babble, but sadly the Law Commission is a prisoner of the Gulag and the provisional conclusions prove it. In view of the growing groundswell of public opinion against the damage caused to society by radical feminism, and in helping Harriet Harman to sell the feminist pass, the individual Law Commissioners responsible for the proposals should reflect on the effect that their misguided proposals will have on their reputations in the long-term.

All of this leaves the British electorate (and men in particular) to reflect on the reasons for the increasing hostility of the legal system towards masculinity, and on what should have been obvious all along. If you vote for man-hating feminists you get laws that discriminate against men, and don't expect sexist institutions like the Law Commission to protect your basic human rights.