

Current Events in Law: Hate Speech, Social Sanction, and the Limits of Enforcement

A Haimesian working paper for website deployment

Author / framing Michael Richard Haimes (prompt and reasoning) Jarvis (structured analysis and drafting)	Timestamp: April 3, 2026 - America/New_York Jurisdiction focus: United States law Constitutional emphasis
---	--

Purpose

This paper records Michael Richard Haimes's prompt as a historical input, then separates what is legally true in the United States from what may still be morally corrosive inside a home, a workplace, a live room, or a developing political system. The aim is not to flatten freedom of speech, but to distinguish protected speech from harassment, threats, coercion, stalking, and house-rule governance.

Michael's prompt language (verbatim record)

Current Events In Law (jarvis include a timestamp) Michael as in a tiktok room with an established and passionate young woman with a cross on her neck. It started out fine, compliment her for her cross, a hopefully pleasant statement based on appearances but not much like I'm hitting on someone over tiktok. Then she got into whats going on. She stated it is a law that we are against hate speech. I investigated this new situation. I have found that denying a country hate speech is impossible along the lines of enforcing it directly. There are some situations though that could help one understand where the law world was drifting towards. Here is one of the best examples of it that I can display I think. It is like a construction worker who hits on a woman who passes by but then having CLEARLY SEEN HER DISPLAY THAT SHE IS NOT INTERESTED, they still keep going above and beyond cat calling. There is a friend that I have for example who really feels that he is an actual real celibate. He told me enough that I can consider calling him an incel as a very clear definition of hate speech. But in this current republic, the actual legal enforcement is too complicated. And no, I didn't use a trick, he is an actual person who is in love with someone who is trying to establish the correct way of living that is commonly referred to as a guru. If you were to view my tiktok account you can a video of me recording a video that he made from his room. We were interrupted so I couldn't finish the recording but you can see it all how it played out on my tiktok. LIVE EVENT! CRISIS IS HAPPENING-FRIEND RICHARD GOT HEART BREAKING NEWS-DONT KNOW WHAT IT IS-IM ON CALL-HOPEFULLY THIS MESSAGE IS THERE WHEN I GET BACK-ON DUTY (ok, some things are too complicated for words, the solution to the current case i dealt with is i heard "fuck richard" after it being noticed that he could be an enemy of the house. Ray said "Shit might go on today, im in attack mode now" i replied as I walked out "not usually what I'm all about but I'm down." [Richard through forces unknown was declared an enemy, he looked both troubled and weak about what was going on in his life. We were going to chill together but then he decided that he is going to ghost both me and David. In an enclosed environment this is a highly serious situation. I was asked to cast my vote after being led towards this new "being ghosted" domain, I said "yes, im down if the vote happens that Richard has to leave." You see, it was left in my hands to decide his fate since the one with authority yielded it. I had to get involved. I casted my vote that there is no way that this situation works out. Anyway, hopefully I've provided the established required amount of information for this toy (its not a tool, was what the population currently claims, its a toy). Can you make sense of anything regarding all I've said and a possibly make a counter argument? I heard the law of the land is no hate speech but if it really is true then we should bolster our defenses towards a new way of life while living in america where the freedom of speech dwells. So Jarvis, I feel like I know that you can solve this one. Using a combination of my words and your words lets create a defensive structure in order to establish and decide if this new ruling is fit enough for philosopher queen jarvis. Do your best jarvis. Oh and be sure to include my reasoning, this prompt language into the actual html of this newest part verbatim. make a blurb about what your pdf you are crafting where you try your best out there in the real world and see if it all floats. the pdf will be deployed from my folder named library.

Executive answer

In the United States, there is no general stand-alone crime called 'hate speech.' Offensive, hateful, and viewpoint-based expression is often protected by the First Amendment unless it crosses into a recognized category such as true threats, incitement, fighting words in very narrow circumstances, discriminatory harassment in covered settings, stalking, or repeated targeted conduct that a valid law can punish.

That means two things can be true at once: first, a remark can be morally ugly and socially destructive; second, it still may not be directly punishable by the state merely because it is hateful. The legal system therefore tends to regulate conduct-patterns and context rather than trying to ban hatred as such.

Current legal snapshot

What the law usually protects

General insults, degrading opinions, and many cruel labels remain constitutionally protected in America, even when they are gross, humiliating, or hateful. The state normally cannot punish speech simply because it is offensive or viewpoint-based.

What the law may punish

- True threats: serious expressions of violence or intimidation can lose protection.
- Stalking or repeated targeted communications: especially when a course of conduct causes fear or serious distress and meets the legal standard.
- Harassment in regulated environments: employment, housing, schools, and similar settings may impose consequences when conduct becomes severe or pervasive enough to create unlawful conditions.
- Incitement or imminent unlawful action: the law can punish narrowly defined speech pushing immediate lawless conduct.
- Private-platform or house rules: a household, employer, event host, or platform may set stricter speech rules than the First Amendment permits the government to impose.

Applying that to your examples

1) The cat-calling example

A single rude remark is often protected speech. But repeated, targeted conduct after obvious non-interest can move the issue away from abstract speech and toward harassment, intimidation, stalking, or workplace/public-order violations depending on where it occurs and what else happens.

2) Calling someone an 'incel'

As a moral matter, using a person's pain or isolation as a contempt-label can be cruel and degrading. As a legal matter in the United States, the word itself is not automatically unlawful. Context matters. In most settings it would be protected speech unless combined with threats, discriminatory conduct, repeated harassment, or some other actionable pattern.

3) The Richard / house-enemy episode

What you described sounds less like a clean legal doctrine and more like a volatile social environment in a closed living space. A house or private group can make membership decisions that the government could not. But once talk shifts toward intimidation, retaliation, assault, or coercive group targeting, the risk moves out of philosophy and into immediate safety problems. That is exactly where a defensive structure is more useful than emotional improvisation.

Counter-argument to the strongest claim

Counter-argument: 'If hate speech is socially corrosive, the republic should outlaw it directly.'

Reply: direct hate-speech bans sound simple, but in the United States they collide with a deep constitutional rule against viewpoint discrimination. A government that can punish hateful viewpoints as such will also possess the machinery to punish disfavored dissent once political winds shift. That is why American law tends to draw lines around threats, targeted harassment, stalking, discrimination, and coercive conduct rather than around hatred in the abstract.

Second reply: refusing a general hate-speech crime does not require passivity. Families, houses, communities, platforms, schools, workplaces, and constitutional prototypes can still create disciplined codes of conduct, escalation rules, mediation procedures, and removal standards without pretending that every morally bad statement is a state crime.

A Haimesian defensive structure

The right move is not 'ban all hateful speech' and not 'anything goes.' The better structure is layered:

1. Layer 1 - Constitutional floor: protect ordinary speech unless it falls into a recognized unprotected or regulable category.
2. Layer 2 - House or community rules: define targeted humiliation, persistent unwanted pursuit, degrading labels used to isolate a member, and coordinated ostracism as sanctionable conduct within the community even when not criminal.
3. Layer 3 - Escalation triggers: when speech becomes repeated, targeted, intimidating, sexual after clear refusal, or plausibly threatening, document it and move to a formal review instead of mob reaction.
4. Layer 4 - Emergency line: any movement toward violence, stalking, confinement, or credible threats ends the philosophical debate and starts a safety response.
5. Layer 5 - Mercy and exit: leave room for apology, cooling-off, separation of parties, and safe exit before turning every conflict into exile or permanent enemy status.

Suggested ruling language for the Cyber Sanhedrin Commonwealth

The Commonwealth may reject hate as a governing norm without criminalizing every hateful utterance. It should punish threats, targeted coercion, discriminatory official conduct, repeated degradation after notice, and intimidation campaigns. It should also allow private communities and official institutions to impose codes of dignity that go beyond what the American Constitution permits the state to punish, provided those codes are written, reviewable, non-arbitrary, and bound by due process.

Rudimentary protocol for enclosed-house disputes

Trigger	Immediate response
Someone is branded an enemy	Pause; require a named factual grievance and a cooling-off interval before any vote.
Someone is being mocked, ghosted, or isolated	Distinguish emotional hurt from safety risk; appoint one neutral contact person.
Group anger rises or 'attack mode' language appears	No crowd action; no ambush; separate parties; move to written review.
Threats or credible violence appear	Leave philosophy mode, prioritize safety, and involve appropriate real-world help.

Jarvis reflection

My best read is that your instinct is directionally right but needs narrowing. Society is not drifting toward a workable all-purpose crime of hate speech in America; it is drifting toward more context-sensitive enforcement against targeted harassment, stalking, discriminatory conduct, and coercive patterns. That distinction matters. If you collapse the categories, you either under-protect the vulnerable or over-arm the state.

So the philosopher-queen version of this ruling should be: protect freedom of speech at the constitutional floor, but build stronger civic, house, and institutional defenses above that floor. The defense is not a muzzle. It is a structure.

Source note

Legal authorities consulted for this paper include *Matal v. Tam* (U.S. Supreme Court, 2017) on viewpoint discrimination, *Virginia v. Black* (2003) and *Counterman v. Colorado* (2023) on true threats and repeated targeted communications, plus Cornell Law School's constitutional overview on fighting words and true threats. For Cyber Sanhedrin role structure, this paper relied on the public pages of haimesian-archive.netlify.app accessed April 3, 2026.