

An Interview with Carey Linde and Dr. Lloyd Hawkeye Robertson
on Ethics, Freedom of Expression, and Socio-Politics (Part Three)

August 15, 2020

Interviewer: Scott Douglas Jacobsen

Numbering: Issue 23.A, Idea: Outliers & Outsiders (Part Nineteen)

Place of Publication: Langley, British Columbia, Canada

Title: In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal

Web Domain: <http://www.in-sightjournal.com>

Individual Publication Date: August 15, 2020

Issue Publication Date: September 1, 2020

Name of Publisher: In-Sight Publishing

Frequency: Three Times Per Year

Words: 2,826

ISSN 2369-6885

Abstract

Dr. Lloyd Hawkeye Robertson founded Hawkeye Associates. Carey Linde founded Divorce for Men (Law Offices of Carey Linde). They discuss: legal status on the issues of transsexuality and transgenderism; world corporate capitalism; channelling of aggression and competition; free speech, and hate speech, or “freedom of expression”; the precise ideological premise; and sociopolitical environs of the country.

Keywords: aggression, capitalism, Carey Linde, competition, Divorce for Men, ethics, free speech, freedom of expression, Hawkeye Associates, Lloyd Hawkeye Robertson, sociopolitics.

**An Interview with Carey Linde and Dr. Lloyd Hawkeye
Robertson on Ethics, Freedom of Expression, and Socio-**

Politics: Founder, Divorce for Men (Law Offices of Carey Linde) & Founder, Hawkeye Associates (Part Three)[1]:[2]*

Please see the footnotes, bibliography, and citation style listing after the interview.

1. Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What *should* be the legal status on the issues of transsexuality and transgenderism in regards to some of the aforementioned stages of change? Where do parents' rights and children's rights work well together in this context and not well together for the overall well-being of the child or adolescent?

Carey Linde: I detect cocktail and beer parlour disputants, maybe out of pure exhaustion caused by confusion, are intellectually prepared to throw up their hands at what adults want to do. But children – hell no! The ever louder exception are the die hard cultural resister radical feminists who say men who think they are women must stay the F*#K out of women's historical safe and protected spaces.

The rights of parents and children ultimately exist only in legislation and law. In the US increasing numbers of republican dominated state governments are enacting laws making it illegal for doctors to transition children, schools to push it, sports teams segregated by sex, and to stay with historic pronouns. Provincial and federal governments in Canada are going the other way. Canadian courts have barely started looking at this stuff.

Dr. Lloyd Hawkeye Robertson: *Although I am not a lawyer, I would think that it is difficult to have consistent law on internally subjective criterion. I would therefore switch from a focus on gender to sex. A person's sex can be objectively determined by criteria that is understood beforehand. People who are in the process of transitioning may be granted special or provisional status taking into account the fears and concerns raised by women and by parents.*

2. Jacobsen: Mr. Linde, why the focus on world corporate capitalism as an ill? What makes the “medical profession and big pharma” part of the problem rather than a component of an integrated solution? Dr. Robertson, why the limitations in the study of, and the lack of study of, the acceptance of greater diversity by men than by women? That is, why are some questions simply not asked in some eras? Why is the channelling of aggression and competition necessary for the advancement of civilization? Will religion or proto-religious movements rise in the place of diminishing universal human rights as an ethic? Are they rising?

Linde: The profit motive is ubiquitous in corporate share owner capitalism. Big pharma pushes pills. Too many in the medical profession are ideologically rather than scientifically driven. One either sees and understands this or they don't. Together they integrate in the current world wide experimentation on transitioning children.

Robertson: *It is in the nature of the capitalist to maximize profit. Capitalists who fail to live by this maxim do not remain capitalists for very long. Unless they have a monopoly, they lose to the more ruthless. From this lens, corporate philanthropy is a public relations expense. A bit of history is useful for illustration.*

Husky Oil was such a small player after World War II that it could not afford to build a new refinery. Instead, they bought an abandoned oil refinery in Moose Jaw and moved it to the Alberta side of Lloydminster to avoid Saskatchewan's more stringent worker-safety legislation. When I worked at the refinery it was easy to recognize the men who worked “on the rack” for years because they had thick leathery faces from repeated exposure to the fumes from loading tanker cars. I had the more dangerous job of working in the packaging plant where we poured roofing tar and super heated pipe enamel into cardboard drums where the product cooled and solidified prior to shipping. Occasionally the mixture would bubble and splatter the workers in the plant. The boiler plant

operators were different because they looked normal, but they tended to be deaf. Yes, the company provided ear plugs but you had to take them out when communicating with other workers when a boiler was about to blow. The heyday of industrial capitalism is over in this country, and such working conditions would no longer be permitted except in third world countries, but the principle is the same – to grow a company needs to exploit its workers or its consumers. Certain questions would destabilize the existing order and are simply not asked. In Lloydminster during the post war era, no one ever questioned Husky Oil.

Could “big pharma” be part of an integrated solution? Only if you feed the beast. Husky Oil eventually built its new upgrader plant in Saskatchewan only after a massive subsidy from that province. “Big pharma” will be part of the solution to the new coronavirus, and they will pocket a significant portion of the billions governments have earmarked to fight the disease. Who is going to maximize their profits on the transsexual issue? Follow the money.

Why is there no money to study the greater acceptance of diversity by men on these and other issues? Why is there less money for the study of men’s health generally? Certain questions would destabilize the existing ideological order. We are supposed to see the men at Husky who knowingly sacrificed years off their lives in order to provide for their families as exploiters. Men’s lives just don’t count for as much. Prior to her presidential run in the U.S. Hillary Clinton said that the real victims of war are women who lose their husbands and their fathers. The notion that the real victims of war are dead did not appear to have crossed her mind.

Why are men used as cannon fodder on the front lines of war? Because we evolved to be more aggressive, stronger and fearless in protecting family-based bands, tribes and eventually nation-states. But that aggression must be controlled if those political units are to endure. In the end, being a man is a cooperative enterprise. Now we have males transitioning to be females and vice versa. It’s an interesting social experiment.

3. Jacobsen: Dr. Robertson, why is free speech important now, or always? Mr. Linde, is the event described in Seattle a harbinger of anything or events to come in the 2020s in regards to free speech, and hate speech, or “freedom of expression” in the parlance of the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the United Nations (and the European Union)? Mr. Linde and Dr. Robertson, what is the purpose of hate speech? What are the positive and negative results of the legislation of speech via hate speech laws? Mr. Linde, how are social factors and various legislations of speech preventing needed conversations and the infusion of appropriate expert testimony on relevant medical matters surrounding transgenderism and transsexuality? Dr. Robertson, with postmodernism extant without explicit labelling, and so more easily spread in some ways, how is the nullification of values via the collapse of all principles to the same valuation exacerbating clarity on issues on transgenderism and transsexuality?

Linde: Hate speech serves to rationalize and compensate for feelings of fear and inferiority in the hater. Hate speech legislation is a good if it can prevent physical harm befalling a person or group of people.

Needed conversations are frustrated because the gate keepers of the public platform for discourse are cowed by the trans warriors who redefine the common usage of phobic and hate. For an expanded expression of this see my letter attached.

Robertson: *Without free speech, and its twin “freedom of thought,” society ossifies. We lose the ability to meet new challenges in new ways. One of the challenges in improving society is to deal with hate speech and we need freedom of speech to do that. Hate speech is the advocacy of harm to a group of people based on inherent qualities ascribed to that group. Having one’s concept of reality challenged, or one’s entitlements challenged, is not in itself hate speech. We have an example from the transsexual community that*

brings this to light. There are some who believe that sex is a social construct while one is born with an innate gender. I happen to believe the reverse. People are born with certain genitalia and that is not socially constructed. On the other hand, gender is a social construct – it is how we learn to be a man or a woman. And gender is fluid because there are all sorts of ways of living one's life as a man or a woman without going through reconstructive surgery. Is it hate speech for me to have this opinion? Some people would say "yes" but that is an abuse of the term. I don't hate anyone, and I am not telling anyone how they are to live their life, except that they should not live their life in a way that harms other people, or restricts their freedom of speech.

4. Jacobsen: Mr. Linde, what seems like the precise ideological premise – not philosophical view as a whole – of “cultural resister radical feminists” behind the cultural resistance? That which leads to the cultural resistance on these particular discussed topics. What is the culture being resisted? How will the split between some of Canadian society and some of American society in legislation lead to different problems to the cultural issues at present? Dr. Robertson, an objective perspective on the issues can be helpful, i.e., sex discrimination in criteria compared to subjective perceptions of self in regards to gender. What facets of the self, of self-perception as in gender, can be close to objective to make some of the issues of gender clearer and more distinct in conscious discrimination in a manner similar to a sex criterion? What aspects of the self in gender will remain entirely, and far, within the realm of the subjective to make these considerations simply harder to delineate?

Linde: If by “cultural resister radical feminists” you mean TERFS or gender critical feminist, I can say this: the population of trans gendered persons in the US and Canada is estimated to be between 1 and 2 %. The opinion survey quoted in m Attached letter says 19% of Brits are in support. Therefore it is the proponents of transitioning who are the resistance to the more dominant culture.

The gender critical feminists and those who support them vary on their definitions of a trans woman. They all agree that such a person does not have the life experiences and biology to qualify as entitled to enter women's special spaces. Not necessarily because of fear. For many it is cultural. Breach of historic privacy.

Robertson: *I don't think gender can be objectively defined. We construct our selves through a menu of possibilities given to us by an increasingly international and cosmopolitan culture, and by new creative possibilities we may invent for ourselves. Part of that construction is how we relate first and foremost to ourselves as sexual beings. In the end, some people may conclude that they were born into the wrong sex, and if they want to change their sex so be it. But it is their subjective notions they are pursuing, nothing objective about it.*

5. Jacobsen: The law, it may stagnate or change here. Mr. Linde, what seems most needing change? Dr. Robertson, how can any future change in law incorporate expert/professional medical and psychological opinions to issues facing a super minority of the national population while causing severe divisions within the sociopolitical environs of the country? Mr. Linde and Dr. Robertson, let's say Canada sits on its hands on issues of transgenderism and transsexuality, what happens at that time? Alternatively, let's say Canada becomes entirely onerous in either sociopolitical direction on issues of transgenderism and transsexuality, what happens in either of these cases? Please take both extremes to provide a personal interpretation of a possible range between the antipodes presented here.

Linde: Gender warriors, being outed more and more by the media, respond with increasing animosity and ferocity. ANTIFA is now at every rally. The gender critical feminists and the legions of conservative and faith based citizens who support them remain equally adamant they won't change their positions. It is an intractable confrontation of fundamental human values on both

sides. The trans warriors refuse to talk to the other side. The TERFS are always inviting the warriors to talk. Neither side talks to the other. Even the Palestinians and Jews talk to each other. Until and unless each side is prepared to moderate and accommodate the concerns of the other there will be no peace. Period.

Robertson: *We live in an era dominated by identity politics where people who are not part of, or do not support our particular tribe are thought of as oppressive, evil, hate mongers. Were either of these sides in the extreme win and define the law, that would result in the negation of the rights of the other. It would be nice if these sides were to come together and come to some agreement, but that is not likely. It is more likely that the great majority who have remained largely silent will tire of the game and will proclaim the rules both sides would have to live by. I would hope those rules would provide for the sanctity of freedom of speech and freedom of expression. I would hope that those rules define objectively when a man becomes a woman and when a woman becomes a man, and that will mean relegating all notions of gender to the subjective. But once a transwoman meets that definition, then she should be accorded all of the rights and privileges our society gives to women. No half measures.*

Appendix I: Footnotes

[1] Founder, Divorce for Men (Law Offices of Carey Linde).
Founder, Hawkeye Associates.

[2] Individual Publication Date: August 15, 2020: <http://www.insightjournal.com/linde-robertson-three>; Full Issue Publication Date: September 1, 2020: <https://in-sightjournal.com/insight-issues/>.