

### 3.2.2.3.2.84 Violent and non-violent crime

In judging crime, the big divide ought to be between violent crime and non-violent crime. More determined measures ought to be taken to prevent violent crime than non-violent crime, and the punishment of violent crime ought to be harsher than the punishment of non-violent crime.

This view may appear logical, and when the main bodies of penal law were written down in most countries in the 19th and 20th century, this view prevailed and largely resulted in codes that were proportionate along the above principle of differentiating between violent and non-violent crimes.

But since then, the penal codes of many countries have become the favorite playgrounds of those who aim to change human societies to conform with their interests.

For Kreutzian ideology, this is of relevance in the context of drugs and sexuality.

Individual drug use which does not involve violence against others and does not do harm to others (unless strange cases are construed), ranked as a minor offense in original penal codes (if it was considered an offence at all), but now is threatened with punishments on par with murder in many countries.

Likewise, sexual harassment, even if only verbal, is, when the victim is female, now punished more heavily than beating up a male. And the police of many countries will take much more interest in the sexual harassment case of the female than the physical injury of the male.

Making such comparisons, of course, is not politically correct. I will be blamed for defending the male "right" to sexually harass females, even though this is not what I mean. But compared to hitting somebody physically, saying something to a person which the addressed person considers not in accordance with her role model or finds offending, is either a very light transgression, or none.