

Civil Rights and Denial of Service



Fighting for gay civil rights laws back in the 1970s, I had trepidations. Did it work both ways? If this passes and I own a store and some bigot who wishes me dead comes in, does it mean I have to serve them? It was one of those questions that led to my doubts about the left.

I came to realize that the fight for civil rights was everything. The passage of the bill itself, an anti-climax, even a setback. For African Americans, Martin Luther King was one of the greatest things that ever happened. The passage of the 1964 civil rights act, one of the worst. It derailed the movement, led to factions and violence, and created the opportunity for abuse. The goal was liberation, but liberation does not come from a law, it comes from a movement, and a law stops a movement dead in its tracks.

In the gay movement (now the LBGTQ+ movement), there was the same problem, but worse. So called "moderate" leaders wanted to push civil rights bills through back-room lobbying without the visibility that liberal politicians found embarrassing at the time. They wanted the setback without the movement. It was the worst possible outcome.

I want the right to discriminate. That is what freedom is about. It is what life is all about. We discriminate who our friends are, who our lovers are, who we live with. Not allowing discrimination in our employees is anti-productive tyranny.

That said, the playing field under [debt-based capitalism](#) is anything but level. The "old boys' network" would never hire people in certain groups for certain positions no matter how qualified they were. Debt-based capitalism allows the choice between tyranny and gross inequality. Sometimes it doesn't even allow the choice.

In [land-based capitalism](#), the playing field is leveled by the [Earth Dividend](#). Any person or group of people can get an education, grab some land, start a business, raise capital, and not starve in the process.

The right to property is an [objective right](#). It gives the merchant the right to refuse service to any person. It gives the landlord the right to refuse tenancy to any person. It gives the employer the right to refuse to hire any person.

There is the optional [subjective right](#) to be free from discrimination on such attributes as race, ethnicity, creed, orientation, disability, or gender. Particularly in public accommodations, it might be tempting for a [dominion](#) to pass such legislation. That is up to the dominion.

I'm of the belief that after a generation or two of land-based capitalism, the very idea for such a law would be preposterous. "You mean that once merchants refused to serve people because they had brown eyes, not blue?" "Something like that."

Denial of Service

The right to discriminate under land-based capitalism becomes a tool in any fight for justice.

Merchants can collude to deny service to a bigot, a polluter, or some other very obnoxious member of the community. Contracts of collusion are not enforceable, but people are encouraged to collude of their own free will.

In a society where the playing field is level, denial of service will more likely be used as a tool for justice, rather than a vehicle for blanket discrimination.