



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power  
*The Elite Reserves the Right 'To Refuse Service to Anyone'*

It's an ongoing argument as to whether or not big tech/social networks, since they are private corporations, can restrict content and free speech on their platforms. Similarly, privately-owned restaurants in the South, during the 1950's, displayed signs behind the lunch counter: "We reserve the right to refuse service to anyone" (especially if you are black). It took judicial plus courts of public opinion to do away with that practice, but only after blacks conducted 'sit-ins' at lunch counters, and suffered televised beatings.

Even with 'sit-ins', it took MLK Jr. and protestors, at the start of the 'March to Montgomery', crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge, in Selma, being viciously beaten by cops and thugs on national TV, to challenge and put an end to 'the right to refuse service'.

Discrimination back then was obvious—now it is not so 'black and white'. A few decades ago, when a company/corporation (as Google/Facebook do now), controlled majority market share, the federal government stepped-in and declared a monopoly—breaking large entities into smaller businesses that then competed with one another.

That no longer happens because elites see social networks as enhancing stature, and maintaining economic dominance. They argue that mega-corporations need to retain their size so as to match-up in the struggle for global corporate dominance. More importantly, government sees big tech/social networks as useful for doing its dirty work.

The US, government is restricted from abrogating American's 'free speech'. Everybody knows this, so government colludes with social networks to cancel individuals that the elite want shut-out. But they don't let on—they make like the 'networks' shut-out Dr. Robert Malone (or whomever), at their own behest. Consequently, platforms are supported in restricting 'free speech' rights of certain individuals. With the 'left' controlling the 'power apparatus', it's only conservatives that are silenced and cancelled.

In the past, courts would find that restricting 'free speech' to further partisan political aims of 1 party over another violated citizen's free speech rights, and would be reclassified as a 'communication public utility'—and likely broken into smaller businesses.

The 1st amendment protects citizen's 'free speech' from government intrusion, but when government asks 'big tech' for a favor, 'neutering' someone, does that change things? That 'big tech' entity has knowingly become 'an agent of the state' through participating in what is termed 'state action'. In a 'fascist linkage between 'big tech' and government, intended to do harm to citizens, the 'big tech' entity, by virtue of its affilia-

tion with government, jeopardizes and loses the 'safety net' of being 'privately owned'.

As a 'public utility monopoly' restricting free speech, the 'spirit' of the 1st Amendment is obviously broken, and only the 'trappings of tyranny' would defend such injustice.

Free speech seems to have lost its simple usage of times past when the cure for free speech was free speech. Someone expressed whatever opinion, and free speech took them to task. 'Free speech' itself was used to settle free speech controversies.

Free-men and women thrive on free speech. Ask yourself why there was no open Covid discussion. When something of the magnitude of a pandemic is unfolding, there cannot be too much open discussion. Physicians and researchers are the actual 'trial and error' open forum to sort it out. The role of a doctor is not to pass-on establishment dictums, but work with patients trying 'this and that' until something works.

That's how science functions in open-forum, which can get contentious when lives are at stake. In the pandemic (as I see it), millions died or were life-altered because an elite few convinced government to bequeath all power of control to them. But why?

What was to be gained by 'elite regulators' restricting 'free speech' and shutting-down 'open forum' amongst experts? And, why in that process were the elite willing to harass/un-license renowned experts (often colleagues)? Was it simply the vanity of not being exposed as being wrong? Could it have been something that petty—that trite?

Or, did it have to do with 'hubris' combined with 10s of billions of dollars and patents health regulators shared with Pharma? It's a sad truth, but when the pile of dollars becomes larger than a VW 'hippie van', sadly, there are those who would take the requisite steps to reduce human population a couple billion to get their hands on that loot.

Now we get to more 'free speech issues. Elon Musk has taken over 'Twitter', and it's beginning to look as if he ought to have stayed home. If he were a Ron Paul (and he is not), it might make sense to have already lost a \$ billion in a cause for 'free speech'. But Congressman Paul—Elon is not. He is a businessman that made it big with a 'platform' (Tesla), with the potential to make global sustainability worse. Granted, he has some affiliation with 'free speech', but how much? And, does he see what awaits him?

We hear about Twitter hemorrhaging dollars and, of greater import, the 'established' world is utterly against him, By any stretch of the imagination, is the close-minded EU going to allow Elon to invigorate 'free speech'? Not on your life—or on Musk's life.

Musk, for them is another Bitcoin, as soon as he represents a threat to 'control', he is done. Does anyone think the EU tyranny will allow Musk to pervade the airwaves with opinions that run contrary to its dictums and ideologies? No way. Which means, either Musk accedes to 'free speech lite' (de-fanged free speech), or Twitter is gone from Europe—adding \$ 10 more billion to what he already lost. And, Elon has other concerns.

Musk is at cross-purposes with himself, not understanding the basics of free speech. Free speech doesn't 'cancel-out' some and not others. Take the overview: Big Tech tries to shut-us-up based on 'misinformation' when, if you wait 6 months, almost everything they put out devolves into 'misinformation'. So that is nothing but a power play.

Then there's 'hate speech': Musk disallows Alex Jones over that, saying Jones used a profit-motive to deny the murder of children. When I read that I thought maybe Elon had made a mistake citing Jones—as we hear those same words in describing Fauci.

The FCC got it right: Free speech is only curbed for 'safety': don't yell fire in a crowded room. But long forgotten. Elites reserve the right to refuse service to anyone. Please pass my articles along. To get on my subscriber list: erik@neverhadaboss.com.