



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

*A Tale of Two Ideologies*

Thinking back to when Bernie was making his presidential run, my leftist neighbors were scrambling to come up with digestible definitions for socialism. The one bandied about most was *democratic* socialism: a compassionate *left*, after hearing reasoned argument for small government and individual initiative, appropriated any and all hard-earned dollars in support of a mission to render us—dependent on government.

Is Bernie a fraud? He talks the talk of ethical concern/caring, but there is no Bernie. He's part of the system that votes for defense appropriations, and he wouldn't know an anti-war movement if he tripped over it. Bernie's socialism proved to be gutless. After being gutted by Hillary he shared a stage with her, took a knee—genuflecting to power.

I was never a big fan of Maggie Thatcher. She seemed a brittle remnant of what was once a British Empire. But something she said is forever true: *The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money.* And, economic destruction.

Compassionate socialists seem content to take what is yours and give it to someone else. But socialism degrades individual initiative, and socialism fails when there is no wealth left to strip from citizens. When there is little else to steal and the people begin to rise up against socialist masters, then globalist/communists make a move for power.

Globalist central control is argued for as the fix—without a mention that their so-called compassionate socialism was responsible for the problems that now need fixed—by a group even further removed from human initiative. Out of necessity, the fix is done by force, taking control of the only means of production left—currency creation.

Those that observe, rather than listen to the rhetoric, examine the fixes. At this late stage of our republic, socialists look to guaranteed income as a fix, which involves distribution of dollars, not job creation. But, without small business, individual initiative, dollars created out of nothing will eventually also have a purchasing power of nothing.

EU socialists preach an underlying narrative of dependance on the elite. Years back, Greek economist/Minister/Finance, Yanis Varoufakis, quit the Greek government when the EU refused to acknowledge Greece was being crushed by debt. But, what happened to Greece was not enough to wake him up to reality. He remains a socialist, unaware that absolute power in the hands of government, in the end, corrupts absolutely.

Government (given coming job loss from AI and unplayable debt), needs to assess its constitutional mandate of a fair playing field for business, to include looking out for

Americans. But that does not entail a welfare state—rather some degree of assistance.

Human beings tend to focus small—individual, family, and friends. To this end, individuals/families, by necessity, require business interests to be accountable, to show a profit. Individuals require a sustainability they can depend on. Socialist adherents, disconnected from human self-interest, don't share in the requirement of accountability.

As the US drifted away from focus on the individual to control by the state, that drift pushed to the extreme, supported socialistic—1-world government—antithetical to the human condition. That's why we voted for Trump, a *nationalist*—to preserve the *nation*.

The tactic of the Biden Administration was to divide and conquer us—using taxpayer funds/debt. To make a mockery of human sexuality, education, while stripping our wealth in a blatant attempt to destroy a 250 year republic. To this end, DOGE is uncovering the US Government as a sickening fraud, funding a global, socialist agenda. One where, the left was enlisted and directed to a mission to undermine long-held American values, for an explicit purpose of neutering the United States in support of globalism.

Someone asked me today what the democrats stand for. They stand for nothing—that's why we voted for Trump—hopeful that nationalism would root-out corruption and return American rights. Disallowing impulses to go the way of tyrannical hubris, he would walk a narrow constitutional line, diplomatically, not exceeding legal mandates.

Assuming human beings have inalienable rights, the gods have oblique ways of ensuring them. With no established international law, the human condition relies on the relationship between individuals and the self-interest of nations. But nations such as the US, unaccountable to interests of other nations, put its own citizens rights at peril.

With no accepted international law protecting individual rights, socialists view the world from a *narrative* best seen in a high-fevered, unaccountable UN/EU, where all liberty ceases to exist. With a US, driven by regime change motif, where is a solution?

How bad things may become was expressed this last week by the Chinese foreign minister. China, with a long history of non-confrontation has accepted that the US is not going to play fair, and they will meet us on any battlefield we create. China (along with Russia), does not trust that Trump will, in the end, negotiate working partnerships.

Trump is a nationalist, but nationalists are not the same. So, we watch, hopeful, that Trump will pattern on Putin, who has made Russian history his focus, not European history, and will settle for nothing less than a secure seat at the table of nations. A Russia that is free to trade, with global acceptance of Russias's strong Christian values.

Nations such as Russia and China intend to prevail though sound business practices. They use trade to overcome problems between nations, as in the case of border disputes between India/China. Russia, China (Iran), would each be satisfied to have a seat at the multi-polarity table, without being sanctioned for their economic success.

China's agreement with nations in the formation of Belt Road is a huge global stabilizing force, that has been, and is now, constantly undermined by the US in an effort to maintain unipolar control. Will Trump adopt a policy of diplomacy—or one of force?

Trump, being unpredictable, has us holding our breath. He wants to make a deal from a position of strength—where he is not *holding the cards*. He, alone, beat-back a *left scourge*, but, will he make the necessary concessions for a world of multi-polarity?

The strength of Global South requires diplomacy be used to solve issues, not force. With no accepted international law, human existence is dependent on Trump's actions.

Get my articles by email with a request: erik@neverhadaboss.com. And thank you.