



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

Advocates for 'Cancelling' the 2nd Amendment are Delusional

This morning I awoke to a beautiful spring day here in 'Wokeville', USA. Out the window I could see my wife with her cup of coffee surveying the yard and conversing at the fence with our neighbor who was wiping-away the dirt of winter from his new truck.

Downstairs, her iPad on its stand displayed a NYT article by Nicholas Kristof: "It Is a Delusion to Think Having a Gun in the Home Makes Us Safer". I made an immediate surmise that the article had to be ideologically or statistically based, because anyone owning a gun, that they used it to save a family from home invasion, was made safer.

Many Americans are fearful of guns, but they are also those terrified by a virus, only marginally more serious than the yearly flu. Unwilling to face reality on their own, they accept that the number of government employees grows 3 times as fast as population.

If Kristof had exchanged the 1st 2 words in his title, making it into a question, that would be a basis for worthwhile discussion. For example, who is it that 'fearful citizens' think should be armed? The police—because they are the professionals? But are they? Aren't the police, local/state, an ideological representation of a dumbed-down nation? Do fearful citizens know police hiring standards are lowered to meet recruitment goals?

Beginning to write this article, I wanted the NYT editorial title correct so I searched for it online. I found it altered: "A Gun in the Home Makes Murder More Likely, Not Less". Having a pretty good idea about the intentions behind these type of articles and where they lead prompted me to replace the question in my title with a clear statement.

Restrictive firearm covenants are structured around the many children killed—by guns. As with 'vaccine injured and killed children', nothing is sadder than the avoidable loss of a child's life. But, in a shooting, is the gun responsible for taking the child's life?

For that we have to ask some unpopular questions. Thinking back to high school, 60 years ago, there were depressed kids. Plenty of them. But there were no school shootings. In fact there were hardly any shootings involving kids that were intentional.

And there were guns—lots of guns—we all had guns. We walked across the fields with a .22. We left them in our truck at school. We got them for Christmas presents. So, well-armed and depressed, how come nobody decided to go and murder classmates?

It's a hell-of-a question—and the right question. So what is different now that causes people to mow each other down? Most of you already know it's not that we have guns. It's things that are not guns—but are not part of the discussion. One is a Pharma con-

glomerate that owns the airwaves and pays the way for most of our congresspersons.

Finding information online is tedious, especially if the search has to do with the percentage of school shooters on pharmaceutical drugs. Serviced by a media that covers mass riots in Chicago/Baltimore without mentioning that the rioters are black, how can we expect Pharma to use online airwaves to question their underlying profit motives?

I can't find evidence of any school-shooters that had not been using pharmaceutical drugs. And that's not my fault—at the behest of elites honest reporting is disallowed.

Let's go back to 1988 when Eli Lilly began marketing Prozac. It wasn't long before the nation was flooded with Lilly salesmen—and what was it they were selling? An antidepressant that was safe/more effective than its predecessors. Prozac reportedly was the cause of suicide attempts in teenagers, along with depression, anxiety, loss of confidence, and nausea. This takes me back to kids of overworked parents, 'acting out in school', and given Ritalin to stimulate kid's minds—and somehow calm them down?

We, who in varying degrees were part of the drug culture, assumed this was just 'speed', that in the end would harm them more than help them. Like 'Pfizer' mRNA, we hear the doubts of Pharma executives only after retirement/'mea-culpa' confessions.

If a frank discussion of Pharma's role in school shootings is not forthcoming, what happens? 'Guns' will wrongly be assumed to be the problem. If the onus of guilt can be put on guns and gun-owners, justifying what is already a rash of 'gun restriction legislation', sweeping the nation, we will face disarming and illegal laws—in defiance of the recent Supreme Court ruling re-asserting citizen's rights to 'keep and bear arms'.

The 2nd Amendment has to go, or at least be pushed aside to effectively 'criminalize' free speech and 'cancel' the 1st Amendment. Without an effective 2nd Amendment, the republic will be finished. Then and only then, will the authorities have the power to take total control, making us as defenseless Australians in a viral 'lockdown, or a 3rd Reich.

Legally, 'woke' has no justification for non-adherence to the Bill of Rights—inalienable rights not requiring a guarantee, to which, government officials swear to uphold.

But, for the 'identity politics collective' the Bill of Rights has to go—at any and all costs.

NYT opinion expressers ascribing sad losses of children's lives to guns, unknowingly (or knowingly), support not only gun restriction, but bringing 'collective ideologies' to the printed page, they acquiesce to or support 1st Amendment restrictions. Restrictions intended to replace liberty with 'delusional equity'—making a 2nd Amendment necessary.

There are no constitutional police outside of the citizens, who as State Militias are mandated to 'execute the laws of the union, suppress rebellion, and repel invasion'. For these reasons it is necessary that guns be held in the hands of private citizens.

In my 'blue town' the community is aghast when I fail to 'soft shoe' the 2nd Amendment—when I point out that 'enforcing US laws' involves taking necessary measures against 'tyrannical transfer' of power from citizens to 'unlawful' elites. When the powers that be inflict on the citizens what is 'legally', 'insurrection', that needs to be put-down.

The elite don't have 'the law of the land' on their side. All they have is a complacent populace that looks to them for their safety—oh the horror of hyenas in the henhouse!

How does this play out? I'm not sure but it comes with great risk for patriots and the republic. Any further escalations of 'forced vaccines' or 'sanctified no knock' raids by any of several unconstitutional 'law cartels', lays everything on the line—for everybody. Later today, I will post a 'still rough' "Hey Siri", Book 1, at: neverhadaboss.com. I invite you to read it. And, please join my subscribers, by request: erik@neverhadaboss.com.