



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

Am I Too Harsh On Trump?

Am I too harsh in my attitude towards Trump? There's no doubt. The way I react to bullies and being lied to is often harsh. I sometimes meet pro-Trump comments with an 'I don't care if you read another word' attitude. My latest Trump diatribe caused long-time readers to ask: Is there nothing at all positive about Trump? My replies left little room for response. Then, as the hours passed, it began to weigh on me, especially when I re-read the comments and saw they weren't attacking me. At very worst, even if under the spell of Trump, they were asking real questions—deserving of my respect.

Too late to adjust my attitude, it wasn't too late to atone. A series of back and forth emails brought a clarity that surprised me—mended some fences.

I owe much of my economic education/readership to Bill Holter, without whom I wouldn't understand why pre-65 junk silver will be coin of the realm. Even after understanding the logic that made it so, I'd text him before making purchases, to hear him reduce the seemingly complex into simple terms.

While still opaque as to why the US economy is to collapse in a credit event, Bill's repetition on that basic theme, with added details clarified how credit functions. Also, my confusion around how there could be inflation and deflation at the same time (inflation in the things you need and deflation

in the things you have). It was further cleared up by interviewer's example/ buying a car. Were you to buy that car with depreciating dollars—that's inflation. Buy that same car with rising-value silver—that's deflation. Of course. I already understood the dollar is dying, being replaced by gold/silver.

My attitude is suspect—I can be harsh (you don't see a Tolstoy referring to opposing political parties as whack-jobs). For harshness in my articles, I apologize, but in the Platonic sense: A Socratic apology (Apologia), is a reasoned account—nothing to do with contrition or guilt.

I've been writing 2 page articles for more than a decade. In many of my missives, I don't hold back, and they stir contention. For those who post my articles (as on precious metals sites), I need to remember the entire body politic buys metal, and articles I write that put-off 1 party or the other reduces the number of readers for sites doing business. This makes for a narrow path. Well-wrought facts can be presented—but only with care.

For some years, Bill Holter posted my articles on JS Mineset (where he collaborated with Jim Sinclair). Though we were not of the left, it was made clear that articles overtly challenging leftist premises could have an effect of reducing the number of readers/customers—over night.

In those days, even when careful, I was the brunt of criticism/wrath from the left, and I didn't understand the extent that negativity would have on my psyche/self worth. This was during a time I became a pariah in the blue/blue community and state in which I live, Ashland, Oregon—not only to my neighbors but with close friends, who in no way accepted my analysis.

Now, my life's done a 180. Those on the right who formerly cheered my overview, come after me because I advocate against, not for Trump.

This plays hard on my psyche, especially when political divides between friends seem unresolvable, but only until I remember Socrates' definition for justice (*The Republic*), *minding one's own business*, consequently, *the just*

man never treats the unjust man—unjustly.

From that comes my single commandment (100s of years before Christ), which, when I remember it, gives me the courage to face reality: *Keep your word, and in that process don't aggress on any person or their property.* When I remember that—I don't react.

Sometimes, lacking support for my own mental health, I consider it best I quit writing. But that's never the answer—it's always something about myself that needs dealt with—requiring I do a most difficult thing—question the psychological baggage I still carry. That's a tough one.

To the subject at hand, do I think Trump could be as bad for the world (or worse), than Biden/Obama? Time will tell. Are the lies presented as 'shaking up reality' merely Trump ripping the dressings from long-festering wounds?

When I hear friends (some I greatly admire), say they voted for Trump and would do it again, I want to ask: 'What are you saying? Assuming Trump wasn't telling us lies, to stop Harris (who was totally unfit), we voted for Trump. But what about now? With what we know and what he's doing—are you seeing a different Trump than I do?'

Trump is best explained by contrasting 2 camps: the 1st includes Col. Douglas McGregor, John Mearsheimer, and Trump, as opposed to Jeffrey Sachs and most guests on Judge Napolitano's site.

The 1st camp aligns with a *might is right* school of thought where justice is the *advantage of the stronger*. Many who lean right, afflicted with this, are unable to censure Trump for going after the weak. Trump, firmly embedded in that school, is willing to take on his own pernicious mantle of globalism (that he promised not to), in a grab for power, dividing up the world among strong colonial hands—without concern for sovereignty of the weak.

On the right there isn't much talk about Trump's strategy—more the tac

tics. Can we occupy Venezuela? Can we accomplish regime change in Iran? Or, JD Vance telling Greenland it must trade resources for protection. Protection from what? Where was it ever been mentioned that Russia/China have any interest in colonizing Greenland? Canada/Mexico/Venezuela/Iran/Palestine/Lebanon/Syria, and so many others, need protection from Trump.

For any who consider politics to be a matter of opinion, think on Bill Holter reducing economics into simple science. In a like manner I strongly advocate for *truth/justice/science* in political science.

It's seems 2nd nature for a ruling party to take advantage of the opposite party—doing what they earlier accused others of doing to them. And it's easy for Empire on the way down to rationalize behavior, break its word, egressing on person/nations and their property. Scott Bessent admits to sanctions on Iran as intended to hurt Iranians, setting in motion, regime-change—inadvertently laying-out motives that Trump either lied about, or was taken in because he identifies with *force* rather than *force for good*.

I'll adjust my attitude for the sake of my readers and myself, but I expect little support from the *left/right* as I critique Trump. What happens with friends and readers remains to be seen.

A fact just popped: Gold closing in on \$5000/silver \$100, that's *reality adjusting to reality*. 100/1 ratio is 50/1. Reality—getting ready for what comes.

Request my articles by email, or comment: erik@neverhadaboss.com.