



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

*Beneath Trump's 2nd Term—A Quagmire*

Nowhere is this more apparent than Trump letting *New Start* expire. Nuclear arms limitation treaties are difficult (if not impossible), to negotiate. *New Start* was a good one. Not acting on Putin's offer to extend *New Start* for one year, no strings attached, Trump put the world in even greater jeopardy.

With Trump not agreeing, what's his rationale? China. Warhawks around Trump want US nuclear deterrent to match combined Russia/China totals, and *New Start* only addresses nuclear delivery numbers for Russia/US. Consequently, *New Start* fails to address China's 600 nuclear weapons.

Any new nuclear treaty involves China's proposal that US and Russia each reduce to 600. Trump, flanked by what may be, historically, the most ignorant presidential advisor team (Stephen Miller/Scott Bessent), calls-up Dmitri Medvedev's statement: *if Trump does not act on Putin's offer to extend New Start, all bets are off. Trump ceases to be trusted as his own man.*

The quagmire underlying Trump is manifest. He used his 1st term to get rid of the intermediate nuclear treaty, and his 2nd to finish the job. Trump is not his own man. Now Bibi arrives in DC a week early to convince Trump to attack Iran. But Trump's *tit for tat* offer to Iran has backfired. Any attack on Iran will be met with full scale missile launch on US personnel—and Israel.

At best, Trump sees some things that he cannot act on, but, with passage

of time, it's more apparent he is his own guy—disposed to US unipolarity.

We see this in JD Vance advocating for a thinly disguised unipolarity, gathering allies in support of price caps, price floors for strategic minerals (might be a tad late considering we have no silver stockpile). Done to slow China—this type of market manipulation is often unsuccessful.

Six decades of tough negotiations gave us arms control, tossed aside with a view to extend multipolarity by containing China—which will likely prove an impossibility. Along the way, many of Trump's promises have been broken. For his 1st term, AG Bill Barr actively worked to undermine him—now Pam Bondi acts against promises made, as evidenced with gun rights.

I'm having interesting dreams—riddles to be solved? Last night, Trump was arming Iran against Israeli aggression. That one's easy. Since Trump has no need for nuclear or any other treaties, and given Trump's personality, anything's possible, including changing alliances resulting in nuclear war.

Maybe I'm listening to too much Bill Holter, or reading Cormac McCarthy's *Trilogy* too many times—but I don't think so. My overview of how we got here, and where we are headed—is what it is. Bob Dylan will judge as to whether my overview proves true or false: *Then time will tell just who fell—And who's been left behind—When you go your way and I go mine.*

Those of us who inhabit the *rational middle* gain a better overview of the landscape than those who inhabit either side. What's my outlook for the future I see coming? For any who say I'm too hard on Trump, it's not about Trump. Each president (in recent history), has been nothing more than an *efficient cause* for what is our future. They either slow the process or hasten it. Biden/Trump have each sped-up what is coming.

Even alternative US commentators are paying lip-service to Trump's bullying threats, done to strip nations of sovereign assets. With the US in dire

circumstances, they justify Trump flexing muscles to take what the US needs to survive? Begging the questions: how did we get here, and, in a world that sees Trump's motivation, who will buy our worthless paper (bonds and dollars)?

What's the future hold for the US? We get 1 of 2, a *Fall of Rome* scenario, or Cormac's *post apocalyptic* vision. Both are terrifying though the former is preferable. Degrees of conflict from border skirmishes, up to the Ukraine war, might not themselves bring-on nuclear war, but threatening major powers such as Russia/China/Iran, existentially, brings on option 2, by default.

Assuming survival as *last-ditch* choice over ideology, think back on the *Fall of Rome*, and the consequences for the Roman Empire, Roman citizens, and Roman culture. Historians generally agree that after the fall, the population of Rome (left with no viable economy), shrank to almost nothing. 100 years later, Romans (dumbed-down) had little or no idea what the ancient system of aqueducts, long in disuse, had been used for.

Governments come in two forms: support for citizen's liberty/economy, or in support of elite control—for the sake of elites. Modern empires, for centuries, masqueraded as *liberalism*, each waving a banner for a mission to make the lives of *everyman*—better.

Privately scoffing at ideas that everyone is equal under the law, empires took the same fall-back position. As when, millions on the African Continent unfortunately had to be killed as part of a plan to establish control, in the end, the mission would make things better for all.

US foreign-policy has replaced *inalienable* rights with *equity*—which they tell us is only possible with forceful implementation. Do we take the elite's word that once *equity* is the norm, things will improve for everyone? This mockery extends the timeline to implement individual rights and liberty far

past the horizon—without bounds—in Orwellian terms.

Western hegemony is being replaced by a BRICS model of multipolarity/sovereignty, largely already in place, but having gone unnoticed. Given that reality, can we speculate on a future for global entities? With multipolarity as the model, can we assess each nation's future?

Our world produces senseless leaders, EU/Biden/Trump. Lacking strategy ability, they would not be leaders—except for present circumstances. Looking back to Eisenhower/JFK, did they support citizens over unfounded ideologies? To some extent, but it was Ike who came up with the *commie domino theory* that gave us Korea/Vietnam. And JFK, while not supporting *Bay of Pigs*, increased US military advisors in Vietnam from 100s to 1000s.

What are some likely futures? The EU was doomed from the start by enacting a common currency without dealing with national debts. Likely a CIA project to slow slaughter on the Iberian Peninsula (making it manageable for US control), the EU dumbed-down the continent to a hapless 400 million Europeans. Reserve currency for the US has the same doom—built right in.

Without sense to seriously join the Global South, the EU instead supports war with Russia, doing the bidding for Trump's self-serving embers of dead liberalism. Trump, who could care less what happens to European ancestors. NATO/Article 5? Forget it—the US was never going to launch nuclear war to save a European city—in a trade for Boston/New York.

The US/EU share a destination, only the EU gets there first. Because of *liberalism's* unconcern for citizens, the US can't go back to inalienable rights/sovereignty. That clock, by necessity, slips back to way before 1776.

The EU? Maybe they return to a time of machine guns/barbed wire?

Silver? Will silver dimes continue to be undervalued? A coming article.

Request my articles by email, or comment: [erik@neverhadaboss.com](mailto:erik@neverhadaboss.com).