

neverhadaboss.com updates on the insane world of money and power Conflict Doesn't Create Character—It Exposes It

Sometimes I only have to go downstairs to find a subject for today's article. My wife was making coffee and listening to NPR, and when she heard me she moved to turn it off. I told her she didn't need to turn it off for me. She, as an ardent democrat, knows I'm no fan of NPR and she doesn't want something she's listing to become contentious.

It's better that she leaves it on—I'm way past getting into it with her over something that might get said on NPR. Our conversation then shifted to a ride up to my son's house (while he's out of town), to see if I could fix the door on his Bosch dishwasher, or determine if he needed a new one. That set-up my 1st big mistake for the morning.

I suggested that just as I'm not buying any more European cars/motorcycles, my son might be better to avoid German appliances. As un-contentiously as I could, I explained the reason to avoid German products: the US needs to re-industrialize, but, as Trump found out, that is not possible given runaway regulation and un-payable debt.

And a likely reason Biden blew up NordStream? Without inexpensive Russian natural gas, European products will no longer be competitive (parts for *Miele* products are no longer available in the US). So, it's time to consider buying American and Japanese.

Obviously the subject is politically contentious, but as close to 'facts' as one can get —with even a glance toward logic. This US hegemony, of which we are members, bullied the world for the past 75 years, and in that process, gave-away our manufacturing base in trade for 'lazy luxury'. Now, needing productivity the US views friends and allies as 'ripe for the picking' to steal their manufacturing. So we blew up their gas supply?

What is the likely outcome? The US gets European manufacturing for free, and over time, 100 years of Porsche coach-craft becomes indistinguishable from a Chevy Volt?

I said what I said as un-contentiously as I could, but it was received as emblematic of me thinking I'm smarter than others and mean-spirted. But this being a friendly talk, I changed tactics. No-one within 1000 feet of my home has read even a few of my articles, so I tried explaining that in my last artifice I did a couple of paragraphs on Donald Trump as a compromised human being. I could do that because the big picture is what matters to me. I'm not a Trump fan; I don't need to be right; what I need is an overview.

Let's stay with Trump: one of my readers, responding to my critique of Trump wrote: There are really only two parameters that mean anything. Trump or no Trump. I can't disagree with that because this may be the most important election in US history. Not

that we need Trump, but because this is last chance, realpolitik, and dems have to go.

Without getting too far afield, Trump supports \$95B for wars that put humanity at risk. Trump has said that he would be doing exactly as the Israeli Defense Minister is doing. Trump will have no problem stripping Europe of its manufacturing base—consider what he did with Syria's oil and what he wanted to do with Venezuela's oil. As Obama kissed the Saudi ring, Trump, with son-in-law in tow—likely kisses Bibi's ass.

Trump says he will end the war in Ukraine (and maybe he will), but his ego is huge, and Putin will not be bending to his will. And lest we forget: Japan has the highest mRNA 'vaccination' rate in the world, and has just reported 117,000 excess deaths (purportedly caused by the 'vaccine'). And Trump, behind that ego—admits to nothing.

That said, Trump has my vote, and he ought to have the vote of any American who would rather trade a mob of evil globalists for a patriotic nationalist. With Trump we get rid of 'imminent destruction'—allowing breathing space for globalism to self-destruct.

In the midst family squabble, Mark from Grant's Pass (another blogger), called. Mark is a 'good old boy', living a rural existence smack dab in the middle of town. He keeps bees, and like sheep ranchers who are harried this time of year with lambs dropping (a few minutes earlier I'd remarked to my wife that the woman who delivers our eggs, moves quickly—no time to talk). As it turns out, she has a farm—with sheep. Anyway, Mark referenced sheep but he was talking bees and what happened to him last night.

He got a call from a neighbor—one of his swarms was up a tree in his yard. Mark went over, in shirt sleeves, cut a hole into the foliage and pushed a clump of maybe 1000 into a box. That clump likely contained the queen. Soon, the strays followed her.

I related the story to my wife as he told it. At the end he asked that I give her a hug from him. My wife, who after hearing hours of phone conversations, on speaker, with my friend Phil, regards him as a good guy—so how is it that I am mean and 'far right'?

Honestly, I don't know many less 'far right' than myself. I tried a different tack: when I am fortunate enough to have written an article that strings together good sense, I wake up to a half dozen new subscribers. Many come from being posted on Bill Holter's site. It's likely that I can thank Bill Holter and Jim Sinclair for many 100s of my subscribers.

Anyway, this morning I had a 4 or 5 new subscribers, both men and women, 2 of whom mentioned Bill Holter. I asked my wife if I could read a few words of what they had to say, maybe dispel this idea that I am a 'far right' ideologue? My offer was accepted, but just a few words, after which she agreed they seemed nice rational people.

This is a year of *infamy*, to use FDR's word. And there is a sense that this infamy is even more dangerous than his. FDR is cast as an American hero, but he was not. He was an elitist who saw the Constitution as something in his way—to trash as needed.

I sense this is the time where we are living most dangerously. That this nation could suffer the German plight of the 30's, or a Russian fate of the 40s and 50s. When I hear from a good friend that we lost the Constitution in 1913 with the installation of the Fed, I understand but hold back from agreeing. 1913 and the 1971 end of the gold standard, each dealt crippling blows to the republic—but setbacks/fears need to temper resolve.

If this nation comes back it's because this is 'do or die'. When everything is on the line, those who are willing to put themselves at risk are the 'gold standard'. And each person convinced of the facts gets us one step closer to winning. What's that line? For the want of a nail, the shoe, the horse, the rider, the battle, is lost. And the republic?

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