



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

*'Opinions Are Threats'—We Are Not Allowed To Have Them*

The 1st tactic of the elite was to cancel any criticism of what they saw as their mandate. The 2nd step was to quell any meaningful discussion of that mandate. Now we see the 3rd step: personal opinion is a threat that we're not allowed to have. Contrary opinions need to be criminalized—but 1st, sharing of personal opinion needs to stop.

For this they have a plan: Their dictates are framed in terms of 'public health'. Guns need to go because they present a threat to public health. 'Climate change' must be fast-tracked' (into impossible Net Zero), because the consequences for not acting threaten public health. mRNA—not taking untested experiments puts public health at risk. Now, for the sake of public health, they need to eradicate our personal opinions.

For that they need AI 'chatbots', developed to 'neuter' online discussion. This is a 'speed of light' equivalent for what not long ago were 'fact checkers'. When someone of the 'woke' wanted to denigrate facts, they 'logged in' to a Soros type, funded cite, to get the 'progressive spin' on reality—Then, relying on authority, they shut down true facts.

But that was old school. Chat-bots are being introduced as a 'digital 2nd Amendment', a lethal online 'shooting gallery', allowing elites to 'edify and edit', 24/7, everything that passes through the online portal—restructured to fit 1 view—and 1 view only.

In this process they pledge to defend 'online space' against all misinformation, disinformations, malformation—in real time . But no worries: these new digital-age weapons will be used in support of 'public health'—defending our civic identity and our humanity.

'Woke' AI control needs implemented online at the 'speed of light', as the 'collective' fears a 2nd Trump presidency. This is the same collective attempting to fund Ukraine in perpetuity, fearing a 2024 election could bring a sane look into an insane foreign policy.

None of this BS passes constitutional muster, yet lawless 'proclamations/mandates' are the 'order of the day. Given a judicial system, already devoid of justice, it seems courts could get no worse. Instead, we are besieged with 'emergency proclamations'—intended to marginalize whatever 'justice' remains. 'Proclamations' that strip us of our rights, only returned after lengthy court battles—after the damage has been done.

This tactic, by design, is used efficiently and effectively to suspend 'guaranteed rights' until the elite can find a way to make 'temporary proclamations' permanent.

When courts do their job (within a reasonable time frame), illegal proclamations, at behest of 'evil uncaring elites', are quickly reversed. But, with courts 'politicized', justice

is a long way out. Politicized, slow-moving courts obviate a necessary function of the judiciary—the right of citizens for timely redress of grievances against the government.

In a trial, neither party can assume 'unproven facts' as a basis for argument. Facts get argued/adjudicated in court. Facts cannot be 'assumed', 'sliding by'—unchallenged. As in: is 'climate change' the emergency it is being sold as? If so, where is the proof—and what is the argument on the other side of it? 'Keep and bear arms' is already clarified SC 'fact'. And, mRNA elites don't want courts 'weighing in' on its nonexistent facts.

Does 'public health' have a factual basis in the Constitution? Public health concerns have no constitutional status. Instead, 'public officials' who knowingly attempt to subvert rights guaranteed in the Constitution/Bill of Rights are legally subject to immediate impeachment and penalties under the law. Which law is that? 'The law of the land'.

There are federal statutes to go after state officials, criminally, who block rights enumerated in the Constitution—as well as federal statutes to go after them civilly. For criminal cases (the New Mexico governor's gun ban), there is no 'qualified immunity'. If her proclamation is deemed criminal under the Constitution—she should be charged.

Charged with what? Because her crime rises to aiding and abetting enemies of the Bill of Rights and the republic—it meets the standards of impeachment as well as criminal charges. The solution for crimes such as the New Mexico 'carry ban' is harsh, swift penalties (court costs/loss of property), for any person in authority who clearly flouts Constitution and Bill of Rights guarantees. Proclamations have no constitutional basis.

John Allen, the sheriff of Bernalillo County, New Mexico, informed the New Mexico governor he would not be enforcing her 30 day, no-carry 'emergency' dictate—because it is unconstitutional. She retorted that he needs to enforce—and not be '*squeamish*'. For any not recalling the definition of 'squeamish', it's that sick, disgusted feeling one has in the presence of something unpleasant. What might be making Allen squeamish?

How about as sheriff he knows gun violence is not caused by 'concealed carriers'? That permit holders are armed for self-defense—often willing to come to the aid of citizens/police under attack. Concealed carriers do not take phone-videos of beatings.

The sheriff knows that like the governor, he took an oath to support the Constitution, and he doesn't want to be on the wrong end of a civil-rights lawsuit he knows is wrong, and he doesn't want civil war to begin in his county over a loss of the 2nd Amendment.

If the sheriff is 'squeamish', he is disgusted that the governor of his state doesn't understand basic tenets of the Bill of Rights. To support his oath to the Constitution, he is required to go against his boss. If he were to enforce—what then? If she gets away with this ploy, she cancels the 1st Amendment to quell criticism of her ban on the 2nd?

She's his boss, but only to a point. He is duty-bound to not enforce unlawful orders, including any order, issued by anyone, curtailing enumerated rights of citizens. He also knows that not that long ago New Mexico was a 'red state', 'out to the badlands' Marty Robbins sang about. A western state of gun-toters'—many of whom are still out there.

The 3 steps to silence/criminalize patriots I address here are more accurate than not. We look to Canada, Britain, and EU to see what elites have in store for us. Our protection is the Constitution/Bill of Rights, and 100s of millions of arms guaranteed by the 2nd Amendment. Along with 'liberty' to position outside of a coming economic tyranny.

The labor cost of production is in the price of gold/silver, so neither owes anything to anybody. In a world cusping along the edge of chaos, silver coins may 'save our souls'.

Contrarians can get my articles by email, with a request: erik@neverhadaboss.com.