



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

## *Ukraine is Our Proxy War Before Our War Between the States*

"May you live in interesting times", a traditional Chinese curse, is unfolding across the open plains of Ukraine and in the straits of the South China Sea, but as Bill Greider told us back in the 80's, the real war for the soul of humanity is to be fought in the US.

It's time to let go of fear for what is coming and accept a reality that when 'great powers' reach their demise, the security we gained from being a citizen becomes an un-secure nightmare—with every aspect of our lives subject to change—for the worse.

The US is at the onset of 'unavoidability', as in 1776, against Britain, then in the late 1930's buildup to war against the AXIS. This time, Russia and China will defend themselves as nationalists in any global conflict, while Europe and the West are firmly in the totalitarian globalist camp. But it is within the US, the great 'wounded beast', at crossed-purposes with itself, where the fate of humanity will be sorted-out and decided.

For almost 250 years, much of world history has been written around the United States. I was born in Canada, my parents were from Britain. Thankfully they came to Canada and we left there for California, because being in the United States for the 2nd half of the 1950's, and for decades following was an experience—without comparison.

Granted, it's horrible here now, chock-full of fools and petty-tyrants who want to run our lives—leaving us with 'existential' questions: Can the republic be saved? Is it worth saving? If so, do I have the courage to risk everything—if that's what will be needed?

Before anything that horrific, built into the Constitution are legal means to combat fools and tyrants. Failing that, we have a 2nd Amendment to protect and enforce rights.

As a young, 'blue collar democrat', I saw the 'filibuster', 'state's rights', and the 'Electoral Collage' as impediments to a working government. But that was before I understood human nature and how purposeful the 'founders' were at hampering 'mob rule' or giving government any mechanism or ability to strip Americans of rights and liberty.

It would be an interesting poll among our Marxists to see which they hate more, the 2nd Amendment or 'state's rights'. Though they might jump-on banning guns first, upon reflection, what they hate more is constitutional limitations on centralized elite control.

Might we lose the Constitution and Bill of Rights? Yeah, that's what's at issue and we could very well lose. But win or lose, the Constitution and Bill of Rights are the supreme achievement of mankind, a legacy from a great and meaningful rebellion—which lives in the sprit of freedom-loving human beings—no matter where they abide.

When all the world wanted to be Americans, it wasn't about movies or cars. It was an envy for a spirit that came out of 1776—and a roadmap for a republic and liberty laid out in the Constitution and Bill of Rights—the things that made all the rest possible.

Because we have the Constitution, we have something to fight for. What can the Germans fight for? An EU model? Canada—fighting the WEF. New Zealanders pushing back against a despot with bent teeth. Australians—even worse. There, private guns were handed-over to the elite, showing gross ignorance of what awaits the disarmed. This comes from an Australian reader: "Don't ever make the mistakes we made—don't ever give up your guns. If you look at what is happening here, it never could have happened if we hadn't given up our guns." If they want ours, they gotta take them.

For 250 years, under our Constitution, Americans settled internal issues at the ballot box, in the streets, or in court. Now, we only hope legislators and courts will act legally.

Using 'divide and conquer', tactics, the elite, hardened by self-interest, push the idea of 'equity' onto already guilt-ridden, low self-worth masses, who are then tasked to create 'equity policy'. For example, the Minneapolis Teacher's Union has adopted a policy, that given a staff-reduction scenario, 'white teachers' will be let go first so as not to undercut an 'unconstitutional' policy intended to sustain 'educators of color protections'.

What about 'identity politics' legislation? The 14th Amendment renders legislation favoring 1 'identity group' as unconstitutional: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Constitutionally ignorant support for 'White Privilege/Black Lives Matter/ANTIFA' 'doctrines of division', whether one sees oneself as perpetrator or victim, shows a lack of understand that it is they, ultimately, who are the intended victims of an elite takeover.

This process sets up a competition (sold by elites as a fix), between successfully achieving 'equity'—at the cost of 'opportunity'. However, when 'equity' fails (as contrary to human nature), it leaves in its wake, a dumbed-down citizenry without any means to accept reality or re-invigorate itself—a populace to be easily herded into feudal slavery.

The US Constitution Article I, Section 10 states that, "No state shall pass any Law impairing the obligation of contracts". So, whether state or federal law, using 'unconstitutional' emergency declarations to control property rights of either party subject to a private contract, is in direct violation of a constitutional protection—and illegal. Also, 'emergency use' 'vaccine mandates' are unconstitutional and illegal—and they know it.

Mandates function as elite feelers—seeing how far they can go. Out West we have wildfires. Without input from forest landowners, 88K Oregonians were served a letter intending to reclassify forest properties as 'high' or 'extreme', worse yet, 'wild life interface'. An elite attempt to subject property owners to conform to updated building codes.

'Ex post facto' is Latin for 'after the fact'. Article 1, Section 9, of the US Constitution reads: 'No.....ex post facto Law shall be passed.' Which means: owners 'certificate of occupancy' met legislative standards when it was issued, restricting government from mandating a process that compels a citizen to 're-apply' to legally occupy that property.

There's more protections that I will be bringing up, but for now, be thankful to be an American. The mantle has been passed—if the republic is to be saved—that's on us.

I'm heading East from Oregon. If you want to get a coffee, or subscribe, email me: erik@neverhadaboss.com. I'm back to posting my articles at: neverhadaboss.com.