



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

*When There Is No Middle To Be Found*

Not that long ago, most of this nation was comprised of an upper, middle, and lower middle class. Now, the United States is mostly poor—controlled by a smaller elite rich. This change has come about over 3 or 4 decades, but actually got its start in 1971 with the closing of the gold window and the abandonment of sound money—gold.

Abandoning the gold standard in 1971 set the stage for 2 consequences: without gold acting to constrain credit and debt, inflation (nothing more than creating too much currency), found its way into the US economy—in a big way. Although labor unions or foreign subsidized goods get blamed for it, inflation is strictly a monetary event.

Without a gold standard, a lack of productivity becomes the lesser problem compared to inflation. Government debt as well as home prices benefit from inflation. But, with increased inflation, taxpayers pay more than the purchasing power they get back.

The cures offered for inflation are cuts in government spending—which only works if it's the same cuts across the board, and each department makes its adjustments. But real spending cuts don't make it onto the list of things contemplated by government because spending curbs translate to power loss—and less chance of being re-elected.

Legislatures are, for the most part, unconcerned. The effects of inflating a budget are not felt for months, and ultimate consequences often take years. By that time legislators have 'made their mark' and retired rich—they have rationalized that every budget gets balanced—if shortfalls have to be put on taxpayers who are required to pay for it.

Until inflation crushes an economy, it is sold to the public as something productive. Such that, when citizens say they want to stop inflation, what they actually want is for prices for things they need to go down, but for the value of things they own to go up.

Under a gold standard, government decision-making has to do with economics and politics. That may seem obvious, however, government dictates originate in 1 of 3 areas: economic, political, and ideological. Unfortunately, we now find ourselves in a time when few decisions have to do with economics and politics—almost all are ideological.

For a government mandate to be 'economic' requires that it advance an idea of economic sustainability. For a mandate to be political it has to have the good of the people 'at heart'. Without those 2 things, government decisions are, by default—ideological.

Ideological governments inevitably 'fly off the rails' while everybody equivocates. Elon Musk ('pussyfooting'), sees election fraud but not enough to steal the election.

How the hell does he know that? Is he able to count the number of Americans silenced by FBI and DOJ for their political and 'vaccine' views? Is he able to translate the impact that a 'criminally' lingering RussiaGate had on a Trump 2nd term? Does he know the election cost of US Intelligence deceit—giving Hunter's laptop 'all the earmarks of Russian disinformation'—so 'the big guy' didn't have to run as head of a 'crime' family?

Along with 'playing at god', the elite have their sights set on destruction of the Constitution. Then the FBI can drop the pretense of investigation: 'Federal Bureau'. Much closer to its actual mission as a surrogate policing agency for the federal government.

Are there constitutional provisions for either a federal law enforcement agency, or for 5500 federal criminal laws? There is neither, rendering CIA, FBI, DHS, and all 3 letter (4 letter word) agencies, unconstitutional—each subject to constitutional disbandment..

Consider the nature of 'red laws' that are used to wrest control from the Constitution and the citizens in a power grab fashioned by the elite. Since they can't get rid of the 2nd Amendment, they sponsor an unconstitutional grid across states and municipalities that makes it impossible to carry a firearm without being guilty of committing a crime.

Or, they unconstitutionally identify an ever-increasing list of those that can impugn, without 'due process', the character of an individual—so as to confiscate weapons. Done without discussion into causes of gun violence. And, it won't get mentioned that 6 of the original 13 states required American citizens, in public places, to be armed.

As an 'overstepping' federal government lays out its 'red laws' (none of which have the force of law), they hold back from referring to Supreme Court findings in the Bruen decision (reaffirming the 2nd Amendment guarantee 'to keep and *bear* arms'). There the justices used specific language to insist the right had to coincide with *historical norms*.

Governance, and the times we live in, are the most lawless in American history. The Congress has been neutered, having handed over law-making capacities to unconstitutional agencies, then allowing the executive branch to act tyrannically—with impunity.

Left-inspired protests (as in Seattle and Portland), have been orchestrated by the elite to sow dissent amongst citizens, but where are the street protests that could put an end to the creeping tyranny of a demented old man (and those behind him), having issued 100s of executive orders, many (most) of which, do not have the force of law.

The only recourse to push back against Biden's tyranny, besides the shedding of blood, is through Congress, the courts, and voting the 'left' out. The 2024 election will tell the story. If, once again, assuming massive election irregularities, the democrats win, without a viable protest, that will sound the end of hope for any peaceful change.

Meanwhile, America deals with the effects of bad governance in discussions on how to deal with increasing numbers of homeless. Is it legal for them to construct tent cities under overpasses or take over city parks, hiding needles to be retrieved where children play? And these conditions exist before economic calamity befalls us. As with the Titanic, just after a long gash was ripped along her side, she was still 'unsinkable'. The band played on, but all of that changed over 2 hours. As it changes for each one us—soon.

In my last article I wrote about 'anarchy', and some reminded me of its horrors. I don't disagree. But can any of us see a more likely outcome than tyranny or anarchy? There are other possibilities—but are there any as likely as these 2 contenders?

We've lost the middle to the extremes. No peace talks—only 1 war or 2 wars. And a Fed dancing between 2 crocodiles: something gets eaten—the system or the dollar?

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