



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

Blessed Are The Peacemakers

Makers of war are a dime a dozen—peacemakers are as rare as gold. Europe, for the last century has been the bloodiest continent, and is fast on its way back to warfare. Is there a chance for peace? There is, but hope is slim and the peacemakers a but a few.

Idiot Macron wants to put an army of the willing into Ukraine, and allow nations in the EU to share in his nuclear weapons. What could go wrong with that? Putin, who invaded UKR over security concerns for the safety of Russia, would he be okay with that?

Even worse is Starmer, newly arrived Brit PM, seemingly insane, advocating for free speech while arresting/charging citizens for expressing anything he doesn't agree with.

Meanwhile, the US is in turmoil as the US/AID, shreds evidence of its past activities.

Hopelessness becomes hopelessly exacerbated by elites demanding more power to deal with problems they are responsible for. As in, a previously unforeseen level of nuclear danger with Russia? Begin with paragons of virtue W. Bush/Cheney, who in their ultimate wisdom got rid of the ABM treaty in 2002. Then Trump, who is now calling for nuclear treaties with Russia, after being the one to rid us of INF/Open Skies—1st term.

Now there's a proposed cease-fire in Ukraine. Russia is routing UKR, while Trump/Rubio call it a stalemated conflict. After faithless Minsk Accords, why would Russia give UKR 30 days to rearm? Hopefully Trump is talking trash just to open negotiations. Hopefully Trump sees the folly of his proposals and he is working from a greater vision.

Then there's his team. Rubio and Waltz are neocons, with global ulterior motives, and not to be trusted. How can peace be achieved when appointed diplomats/negotiators have unquestioned beliefs about nations they see only as threats and enemies?

Is the new Secretary of Defense, Pete Hegseth, a man in the spirit of Eisenhower, who, having lived through war horror, knew the value of peace? Hegseth is not such a man. Miley/Austin were evil nitwits, but Hegseth, like R. Cheney, is a dangerous man.

How he was appointed/confirmed speaks badly of our President/Senate. What does Hegseth allegedly ascribe to? The US is in a 'holy war' with the left, China, and Islam—none of which can be negotiated with. Trump needs to bomb Iranian cultural sites. Hegseth calls for regime change for China. He calls for another Crusade—his huge tattoos 'God Wills It'/Crusader Cross, date back to the Crusades. The US is a Christian nation whose laws should be based on the Bible. He is totally opposed to secularism.

From my view, men such as Hegseth, Macron, Zelensky, are clinically insane—en-

tirely divorced from understanding human potential. I have some hope for Trump, but he needs to be critiqued at each step. When he speaks of his vision for Gaza, I see insanity. When he points to Netanyahu, sitting next to him on the stage as a man of peace, I see insanity. Cheerleading Trump is no different than not questioning Obama.

In the same way America deals with its problems, we choose leaders by rhetoric that best persuades Americans—who are possibly the dumbest body politic in civilization.

Always the same, even in a democracy, one person, one vote, translates to the lowest common denominator. Trump hasn't read *War and Peace*. He doesn't know Russia.

The EU, a CIA plot, was put together to make Europe more manageable as a vassal state for the US. But everything put together sooner or later, falls apart. Now the EU falls apart, because, without NATO/cheap Russian energy, Europe has and is nothing.

What about the relationship between Europe and Russia? There have been horrific wars, but the direction came from Europe to Russia. And here we are again with the war in Ukraine, where only the brain-dead have not listened to Victoria Nuland admitting US responsibility that forced Russia, eight years later, to intercede/invoke Ukraine.

Why is the world in its most dangerous condition—ever? It's complicated, but not difficult to understand. From the end of WW1, the world operated on Keynesian economics. The Keynes idea was the world did better when government stepped in to provide funding in bad times, and payback the debt in good times. But, as human nature insists, additional funding occurred, but not part two—pay debt down in good times.

Neoliberalism replaced Keynesianism in the 1970s—with its two great proponents, Thatcher and Reagan. With accumulated debt from decades of bastardized Keynes, neoliberals took the stage, directing government spending (often by coercion), into high-yield profit. Neoliberals, from the US right, lectured the entire world about cutting deficits, with a result of redirecting wealth from population assistance to profit-making.

As a result, neo-libs increased US debt more than did Keynesians. Reagan's was the biggest budget deficit as percentage of GDP, providing a basis for the hypocrisy of the US rules-based order. Under neoliberalism, global growth slipped from 4% to 2%.

Government provided currency creation, for the most part, results in a wealth transfer from the middle class to the rich—those closest to the money spigot. Add to that, Thatcher's dictum: there is no such thing as society—only individuals, taken together. As a result government owes nothing to the needy. The needy are left to themselves.

Fine, but with wealth transferred to elites and an economy based on profit (became greed), and neoliberalism tending towards finance rather than manufacturing, there are less domestically-produced products to purchase—even if citizens could afford to buy.

Neoliberalism was codified as the Washington Consensus, the basis for US corporations to offshore jobs to China, to break labor unions, as wages/benefits had reached all-time highs. China wasn't looking for jobs—they had a plan to industrialize, so they required US corporations to partner with Chinese business and share technology. That provided the basis for the Chinese economic miracle—the US now views as the threat.

There's more to say about this, especially around Russia/China being threats. Both are economic/military threats, and each is making it clear they have had enough and willing to face off with the US, economically/militarily, as a counterpunch to our threats.

If we don't live to see 2030, it will be because the Macrons, Starmers, and Hegseths remain antithetical to global realities—incapable of contemplating a world at peace.

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