

The “Good Shepard” – the All-time Charlatan

Description

[Kratoklastes](#) says:

Are they better shepherds?

I do wish people would stop using “shepherd” as a metaphor for good stewardship or custodianship; the aim of the shepherd is to keep the flock intact **until it is time to shear or butcher its constituents**.

Protecting the flock from external predators is not the primary motivation: it is an operational consideration that enables the primary aim – the exploitation of the flock through shearing or slaughter (or both).

Shepherds[1] do not ‘tend’ their flocks because of an inherent good nature, or sentimentality, or altruism.

The actual metaphor is extremely apt: it describes very nicely what the political class is all about – keeping us in line so that we can be shorn or slaughtered as it suits a tiny parasitic class made up almost exclusively of degenerate sociopathic megalomaniacs.

In the same way: when law enforcement and military halfwits self-refer as ‘sheepdogs’ – I always make a point to concur, and to point out that the sheepdog is a tool to further the interest of the herder, not the flock. The sheepdog helps control the flock until it’s time to shear or slaughter: it aims to please its master, not the sheep, and does so in expectation of reward.

So in answer to the question: Are [the current elite] better shepherds? **Absolutely!**

The fleece is abundant, and the periodic slaughter is achieved without significant rebellion among the livestock.

The elite share of output is larger than at any time since the Gilded Age of the late 1920s.

Now that’s some good shepherding.

[1] This is true of all shepherds, including the mythical ‘good shepherd’ – a charlatan whose entire life (and that of his entourage) was funded by grifting off the downtrodden and the gullible: promising everyone a set of lies, in order to get fed and housed. Just another [] politician, in other words.