**The Patriot Dilemma**

“There is nothing which I dread so much,” said America’s second president, John Adams, “as a division of the republic into two great parties.”

Adams’ worst fear came true, of course, and Americans have duly spent much of their history fretting about the political stranglehold of the two-party system. From time to time, third parties have threatened to challenge the dominance of the Republicans or the Democrats – the Populist Party in the 19th century, say, or the Reform Party in the 1990s – but the structure of American democracy has always meant that new movements, whether they be on the left or right, end up absorbed into the coalition bellies of the two big beasts.

**TRUMPISTS' ANGER IS DIRECTED NOT TOWARDS THE DEMOCRATS, BUT AT FOX NEWS, SINCE THEY FEEL AMERICA’S BIGGEST RIGHT-WING NEWS NETWORK HAS SOLD THEM OUT, AND ALSO AT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, WHICH THEY FEEL HAS BETRAYED THEM**

Trumpism, however, is something completely different. It is an increasingly radical and, yes, popular phenomenon that wants to destroy the existing political order. Donald Trump’s “America First” movement believed that the American people had spoken in 2016 when Trump came to power. Now, they believe that the people have been robbed. The 2020 election, they feel, was the greatest fraud in democratic history and anyone who disagrees with them is a traitor. But their anger is directed not towards the Democrats and their new president, Joe Biden. It is aimed at Fox News, since they feel America’s biggest right-wing news network has sold them out, and also at the Republican Party, which they feel has betrayed them. Many of them will now stop at nothing to destroy it.

There are growing calls for a new Patriot Party to “take our country back”. At the “Million Maga March” in December, Nicholas J Fuentes, a radical, nationalist podcaster who has been banned from YouTube, shouted into his megaphone, “We’re done making promises. It has to happen now. We’re going to destroy the GOP!” The crowd cheered and chanted back, “Destroy the GOP! Destroy the GOP!” – the new mantra of the emergent American right.

Even seemingly normal Trump voters have become ever more militant and radicalised by the culture wars. Social media makes them so. It’s not just that “deep state” conspiracy theorists drive them crazy in online echo chambers, it’s that big tech companies’ attempts to control the content on their platforms makes conservatives feel ever more angry. More than 74 million people voted for Trump in 2020 and surveys suggest half of them think the election was “rigged”, while 74 per cent don’t think the result was “legitimate or accurate”. You don’t placate these people by censoring their social media ramblings.

**A PATRIOT PARTY WON’T BE A ‘THIRD PARTY’ IN ANY NORMAL SENSE, SINCE MANY OF ITS FOLLOWERS WILL NOW NEVER ACCEPT ELECTIONS THEY DON’T WIN. THEY DISTRUST INSTITUTIONS SO MUCH THAT THEY THINK DEMOCRACY ITSELF IS A FIX**

A Patriot Party won’t be a “third party” in any normal sense, since many of its followers will now never accept elections they don’t win. They distrust institutions so much that they think democracy itself is a fix. So it could go two ways. The Patriot Party may end up in the political wilderness as a quasi-revolutionary movement, with Trump as their mad king in Mar-a-Lago, Florida, texting out commandments to his ever crazier followers on the diminishing number of internet platforms that will let him speak. After the storming of the Capitol by Maga-heads in January, Democratic talking heads have been quick to label Trumpism as a “domestic terrorist” force. That’s not fair. But as Trump fans feel more and more marginalised and subjugated, they will become more seditious. America Firsters could end up morphing into the fascistic thugs that the media has always made them out to be. The mask becomes the men.
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Alternatively, the Patriot Party might actually end up disrupting the two-party system. The Patriots probably could not win any substantial elections by themselves, at least not any time soon, but they could end up eviscerating the hitherto durable Republican coalition. This would give their Democratic opponents the opportunity to win every major election for a generation.

The relationship between Republicanism and Trumpism has always been strained. In 2016, Trump won by orchestrating a working-class revolt against his party. He opposed globalisation, foreign wars, immigration – all of which the free-trade-obsessed Republicans had spent the previous decades supporting. From 2017 to 2019, Trump and the Grand Old Party had full control of the executive and legislative branches. Yet the only significant reform they achieved together was a tax cut.

**THE OLD REPUBLICAN PARTY WAS NEVER ABLE TO CHANNEL TRUMP'S MADLY EFFECTIVE POPULIST JUJU. TODAY, ANY ‘TRUMP REPUBLICAN’ CANDIDATE WHO ISN’T DESPISED BY HIS PARTY’S ESTABLISHMENT WILL BE LOATHED BY TRUMP’S VOTERS**

For all his flaws as a man and a politician in office, Trump was a brilliant campaigner. In 2020, he showed how the American right can win in the future by appealing not just to the working-class, but also to socially conservative, or anti-woke, Hispanics and African-Americans. They filled stadiums and arenas my the millions, and the crowds continue to grow to this very day. But the old Republican Party was never able to channel his madly effective populist juju. Today, any “Trump Republican” candidate who isn’t despised by his party’s establishment will be loathed by Trump’s voters.

A more skilled politician than Trump might have taken over the GOP more thoroughly and remade it in his own image, kicking out the old guard at every level and installing his own people and institutions. But Trump was far too interested in the people for that kind of revolution, so he settled for the union with the existing party system instead.

**The Real Invasion**

Illegal aliens, tourists, and foreign visa workers delivered nearly 400,000 children in the United States over the last 12 months, prior analysis concludes, securing birthright American citizenship.

The analysis, [published in 2018](https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2018/10/31/study-300k-anchor-babies-born-every-year-exceeding-u-s-births-in-48-states/) by the Center for Immigration Studies, states that close to 400,000 “anchor babies,” the term used to describe the U.S.-born children of illegal aliens, are delivered across all 50 states each year.

Anchor babies are rewarded with birthright American citizenship despite their parents having no legitimate ties to the U.S., many having only recently arrived. Years later, when the child is considered an adult, they can sponsor their parents and foreign relatives for green cards — anchoring their family in the U.S. for generations.

Specifically, about 300,000 anchor babies are delivered to illegal alien parents every year. In addition, about 72,000 anchor babies are delivered to foreign tourists, foreign visa workers, and foreign students annually.

That total, at about 372,000 anchor babies born each year, outpaces the total number of births in 49 states, [according](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/vsrr/vsrr012-508.pdf) to the latest Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) statistics.

Only the state of California, with nearly 420,000 births in 2020, exceeds the number of anchor babies born each year. The number of births in Texas, at about 366,000 in 2020, is now less than the annual number of anchor babies born in the U.S.

To date, the U.S. Supreme Court has never explicitly [ruled](https://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/08/25/history-and-law-agree-no-birthright-citizenship/) that the U.S.-born children of illegal aliens must be granted automatic American citizenship, and a number of legal scholars [dispute](https://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2017/03/28/never-trump-yale-law-prof-surprised-trump-hasnt-moved-on-birthright-citizenship/) the idea.

Many leading conservative scholars [argue](https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2015/08/18/constitution-doesnt-mandate-birthright-citizenship/) the Citizenship Clause of the 14th Amendment does not provide mandatory birthright citizenship to the U.S.-born children of illegal aliens or noncitizens, because these children are not subject to U.S. jurisdiction as that language was understood when the 14th Amendment was ratified.

Today, there are at least 4.5 million anchor babies in the U.S. under 18-years-old, [exceeding](https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2017/12/26/cbo-at-least-4-5m-anchor-babies-in-u-s/) the annual roughly four million American babies [born](https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2017/12/28/anchor-baby-population-in-u-s-exceeds-one-year-of-american-births/) every year and costing American taxpayers about $2.4 billion every year to [subsidize](https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2018/10/10/illegal-alien-births-of-anchor-babies-cost-u-s-taxpayers-2-4b-every-year/) hospital costs.

New York state’s Department of Health (DOH) announced recently that non-white people should be prioritized over white people for anti-viral pills in short supply.

The DOH [announcement](http://www.mssnyenews.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/122821_Notification_107774.pdf), dated December 27, said limited supply of oral antivirals will “require providers to prioritize treatment for patients at highest risk for severe COVID-19 until more product becomes available.”

Under a list of eligibility requirements for oral antiviral treatment, it said one requirement should be “have a medical condition or other factors that increase their risk for severe illness” and that one risk factor is being a “non-white race or Hispanic/Latino ethnicity should be considered a risk factor, as longstanding systemic health and social inequities have contributed to an increased risk of severe illness and death from COVID-19.”

The announcement also linked to a separate [undated DOH document](https://coronavirus.health.ny.gov/system/files/documents/2021/12/prioritization_of_mabs_during_resource_shortages_20211223_1000_0.pdf) on prioritization that contained the same guidance.

Columnist Karol Markowicz drew attention to the guidelines in a tweet, where she said, “NY State Department of Health warns they don’t have enough Paxlovid or Monoclonal Antibody Treatment and white people need not apply.”

Journalist and author Abigail Shrier called for a constitutional challenge to the guidance. “If the state can discriminate racially for medical treatment, then the 14th Amendment truly has no meaning. There needs to be a constitutional challenge to this IMMEDIATELY,” she tweeted.

Former Trump administration adviser Stephen Miller placed blame on the signal sent by the Biden Administration. He tweeted:

Political commentator Dave Rubin tweeted: “Systemic racism, brought to you by progressive Democrats…”

**The New America Civil War**

As you know, Earth explorers, this is where the past meets the future. Because 52% of Americans polled believe we are on the brink of a new civil war, or at least on the edge of secession, I thought I would talk about theconditions that caused the first one. There may be some similarities.

“I am the last president of the United States,” said James Buchanan on December 20, 1860.

South Carolina had just seceded from the Union.  Ten more states would follow, and then 2 after that, making a total of 13. There were only 20 States in the Union at the time.
Had Buchanan remained in office, there is no question he would have let the South go. The United States would have ceased to exist 160 years ago.

So what? I mean Buchanan was right. There was nothing sacred about the Union. If states want to secede, they should be allowed to go. Right? A recent poll by the University of Virginia Center for Politics claims that 41 percent of Biden supporters and 52 percent of Trump supporters now supposedly favor secession.

While these numbers might be exaggerated, the statistics cannot be denied.
As tensions rise between blue metropolitan areas and red states, many Americans have come to believe that coexisting with our quarrelsome countrymen is no longer worth the trouble. Many hope that peaceful national divorce might allow Americans to part ways amicably, without bloodshed.

Of course, we don’t know who would get the gold. Or who would get the U.S. military or spacecraft, or highway systems, or power grids, or river systems or money valuation controls. We don’t know who would set national policy, or be able to protect against Chinese trade wars. We don’t know any of that.

History tells us that a civil war is not local at all. It is designed, funded, and fortified by foreign powers that want to take over the land, resources, and enslave the people.

**Forgotten History**

In 1861, secession did not bring peace.  It led directly to civil war. War came for the same reason it always does, because financial powers wanted it, and stood to gain by it.
An old saying holds that, when two dogs fight, a third dog gets the bone.

In 1861, the third dog was Great Britain. Today, that dog is the Global Syndicate standing on the bow of Chinese ships. I think even the most casual observer will see the similarities as I proceed. Britain had a strong interest in breaking up the Union, which she saw as a competitor for global dominance. Britain’s plan was to carve up the United States into colonial spheres of influence, to be distributed among the great powers of Europe.

Had the British succeeded, North and South alike would have been defeated and lost their independence. This fact—once widely known to Americans—has been wiped from our history books. Before we start Civil War 2.0, it might be wise to relearn the forgotten story of Lincoln’s struggle against foreign intervention. Grabbing hold of civil war will be a little like catching a groundhog before it gets into its hole. You will need help letting it go.

**Seward’s Call for War**

On April 1, 1861, the Civil War had not yet begun. That day, Secretary of State William Seward drafted a memorandum to Lincoln seeking action against “European intervention.”

“I would at once demand explanations from France and Spain categorically,” Seward wrote. “I would demand explanations from Great Britain and Russia… And if satisfactory explanations are not received from Spain and France, *I would convene Congress and declare war against them*.”

Seward’s concerns were legitimate.

Sensing America’s weakness, foreign powers had begun challenging the Monroe Doctrine, which forbade European intervention in the Americas.

Spain had begun saber-rattling over its lost colony of Santo Domingo, pointedly increasing its Cuban garrison to 25,000 men. France was applying similar pressure over Haiti.

Meanwhile, British diplomats were working hard to bring Spain, France, and Russia into a coalition strong enough to force Lincoln into recognizing the Confederacy.

All of these actions violated the Monroe Doctrine, but no one cared what America thought anymore. The U.S. was falling apart.

“Our domestic dissensions are producing their natural fruit,” wrote *The New York Times* on March 30, 1861. “The terror of the American name is gone, and the Powers of the Old World are flocking to the feast from which the scream of our eagle had hitherto scared them. We are just beginning to suffer the penalties of being a weak and despised Power.”

Does this sound like the Biden Administration? Yes it does. No one cares about what he says. They know he is corrupt and spends Chinese money like his own, after it’s laundered through Ukrainian shell corporations and bureaucrats. Everyone in the world knows he is a Chinese puppet, and that the husband of Heels Up Harris has opened offices for the CCP inside our own West Wing.

When Seward wrote his memo to Lincoln, the attack on Fort Sumter was still eleven days away.  It was the only property in the South occupied by the North. Ever. Not one single soldier was injured by the Confederacy during the expulsion of Union troops from that fort. That ceremonial peaceful first shot of our Civil War had not yet been fired. Fort Sumpter was impervious to shelling, and everyone knew it.

Yet, the mightiest powers in Europe were already spoiling for a fight.

**Britain was the Ringleader**

Great Britain was the driving force behind these plots.  The British had been planning America’s downfall for years. England made no secret of her ambitions in North America.
On January 3, 1860, the London *Morning Post* bluntly called for the restoration of British rule in America. The *Post* was known as a mouthpiece for Lord Palmerston, Britain’s Prime Minister.  Indeed, Palmerston himself was rumored to write unsigned editorials for the paper, now and then. The Global Media Empire does precisely the same thing every single day in America for the Syndicate’s think tanks.

Britain wanted the land back. The CCP wants Americans to just die, so they don’t have to fight our planes or our seals or the hundreds of millions of armed Americans. They just want us to die, so they can take over our houses, factories, and military bases. The question then is the same question now.

“Why leave such a vital asset in American hands?”

“On military, as well as commercial grounds, it is obviously necessary,” argued the *Morning Post*, “that British North America should possess on the Atlantic a port open at all times of year…”

The newspaper recommended that the state of Maine should join the British Empire voluntarily, once the Union collapsed. “[T]he people of that State, with an eye to commercial profit, should offer to annex themselves to Canada,” it suggested.
Canada’s growing power in a post-U.S. world would soon lead to further annexations, the *Post* predicted, culminating in what the paper called “the restoration of that influence which more than eighty years ago England was supposed to have lost.”
With these words, the *Morning Post* made clear that it favored a return to British rule in America, of exactly the sort England had enjoyed “more than eighty years ago” (prior to 1780, that is).

I find it ironic that Western Canada wants to secede now from Canada and be annexed to America. After all, what sane person would reelect Trudeau to office? Nuff said there.

**Britain’s Plan for Proxy War**

England planned to use the Confederacy to fight a proxy war against the United States.
When America’s strength was spent, Britain and her European allies then intended to demand international mediation to end the war. The Global Syndicate has divided up America every way it can, not the least of which is skin color. They have been training tomorrow’s soldiers in our schools with Critical Racist Theory as we speak. Do you think they will ever stop? Hell now, they won’t stop. It is part of their battle plan. They wanted a proxy war led by billion-dollar ground forces like Black Lives Matter and ANTIFA, only worse. They would have much heavier weapons, supplied by the CCP. You have heard them say this on national news just a few months ago.

If Lincoln refused to allow this war, the British Navy would assist the Confederacy in breaking the Union blockade and relieve the South, thus forcing Lincoln to the bargaining table, whether he liked it or not. The arbitrators would partition the United States into two separate countries, North and South. Later, they planned to break up the U.S. even further, into four or more mini-states, too weak to resist re-colonization.

Sounds just like the North American Trade Union displayed by Hillary Clinton while she was campaigning for president. Governors would be nothing more than puppet managers for the White House. Oh, there is much more to this as well, but let me proceed.

**British Military Support of the Confederacy**

Exactly like the Chinese support of the blue-coup that took the form of the *Secretary of State Program, Common Cause,* and *Cheat by Mail.* The first step in Britain’s plan was to exhaust America’s strength through civil war. To accomplish this, Britain became the chief supplier of arms and supplies for the Southern rebels. The Global Syndicate formed hundreds of non-profits, imported more than 100 thousand trained Chinese military troops to infiltrate universities, corporations, and even government agencies on State and federal levels. They poured billions into these efforts to carve up America so they could not move for the bleeding.

On May 13, 1861, Queen Victoria issued a proclamation granting belligerent status to the Confederacy.  This meant rebel warships could now operate legally from British ports.
British shipbuilders provided the Confederates with a modern navy.  Many of the finest rebel warships were assembled in British shipyards, financed by British bondholders, and, in some cases, manned by British crews.

Confederate raiders paralyzed Union shipping, sinking almost a thousand ships. One raider, the British-built *CSS Alabama*, destroyed 65 Union merchantmen and warships in a two-year rampage, until she was finally sunk in June, 1864. The *Alabama*’s crew was mostly British. The tech giants who are torpedoing American small businesses are filled with Chinese tech soldiers. They have destroyed hundreds of thousands of American entrepreneurs who trusted them for platforms, banking, and marketing. These small companies were robbed, cheated, and smashed into oblivion by companies like Google, PayPal, and Amazon, which is the owner of Shopify. If you vote wrong, your money is seized and your site is closed forever.

The British also provided technical support vital in building a gunpowder mill in Augusta, Georgia in 1861. It was the only such facility in the entire South.  Without it, the Confederates would have had no powder. Amazon, Google, Microsoft, and Facebook control nearly the entire information and sales infrastructure in America. If they don’t control the software itself, they control the platforms, servers, and the cables that distribute it. Only Starlink shows any promise of independence, as long as Elon Musk is alive.

**Troop Deployments in Canada**

England provided more than just logistical support to the South.  She also menaced the North with troop deployments and threats of war. The CCP is doling exactly the same thing as we speak.

For instance, in December 1861, Britain deployed 11,000 troops in Canada, called out the Canadian militia, and made plans for a naval blockade of the northeastern United States, as described in Dean B. Mahin’s *One War at a Time: The International Dimensions of the American Civil War* (1999).

The official reason for these preparations was purportedly to retaliate for the so-called Trent Affair, an incident in which a U.S. Navy vessel had boarded a British mail packet in the Caribbean, arresting two Confederate envoys.

Like the Biden Administration’s use of the Chinese bioweapon as an excuse to shut down American commerce and social structures, The Trent affair was an excuse to roll out British plans to invade America again. British strategists in December 1861 recommended seizing Portland, Maine, to prevent Union forces from cutting off British access to the port.

You might recall that Obama decommissioned the 2nd Fleet, that was tasked with defending the Northern Atlantic coastal areas of America. With that fleet out of the water, missile subs could approach our shores as close as 12 miles and lie in wait to destroy the entire Eastern seaboard. One of the first things President Trump did was to reactivate and modernize the 2nd Fleet. Seizing Portland was an existing British war goal.

**Troop Deployments in Mexico**

While Britain was busy building forces Canada—the same as China is doing right now—she also joined France and Spain in a joint invasion of Mexico. The CCP has troops in Venezuela, Mexico, and Cuba. By the way, during the Civial War, all three countries landed troops in Veracruz on December 8, 1861, igniting a Mexican civil war that raged until 1866.

The pretext for the invasion was to force payment of Mexico’s national debt. Its true purpose, however, was to secure Mexico as a staging area for intervention in America’s Civil War, a fact which soon became obvious. Mexico is heavily in debt to CCP banks, as are many other countries in South America, under the dept trap known as the Belt and Road Initiative. Who do you think will force them to pay? You guessed it. CCP troops.

The French emperor Louis Napoleon Bonaparte III was Britain’s closest ally, beholden to England for his throne. A nephew of Napoleon I, Louis Napoleon seized power in a coup of December 2, 1851, overthrowing France’s Second Republic, with the endorsement of Lord Palmerston. Napoleon III then joined his British patrons on a series of military adventures, including the Crimean War (1853-1856) and the 1861 invasion of Mexico.

**“One War at a Time”**

The enormity of French and British provocations clearly justified a military response from the North. Yet Lincoln’s steady hand on the tiller prevented the Civil War from becoming a global conflagration. Like President Trump, Lincoln played a deliberate game of good-cop, bad-cop, allowing his hot-headed Secretary of State William Seward to make reckless threats against encroaching foreign powers, while Lincoln provided the soothing voice of reason.

On April 4, 1861, for instance, Seward told the *The Times* of London that he was “ready, if need be, to threaten Great Britain with war” should she dare to recognize the rebel government. Possibly in response to Seward’s threat, the Queen’s Proclamation of May 13 stopped short of granting diplomatic recognition to the South. Nonetheless, Queen Victoria did grant belligerent rights to Confederate warships, which enraged Seward.
He promptly drew up instructions for Charles Francis Adams Sr., US ambassador to London, ordering him to warn Great Britain that recognizing the Confederacy would be an act of war. President Trump stopped just short of declaring war against China for the bioweapon attack of 2019.

“One war at a time,” Lincoln famously counseled Seward, after reviewing a draft of his letter on May 21, 1861. Lincoln edited the document with his own hand to soften the tone.

Throughout the war, these sorts of private interactions between Lincoln and Seward had a tendency to leak out. Does that sound familiar? To some extent, it seems likely the two men were play-acting, putting on a show for foreign diplomats and newspaper reporters. If Lincoln’s good-cop, bad-cop routine was indeed a deliberate strategy, then it was successful. It kept the British nervous, off-balance, and indecisive through the first three years of war.

Devolution, as we speak, is keeping our enemies from attempting the fatal blow against America. They know that our military is poised to step in to ensure continuity of government is unassailable. Their strategists know that such an attack would immediately replace our pig slop Congress and Senate with trained military personnel to keep the country united. And a united America is absolutely the most powerful force for good the world has ever known.

**Motivating the Confederates**

Knowing this, what do you think the British plan was? Seward’s constant threats intimidated the British, making them fearful of direct action. But they never hesitated to spend Confederate blood in their proxy war against the North. To motivate their Southern clients, the British made shrewd use of carrots and sticks.
They continually offered the carrot of British recognition.

The Global Syndicate is doing precisely the same thing in America right now. They are training and empowering black Americans to rise up and seize shite America for their own.

The Confederates knew that, once Britain recognized the Confederacy, other European powers would follow. Lincoln would find himself isolated in the Western world. He would be forced to the bargaining table. Every corrupt force in America, including the corrupt Democrat Congress attempted to isolate President Donald Trump. Even today, he is the President in exile, working tirelessly to save America from the laws of Communism.

Ah, but there was also the stick. The British made clear that they would not risk war with the Union until the Confederacy had proved she could carry her weight on the battlefield. They wanted American blood spilled to fight Americans, not British. The CCP knows they cannot defeat our jets, or our ships, or our patriots street by street. So, it is placing the carrot of wealth and power for Virtual Joe and his gang of criminals, and the stick is them proving they can shoot the bioweapon into every arm down to the last child.

On August 14, 1861, British foreign secretary John Russell met with three Confederate envoys in London, advising them that England would consider recognizing their government only when, “*the fortune of arms*… *shall have more clearly determined the respective position of the two belligerents*.”

Lord Palmerston sympathized with Southern independence, but cautioned that, “*the operations of the war have as yet been too indecisive* to warrant an acknowledgment of the southern Union.”

In other words, “Let’s see if they will actually kill their cousins in the North before we grant them recognition.”

Have you seen the rage yet? Have you seen the insanity and the mass psychosis of the Left yet? The bulging of the eyes, and straining scream from behind the mask? They are ready for death; yours or theirs.

**The Engine of War**

The promise of British intervention, made privately and repeatedly to Confederate leaders, was the driving engine of the rebellion. Without these promises, there is some doubt as to whether Confederate leaders would have dared go to war in the first place.

You know what it is today, right? The promise of all your debts forgiven, a free basic living wage, a warm dry placed to sleep and three good meals a day. How insane is this? The Great Reset is the promise the zombies are getting 24 hours a day from the Syndicate marketing team. Movies, songs, books, videos, and printed products—if there are even such things anymore—are all a designed psychotic plan to fill the gutters with blood, while they sit back and watch.

As early as the spring of 1860, when Lincoln was still campaigning for president, British consuls in the southern states notified London that secession plans were underway and the rebels were counting on British support.

After a year of fighting, then-Secretary of State for the Confederacy Judah Benjamin still hoped that British recognition might succeed where the Confederate Army had so far failed. The South had not lost a single battle at that time. Not one. In fact, it wasn’t until July 3rd, 1863 that the Union won a battle. Lincoln seized the opportunity and used the massive graveyard that was built at the enormous cost of $100,000 dollars for one purpose. That purpose was a backdrop for his famous 84-word speech known as the Gettysburg Address. He won the investment he needed to prosecute the war and beat the British one more time.

In a letter of April 12, 1862, Benjamin wrote, “A few words emanating from Her Britannic Majesty would in effect put an end to a struggle which so desolates our country.”

But the British were unmoved by Confederate whining. Only bloody action on the battlefield would satisfy them. And so the Confederates fought on, ever hopeful that their next victory might be the one that would convince their British patrons to act.

**England’s Attempt to Force Mediation**

The Second Battle of Manassas proved a turning point.  Following the Confederate victory of August 30, 1862, British leaders decided the time was ripe.
Russell wrote Lord Palmerston on September 14, 1862, noting that Union forces had “got a very complete smashing” at Manassas.

“[W]ould it not be time for us to consider whether in such a state of things England and France might not address the contending parties and recommend an arrangement upon the basis of separation?” Russell suggested.

“Separation” had already been settled upon as the only acceptable outcome.

Lord Palmerston replied on September 17, “I agree with you that the time is come for offering mediation to the United States Government, with a view to the recognition of the independence of the Confederates. I agree further, that, in case of failure, *we ought ourselves to recognize the Southern States as an independent State*. … We ought, then, if we agree on such a step, to propose it first to France, and then, on the part of England and France, to Russia and other powers, as a measure decided upon by us.”

How happy are the metropolitan mayors when Chinese money comes flowing into their real estate markets and banks? Look at San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, Vancouver, and Los Angeles. Look at Charlotte, Boston, and New York. They are bulging with Chinese money. They are covered in empty factories and bloated banks who refuse to meet the credit needs of their communities, starving out thousands of small businesses and denying startups a dime to open their doors to meet demand.

**England’s Hidden Goal**

If Britain’s goal in our Civil War had merely been to seek a peaceful separation of North and South, her actions might be excused as naïve but well-intentioned.
However, Britain’s hidden goals diverged sharply from her official ones.

The diplomatic correspondence published in Britain’s annual Parliamentary Blue Book tends to give a whitewashed version of British intentions, inasmuch as those dispatches were written with the full knowledge they would be published.

A less sanitized version of British intentions can sometimes be gleaned from non-official sources, such as newspaper reports, observations from foreign diplomats, and from the actions of the British government itself.

Careful study reveals that Britain aimed not so much at a peaceful separation of North and South as at the complete destruction of the United States, which she hoped to accomplish by splintering the country into many pieces. That is precisely what the Global Syndicate is doing at this very moment.

And I must tell you that I believe that 2022 is the year of no return for the Global Syndicate. They know that if this year’s election is allowed to occur without Cheat-by-Mail, that they will lose this country for a generation. They know that if a civil war capable of shattering America and killing millions does not happen this year, it may never happen. People are waking up. President Trump, although serving in exile, has succeeded in exposing the Syndicate’s corrupt plan and their cohorts and agents in our country. We see they for who they really are, and the vast majority of Americans don’t like it.

We need to refrain from violence, but we damn well better deliver justice before it is too late. These people need to go to jail.

**Divide and Rule**

Back to the type and a shadow of the 19th century civil war; Napoleon III harbored a “Grand Design” for breaking up the United States, which would leave Texas, Louisiana, Florida and other U.S. territories under French control.

Just so you can put things into perspective, in the last year, 345 thousand illegals invaded California. There were 1.5 million that invaded Texas, Arizona, and Nevada. Those people all work for cash and drain the resources of those States. BTW, Texas now funds the construction of the border wall, and it is mostly Hispanic land owners donating their land to get it done.

The British had similar plans, which they no doubt coordinated with their French allies.
On September 25, 1861, following a long string of Union defeats, Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton, a leading British statesman and member of Parliament, gleefully predicted America’s break-up into four or more pieces, “with happy results for the safety of Europe.”

“That separation between North and South America which is now being brought about by civil war I have long foreseen and foretold to be inevitable,” said Bulwer-Lytton.
He predicted that the U.S. would split not into, “two, but at least four, and probably more than four separate and sovereign commonwealths.”

This was good news for Europe, Bulwer-Lytton declared, for, as long as the U.S. remained united, it “hung over Europe like a gathering and destructive thundercloud. But in proportion as America shall become subdivided into different States… her ambition will be less formidable to the rest of the world.”

**“You Will Break Into Fragments”**

Bulwer-Lytton was not merely expressing his personal opinion. Russia’s foreign minister, Prince Alexander Gorchakov, warned Lincoln of this plan.
“One separation will be followed by another; you will break into fragments,” said Gorchakov, in an October 27, 1862 meeting with Bayard Taylor, the American Chargé d’Affaire in St. Petersburg.

U.S. Ambassador to Britain Charles Francis Adams, Sr. drew a similar conclusion.
“The predominating passion here [in England] is the desire for the ultimate subdivision of America into many separate States which will neutralize each other,” wrote Adams to Seward on August 8, 1862.

**England Moves Toward War**

All evidence suggests that British planners knew from the beginning that their goals in America could never be achieved without bloodshed.
Even the first step of separating North from South would require military intervention.

As noted above, Seward had made clear on April 4, 1861 that the Union would declare war on Britain if she recognized the South.  In such a case, the British planned to use the Royal Navy to break the Union’s blockade, fully aware that the North would respond by invading Canada.

For this reason, when Lord Palmerston approved the mediation plan, he emphasized, in a letter to Russell of September 17, 1862, that, “We ought to make ourselves safe in Canada, not by sending more troops there [in addition to the 11,000 already deployed the previous year], but by concentrating those we have in a few defensible posts before winter sets in.”

At this time, there are enough Chinese in Canada to match our federal forces that might be called home to defend our Northern border. Without massive civilian forces, American northern States would fall within hours of an invasion. Within days the mighty American river systems would be seized, and the nation would be cut literally in half.

The Prime Minister in 1862 admitted that his “mediation” proposal would likely lead to a ground war between Britain and the United States. Palmerston chose to proceed, nonetheless. Just to put this in perspective, I do not believe that China will prevail in a ground war in the US. Without subversion from within by Communist groups like Black Lives Matter, ANTIFA, and the OFA, there is no hope of ever winning inside America. For that reason, I believe that an EMP will be combined with the bioweapon to overstress society by killing 30-35 million through exposure and lack of medical support. Winter would be the optimal time for such an attack.

**“They Have Made a Nation”**

A meeting of Queen Victoria’s cabinet was scheduled for October 23, 1862 to discuss plans for a joint intervention by France, Russia and Great Britain.
Two weeks prior to the Queen’s cabinet meeting, Chancellor of the Exchequer William Gladstone set the stage for recognizing the South in a speech at Newcastle given October 7, 1862. Gladstone said:

“Jefferson Davis and the other leaders have made an army; they are making, it appears, a navy; and they have made what is more than either, they have made a nation. … [We may] anticipate with certainty the success of the Southern States so far as regards their separation from the North.”

Notwithstanding Gladstone’s bravado, British leaders were nervous, hesitant to proceed without support from other European powers.

On November 17, 1862, Russia’s Chargé d’Affaires in Washington, Edouard de Stoeckl, reported to his government that a French and British attack upon the Union was imminent. Since neither the French nor British had “any illusions of their offer of mediation being accepted… The next step will be recognition of the South… [and] forcing open the Southern ports…”

Before taking this step, the British sought to line up support from all the Great Powers of Europe. Stoeckl reported that Lord Lyons, Britain’s ambassador to Washington, wanted “the [mediation] attempt to… come not only from France and England but from the entire civilized world.”

**The Russian Question**

For all these reasons, the British were keen to get Russian support for their move against Lincoln. They knew Russia was Lincoln’s strongest supporter in Europe, yet hoped they could break the friendship, if they applied the right pressure.

In fact, Tsar Alexander II was double-crossing the British. While pretending to give ear to their mediation schemes, Russian diplomats promptly reported everything back to the Americans.

Why do you think President Trump was so sharply criticized for offering to make friends with Putin? Why do you think they feared allowing him to add Russia to the G7 to make the G8? Why do you think they attacked him for 5 years about collusion with Russia? Because they knew that with an Ally in Putin, they could not defeat America.

The British tried to lure Russia into cooperating with them, by offering concessions in other parts of the world. The same as the CCP announces every few days that they are working through this agreement or that agreement with Putin. Let me assure you one thing. Putin is not a Globalist. He despises the Davos Crowd and wants the EMF to eat shit and die. He tells NATO to back off, and he means it. For those reasons, he is already an ally of President Trump.

A Polish revolt against Russia in 2022 would be just as damaging as it would have been in 1861, providing France and Britain with an excuse to threaten Russia with intervention. Also, England, France and Russia were negotiating to decide who would become the next King of Greece. NATO would jump at the chance to push its hardware closer to Russia.

Rumors reached Seward that the Russians might support intervention in the American Civil War, in exchange for concessions in Greece. Seward was sufficiently concerned that he summoned de Stoeckl to the State Department in early 1863 to demand an explanation.

Just to put this in current perspective, President Trump’s staff went to eastern Europe last month to discuss relations between Kosovo and Serbia, and while the strained relationship between those two powers is certainly significant, the fact that Richard Grenell was there at all was highly unusual. Virtual Joe does not currently have diplomats in Kosovo.

The press was totally kept in the dark and first learned of the foreign excursion not through normal diplomatic channels but from Trump’s political action committee. The announcement was delivered via email a couple of weeks ago on a Thursday morning, and it reported that Grenell would be touring the Kosovo-Serbia border later that day to highlight the so-called Washington agreement that the two republics had struck almost a year prior in the Oval Office. If there is any doubt that Devolution is under way and in good command, this should dispel that doubt.

The agreement that both sides signed was “historic, and should not be abandoned,” President Trump said in a statement, because “many lives are at stake.” And Grenell, who had hosted talks between the two parties previously, was there now to tour the area as “my Envoy Ambassador,” Trump explained. There was a final line of encouragement (“peace is possible, don’t give up — long term prosperity for those two nations is at stake”)

**Lincoln’s Appeal to the Tsar**

With French and British intervention looming, and Russia’s position still uncertain, Lincoln made a secret appeal directly to the Tsar. This was a shrewd move.

Russia was the only European power with land armies in Asia sufficient to challenge British dominance over India and the Middle East.  For that reason, England and Russia were bitter and permanent foes. Adding to these tensions, England, France and their Ottoman allies had recently defeated Russia in the Crimean War of 1853-1856. The Russians burned for vengeance.

Lincoln knew it was long-standing Russian policy to play off America against England, a strategy dating back to the Revolutionary War, when the Russian Empress Catherine the Great had supported the right of American colonists to seek independence.

In 1839, Tsar Nicholas I had famously told George Mifflin Dallas, the U.S. minister to St. Petersburg at the time, “Not only are our interests alike but our enemies are the same.”

The “approaching dissolution of the American Union” would pose a threat to Russian interests, Stoeckl warned Prince Gorchakov, in a letter of January 4, 1860, since Britain’s rivalry with America had previously “been the best guarantee against the ambitious projects and political egotism of the Anglo-Saxon race.”

Better to keep the Anglo-Saxons divided! The Tsar agreed that preserving the American Union was “essential to the universal political equilibrium.”
Thus a basis existed for Russian-American cooperation.

**The Tsar’s Promise to Lincoln**

In early 1862, Lincoln ordered the new U.S. ambassador to St. Petersburg, General Simon Cameron, to secretly question the Tsar as to what he would do if France and Britain intervened in our Civil War.

The Tsar promised Lincoln that, in the event of a foreign intervention, “or upon the appearance of real danger of it, *the friendship of Russia for the United States will be known in a decisive manner, which no other nation will be able to mistake*.”
Upon receiving this assurance, Seward went out of his way to spread the rumor that some secret understanding existed between the U.S. and Russia.

“It might be well if it were known in Europe that we are no longer alarmed by demonstrations of European interference,” Seward wrote to the U.S. consul in Paris, John Bigelow, on June 25, 1862.

Henceforth, wrote Seward, any European state “that commits itself to intervention anywhere in North America, will sooner or later fetch up in the arms of a native of an oriental country not especially distinguished for amiability of manners or temper…”
When he spoke of an “oriental country” not “distinguished for amiability,” Seward plainly meant Russia.

**Union Weakness**

The spring of 1863 saw Union hopes at their lowest ebb.  In his book *Czars and Presidents*, Alexandre Tarsaïdzé describes the situation thus:

“The Northern armies had nothing to show for two years of bloodshed… When Lee threatened to invade the Northern States, Baltimore was joyous, Philadelphia paralyzed, and New York City ready to secede. … In July, 1863, riots broke out in New York City over the Conscription Laws, and within two days a thousand soldiers and civilians… lay dead in the streets.

“Secretary Seward was informed that French troops in Mexico were pressing northward. At about the same time came news that a British regiment, to the spirited strains of *Dixie*, had landed in Canada.”

Meanwhile, *Harper’s Weekly* reported that two new rebel ironclads would be launched from British ports in September, whose obvious mission was to help break the Union blockade.

On the night of June 26, 1863, a Confederate raiding party entered Portland Harbor on two captured ships, intending to destroy the port. U.S. Navy vessels engaged and captured the Confederates, but the Battle of Portland Harbor, as it came to be called, raised unsettling questions about the continuing British troop buildup in Canada.

Capturing Portland was a well-known British war goal.  Did the raid on Portland foreshadow some imminent British action?

**The French Make Their Move**

French troops took Mexico City on June 10, 1863, deposing the liberal president Benito Juarez, who fled to the mountains to organize a guerrilla resistance. A month later, Mexico’s new French-controlled government invited Austrian Archduke Maximilian to form a puppet regime and accept the title of Emperor of Mexico.

By October, 1863, some 40,000 French troops were fighting in Mexico. As French involvement in Mexico deepened, Confederate officials rushed to ingratiate themselves with Louis Napoleon.  Rumors flourished of a secret alliance between the Confederacy and the new French regime in Mexico.

“[T]he Confederate States will be our allies and will guarantee us against attack by the North,” declared a French propaganda pamphlet of 1863.

Previously, on January 19, 1862, Lord Palmerston had written approvingly to his foreign secretary John Russell noting that French plans to establish a monarchy in Mexico would discourage further southward expansion by the United States.

**Russian Intervention**

With General Lee on the offensive in Pennsylvania, and 40,000 French troops potentially menacing Texas, fears of an Anglo-French intervention intensified. Three miracles saved the Union.

The first was victory at Gettysburg on July 3, 1863.

The second was the fall of Vicksburg the following day, July 4, 1863.

The third miracle was the arrival of two Russian fleets in New York and San Francisco, in September and October, 1863 respectively.

Russia’s Baltic Fleet suddenly arrived in New York between September 11-24, 1863, under the command of Rear Admiral Stepan Lisovsky. On October 12, Russia’s Far East Fleet dropped anchor in San Francisco Bay, under the command of Rear Admiral Andrei Popov.

The Russian Navy remained in U.S. waters for seven months.  By the time they left, the war had turned decisively in Lincoln’s favor. The danger of foreign intervention had passed.

**Mystery and Secrecy**

To this day, mystery, controversy and secrecy surround Russia’s 1863 naval deployment.

Academic historians have long argued that the Russian deployment had nothing to do with the American Civil War. Few facts or documents are available to clarify the matter.

It is certainly true that the Tsar needed to get his fleet out of harm’s way.  If the French and British decided to go to war over the Polish revolt, the Russians feared their ships might be trapped in their harbors.

Yet there are many other places the Tsar could have sent his ships. By sending them to America, he deployed them in the midst of what was then the world’s hottest war zone.

It seems reasonable to conclude that, whatever other motivations the Tsar may have had for sending his ships, one motivation was to warn England and France not to break the Union blockade, as they had threatened to do many times.

**Evidence of Russian Intentions**

Certain statements attributed to Prince Gorchakov, Russia’s Foreign Minister, may help shed light on the reasons for the Russian deployment.

In February, 1862, Prince Gorchakov asked U.S. diplomat Charles A. De Arnaud whether the Union had enough ships to maintain the blockade.  De Arnaud admitted he was not sure, to which Prince Gorchakov replied (according to De Arnaud’s memoirs):

“I shall find out whether they have vessels enough to maintain the blockade, and if they haven’t, we have! The Emperor, my August Master, will not permit any one to interfere with this blockade, even if he has to risk another allied war!”

Eight months later, in October 1862, the same Prince Gorchakov responded to a letter from President Lincoln by offering these assurances to Bayard Taylor, America’s Chargé d’Affaires in St. Petersburg:

“Russia alone has stood by you from the first and will continue to stand by you. … We desire, above all things the maintenance of the American Union as an indivisible nation. … *Proposals will be made to Russia to join some plan of interference. She will refuse any invitation of the kind*. … You may rely upon it.”

Thus, ten months before the Russian fleet was deployed, Prince Gorchakov had warned Lincoln to expect a final intervention attempt by France and England—an attempt which everyone knew would involve naval action to break the Union blockade.
In view of these facts, it does not seem farfetched to conclude that the Tsar sent his fleet, at least partly, to discourage France and Britain from their plan.

In that case, it would appear that the Tsar kept his promise to Lincoln that “the friendship of Russia for the United States will be known in a decisive manner, which no other nation will be able to mistake.”

We may very well be indebted to Russia for defending the Union at a crucial hour.

**How Britain Caused the Civil War**

Britain’s meddling clearly violated any reasonable definition of neutrality. But there is more. Some evidence suggests that England may have actually *caused* the Civil War.

Lincoln’s top economic advisor, Henry Charles Carey (1793-1879) believed this. He accused Britain of instigating the war, for her own profit.

In his 1867 pamphlet *Reconstruction: Industrial, Financial and Political*, Carey charged Britain with enflaming secessionist passions through a network of “British agents” working “in close alliance with the slave-holding aristocracy of the South…”
The Southern economy depended on Britain, which purchased 70 percent of Southern cotton exports each year. According to Carey, Britain used its influence to push Southern leaders toward secession.

The British knew that an independent South would be free to cut tariffs and use slave labor, keeping cotton prices low. Unless the underlying problem of British influence was addressed, Carey predicted that Union efforts to “reconstruct” the South would fail.

“British free trade, industrial monopoly, and human slavery, travel together,” Carey concluded, “and the man who undertakes the work of reconstruction without having first satisfied himself that such is certainly the fact, will find that he has been building on shifting sands, and must fail to produce an edifice that will be permanent.”

**“British System” v. “American System”**

Carey believed that two rival economic systems were competing for dominance in the 19th century, the “British System” and the “American System.”

He argued that our Civil War was fought, very largely, to determine which of these two systems would prevail. The British System sought to make England the “workshop of the world,” with a global monopoly on industrial production. Other countries were to provide food and raw materials, in exchange for British manufactures.

By contrast, the American System encouraged national self-sufficiency. Americans were urged to produce everything they needed in their own country, including food, raw materials and manufactures. The two systems were incompatible and bound to collide.

America was the natural arena for this contest, inasmuch as the industrialized North followed the American System, while the agricultural South followed the British System.

**Why England Supported the Confederacy**

The British had much to lose if the North prevailed.
The North was building its own textile mills and trying to replace England as the South’s leading trade partner. If that happened, the British System could potentially collapse.

Britain would lose her supply of cheap cotton. She would lose her global textile monopoly. And she would lose the American South as a market for England’s manufactures.  Southerners would henceforth buy manufactured goods from the North.

On March 7, 1862, Lord Robert Cecil addressed the British Parliament in these words:
“[T]he Northern States of America never can be our sure friends…  because we are rivals, rivals politically, rivals commercially. We aspire to the same position. We both aspire to the government of the seas. We are both manufacturing people, and in every port, as well as at every court, we are rivals to each other. … With respect to the Southern States, the case is entirely reversed. The population are an agricultural people. They furnish the raw material of our industry, and they consume the products which we manufacture from it. With them, therefore, every interest must lead us to cultivate friendly relations, and we have seen that when the war began they at once recurred to England as their natural ally.”

With these words, Lord Cecil made clear that the relationship Britain desired with America was a colonial relationship, in which the “colonies” would export food and raw materials to the mother country, while the mother country supplied manufactured goods in return.

Britain favored the South precisely because Southerners had never broken the colonial bond. The South remained economically dependent on the mother country.
The North, on the other hand, had sought to better its lot by industrializing and building its own merchant fleet, thus competing with Britain. In so doing, the North became England’s rival, and ultimately her deadly enemy.

**Political v. Economic Independence**

Through this experience, the Revolutionary generation learned that political independence is worthless without economic independence.
As long as the British controlled America’s purse strings, she controlled America.

The trade war of 1783 made clear that Britain would not surrender her monopoly on manufactures in America. For all practical purposes, America remained a British colony.

The essence of a colonial relationship is that the colony produces food and raw materials, while the mother country produces manufactured goods.  Because raw materials are cheap and manufactures expensive, profits flow continually to the mother country.

Prior to the Revolution, Britain kept a tight rein on American commerce through the Trade and Navigation Acts of 1660, 1663 and 1672.

The colonists were forbidden to engage in manufacturing. Obama exported more than 70 thousand factories to China in 8 years. America fell to the lowest level of startup businesses in history. Capital was stripped out of American business and deposited in Chinese banks. Hardly an American politician did not have accounts in Chinese banks bloated with cash. In fact, Matt Gaetz forced himself to close his Chinese accounts and promised not to take any more Chinese money into his campaign. Within hours, false rumors of sexual activities with a teenage staffer emerged.

Great Britain enjoyed a ten-to-one trade imbalance with her American colonies by 1677, a ratio which remained constant till the Revolution.
BY the end of the Obama reign, China maintained a $500 billion annual trade deficit with America. President Trump sought to lower this and forced China to sign the first trade agreement in history. The following day, Nancy Pelosi launched the impeachment of President Trump and the Chinese bioweapon was released on America.

Now, you know the truth behind the new American Civil War.

**The ICE is Here to Stay**

The all-powerful Environmental Protection Agency [announced](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/12/20/climate/tailpipe-rules-climate-biden.html) Monday that all new cars that aren’t electric must average 55 miles per gallon by 2026. People can’t stop laughing.

This amounts to a Great Leap Forward of almost 20 miles per gallon from the currently ordered 36 miles per gallon that all new cars must achieve, else their manufacturers be punished for making them via “gas guzzler” fines applied to them.

Of course, they will try. They turbocharge and super charge and computer control the engines to have less horsepower and reach the standard. The extra cost will be passed on to you. New cars will sit on the lot and used cars will be worth more and more every day. A car with no airbags, 400 horsepower, and regular power brakes will cost you about $100k now.

The fines only apply to new carmakers. Rebuilders don’t have to pay any attention to these standards. Yet. Advance and Summit Racing are the largest jobbers in the country and getting larger every day. People are keeping the older cards and trucks running better than new, for far less money than buying a new computer on wheels.

The Biden administration considers it their right and duty to punish you for buying the car you want if it doesn’t do what they like.

The *free market* being an intolerable affront to them. Can’t have supply and demand determined by … supply and demand. That would be even worse a thing than *free association*.

The administration will say they are “saving you money on gas” via their “rules.” Which is true in the same way that “ruling” you must live in a small apartment in the city “saves” you the bother of having to cut a lawn. They do not say anything about the cost of the apartment — including the diminishment of your personal space — and your control over it.

Nor, of course, do they say anything about using “rules” to make you pay more for what you don’t want. An affront which brings us to the following fact:

Right now, only two new (2022 model year) cars meet the new “rule” — just barely. They are the Toyota Prius and the Hyundai Ioniq.

Both are partially electric cars (i.e., hybrids) and also small cars designed to be primarily economical cars. They are not bad cars. Indeed, they have their merits — chief among them their ability to average about 55 miles per gallon. But they are not cars most people want — or *else you’d already see most people driving them*.

Italics to make the point.

Why then aren’t most people driving them — assuming (as the Biden administration insists) that “saving gas” is the most important consideration motivating car buyers? The answer, of course, is that it isn’t — even though Biden has caused the cost of gas to almost double in less than 12 months.

Small hybrids are wonderful — as commuter cars and cars for single people and even small (emphasis on small) families. They are inadequate for large families and the bottom line fact is that many — most people — do not *want* to drive a small hybrid car, even if it does average 55 miles per gallon.

They prefer to drive some other kind of car. More precisely, a crossover or an SUV, or a pick-up, the three most popular kinds of vehicles — by far. None of which averages 55 miles per gallon.

There isn’t a single *car* — without batteries and motors — that meets this standard or comes even close to averaging it.

A few non-hybrid medium-small cars manage just slightly more than 40 miles per gallon … on the *highway*.

They average much less.

Consider what that implies about the purpose of this New Rule.

All of those other kinds of cars are to be “ruled” off the market, by positing a “rule” which they*cannot* “comply” with. There are hard deck limits to what is possible, in terms of physical facts, in terms of engineering. In terms of cost — and the ability of people to absorb it.

It’s not possible — as a purely*technical* matter — to build a car, crossover, SUV, or pick-up that averages 55 miles per gallon without converting it into at least a partially electric car, crossover, SUV, or pick-up. And even then, it will be exceptionally difficult and very expensive, both in terms of the cost of the technology necessary (adding hybrid components adds thousands to the cost of the vehicle) and the cost of the compromises that will be necessary, such as diminishment of size and capabilities.

Well then, just buy an *entirely* electric car!

Like the new [GM Hummer](https://www.ericpetersautos.com/2021/12/18/hum-job/). It’s only $112k to start.

This being the ultimate point of the new “rule.” Which is to say, to make non-electric and even partially electric vehicles *at least as expensive* as electric cars … but without the charms of electric cars.

A “ruled” role reversal is underway.

Non-electric cars will get progressively *weaker* (note the trend toward micro-sized engines, even in $50k-plus luxury cars) while becoming more expensive and complex (hybrid drivetrains, nine-ten speed transmissions, multiple turbos applied to smaller, and smaller engines, rendering them less and less likely to last much longer than the warranty coverage) and so *less desirable*.

Kind of like electric cars would be … in a free market.

And so, by four years from now, it is likely there will be not much left that isn’t at least partially electric — and much more expensive, regardless.

The point of that being to drive *all* cars off the market — or at least, out of the reach of almost all people. Some will say this isn’t so. I ask them to say how most people will be able to continue buying cars when the *average* cost of a car sails to $30,000-plus for the handful of partially electric (hybrid) cars still available by then to $40,000-plus for the electric cars which our *rulers* are determined to force onto the “market” even before then?

“We are setting robust and rigorous standards that will aggressively reduce the pollution that is harming people and our planet — and save families money at the same time,” says EPA Thing Michael Regan.

*Saves?*

This isn’t about “saving gas” or reducing gas — i.e., the production of carbon dioxide, the new excuse for the “rules” from on high.

How does an electric car with 1,000-plus pounds of caustic materials that require massive energy inputs to manufacture and which requires massive — and nonexistent — energy capacity to support save — or even reduce — anything?

Well, except new car ownership.

The point of the thing, you see.