MacDonald King Aston

Fire Eater! Editor

The Hind Tit: *Of Bread and Faith*

30 January 2004

(Originally published on Dixieinternet.com.)

> "Since 1865 an agrarian Union has been changed into an industrial empire bent on conquest of the earth's goods and ports to sell them in. This means warfare, a struggle over markets, leading, in the end, to actual military conflict between nations."
>
> *(The Hind Tit, Andrew Nelson Lytle, in I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition.)*

Mr. Terry Compton's recent article, Bread, Faith and the Relevance of the Southern Movement, has garnered support for its basic theses, and rightly so. For in his article, he lays his finger on some practical ways by which Southerners can take back their culture, if not their land. It is, I believe, an important essay, one that all thoughtful members of the Southern movement should read. Mr. Compton's essay provides a starting point, for one, opening up discussion on how the Southern movement should proceed from this point. But also, it points the way to more in-depth issues which, perhaps are not directly related to practicality, but important in their own right. It is these issues I wish to talk about here.

Mr. Compton points out that there are two factors to consider regarding the future of the Southern movement: Are we right? and Are we relevant? To the first he gives an affirmative nod; to the second, a negative. As is ofttimes the case, the negative side of a debate proves a fecund ground in which to plant the seeds of real progress. For to answer the question "Why are we not relevant"? is to ask at the same time "What can we do about it?"

The essay asserts that the Southern movement, to be relevant, must offer alternative solutions to the problems facing the modern South. Beyond that, Mr. Compton offers his own alternative solutions, namely three: a reaffirmation of the religious foundations upon which the South was built, a move to seize control of the education of our young, and an economic model that can practically supplant the current economics of the empire in Washington, D.C. Each of these points deserves its own detailed examination, but for now I would simply like to offer some thoughts that were occasioned by Mr. Compton's essay.

First, we must rid ourselves of a common illusion, one that so often blinds us in our attempts to build the future. That illusion, built upon a faulty metaphor, is called Progress. Or, more pointedly, Progress At All Costs. It is common to hear folks say "We cant turn back the hands of time" or, as the Southern writer, Thomas Wolfe said, "You cant go home again." As a literary phrase, Wolfe's remark is beyond equal (as is his novel titled the same). But the fact is, we can go home again. And we must.

Not only go home again, but once there we must rebuild the old red barn from the ground up. As may be evident from the quotation above by Lytle, I take my cue from "The Agrarians", those Southern writers whose book of essays was published in 1930. The central thesis put forth in I'll Take My Stand is simple: Man versus Machine. The Industrial versus the Agrarian. The

Economy of Money versus the Economy of Wealth. As Lytle put it, the old agrarian economy of the South has been forced by the mercantilist economy (and culture) of the North "to take the little hind tit for nourishment" instead of the side tit, and "all because the suck of the others is so unreservedly gluttonous."

Recently I have been attacked for believing in a fabled dream of a golden antebellum South, and I admit it freely. But it is not a return to that antebellum South that will save us; rather, it is a return to the values and the culture that embodied those values that will save us and, more importantly, our children.

What Mr. Compton's essay made me realise was that the Agrarians were right. We must "Throw out the radio and take down the fiddle from the wall." But remember my warning about Progress. Progress is, like every other concept known to man, a metaphor, and poor metaphors can be exchanged for better ones. As an unabashed optimist, I hold that the people of the South can take their future into their own hands, should, and will. Mr. Compton's idea of returning (another metaphor!) to the Master - Apprentice economic relation is just one of the ways in which this future can come to pass. There are more.

Before we can reasonably advance into that future, however, there is the matter of rebuilding the barn. As Mr. Compton notes, speaking of the destructive effects of Yankee mercantilist culture, the Southern movement, to survive, must reach out to the average man: "...we MUST be able to articulate to the people of the South this state of affairs, our stand against it, and then be able to demonstrate that the solutions we proffer will actually make things better."

What are the obstacles that stand in the way of reaching out to the average man? Chief among them is education. Not the education passed off in today's schools and universities, but an education steeped in the values (including religious values) of the community for which it serves. I notice, for example, that when attempting to offer a vision for our future, at every turn we are shackled by the chains of the very mercantilist ideology that we must needs overthrow to arrive at that future. Thus, we are taught that Progress is everything; even sacred. Of course, it is neither.

Put simply, we are oppressed by an ideology that has already partially destroyed our Southern culture and that threatens to eradicate it altogether. Fair enough, but how must we combat that ideology? After all, we can hardly present a resonant message to the mythical average man unless we have our own ideas in order. It is high time that we undertake that task. It is not an impossible task. In fact, as Mr. Compton's essay asserts, it is a practical task. Throwing off a false veil of ideology is as easy as opening one's eyes, and all activist movements must face this task head on. The Master - Apprentice relation, for example, is none other than a throwing off of a false ideology: the ideology of Inevitable Progress. Progress is merely a metaphor and, hence, does not partake of the kind of reality we would normally give to, say, an apple or a chair. It may shock some, but the concept of "progress" is simply a concept. There is no corresponding substance to the term, despite the elaborations on the metaphor (progress "marches", we are told).

Yet once we have divested ourselves of this false ideology, we must have a better one with which to replace it. Mr. Compton's essay presents a starting point, but, as I said above, there are in-depth issues to address as well as practical ones:

First, we must understand the opposing ideology, its theoretical foundation and its concomitant results. We must, therefore, scrutinise its metaphors and its metaphysics, and expose them to the light of day.

Second, we must offer up a new and healthier ideology (for we must have an ideology whether we will or no). Therefore we must examine our own metaphors and metaphysics, and let the light of day shine upon them.

Third, we must give a name to our new way of thinking and being. Our new ideology must be able to be grasped by everybody, including the average man.

Empire is anathema to the Southern culture, but all empires crumble. It is the nature of empires to dissolve under the weight of their inherent ideological contradictions (for ideology is, at bottom, a controlling mechanism, and people, equally at bottom, will not be controlled by a poisonous ideology). Just as the Roman Empire fell (largely because of its oppressive centralised structure), and just as the British Empire fell (largely because of its oppressive monarchical structure), so too will the American Empire fall (largely because of its oppressive federalist structure). The future of the South lies in the hands of those who will offer a better way of life to everyone in it, and, more important, show the way there. I applaud Mr. Compton for showing us the beginnings to the way back home. For we can and will go home again. But this time around, the hind tit will not suffice for us.

Our Creator endowed us with will (which is, by definition, free), and we must will that our people have both the bread and the faith they need to live upon the land as free men and women under a Southern sun.

The Hind Tit, Part II: *Words as Weapons*

12 February 2004

In my last article, *The Hind Tit: Of Bread and Faith*, building upon Terry Compton's article (*Bread, Faith and the Relevance of the Southern Movement*), I argued that, for the success of any movement, including the Southern movement, the adherents of a movement must be able to discern and throw off the ideology of their opponents. Otherwise, they are bound to flail about in an ideological void, manipulated by, essentially, propaganda. But, assuming that one does get past the obvious propaganda of one's opponent, what then? One does not supplant propaganda by more propaganda (for presumably, one is trying to supplant propaganda with truth).

I laid out three points to consider when dealing with propaganda (a false ideology): First, we must understand the opposing ideology. (Know thy enemy.) Second, we must offer up a new and healthier ideology. (Let sanity return.) Third, we must give a name to our new way of thinking and being. (Let us be understood by all.)

In this article, which covers the first point, and the next two articles, I intend to focus on each of these three points so that the people of the Southland, and supporters of both the South and the original American Republic, might have a practical way to fight back against the tidal wave of imperial propaganda oozing, like a cottonmouth on a slimy stump, over the land. Words have power

Contrary to popular thought, words have power. The reason they do is because underlying every word is an idea, and ideas wield immense power. It was once remarked that before Thomas Paine published his famous work, Common Sense, in January of 1776, there were no "Americans", but immediately following the publication, there were. Behind Paine's words were ideas with power (the dissolution of the colonies from the British Empire). In the united States today, the power of words, and the ideas behind them, seems to elude the many, while the few wield that power to their advantage. For the Southern movement, this state of things has both pros and cons.

Taking the cons first, we may say that the words and ideas (which form an ideology) emanating from the media, from the powerful centralised government in DC, and from hither and yon in general, are set against us. Most readers will recognise this

point as self-evident from the facts (for example, the Confederate Battle Flag is a "divisive symbol", Southerners are all "gap-toothed", pickup-driving, tobacco-chomping rednecks, and so forth).

Yet there is always a weakness in any ideology. And therein lies the positive side of the issue. For just as our opponents use their words and ideas to enslave us to their ideology (for the purpose of controlling us), so too can we use words and ideas to loosen our shackles and even fight back with authority.

First, one must admit an obvious truth: "The person of inferior or inadequate knowledge will always be at a disadvantage in dealings with other people." [1] Thus the importance of educating our young, and especially educating them outside, completely outside, the grasp of the public schools which serve the American Empire chiefly as a means of controlling its subjects. Assuming an educated people, though, how do we then use our own words and ideas, our own ideology, in short, to fight back against the propaganda of empire? Understanding the opposing ideology

It is of little use to fight against an opponent whose thought, whose being, you do not really comprehend. As is well known in Classical Rhetoric (ARS RHETORICA), you can not prove a lie unless you know the truth. But how do you get at the truth, given the enormity of the Lie?

The answer is both simple, yet difficult. Simple, in that getting at the truth of anything merely requires knowledge. Difficult in that you must have that knowledge in the first place.

This article uses, for an example, the argument that the current government in the united States of America is an empire. The classic leftist/secular approach to this concept is the book by Jim Garrison, America as Empire. Touted as "a member of Howard Dean's inner circle" [2], Garrison argues that Americans need to wake up and accept the fact that they are now the proud possessors of an empire. "The United States has become what it was founded not to be...an empire." And "The challenge for the United Nations and the larger world community is the reality that the United States is no longer a nation among nations. It is an empire among nations..." Garrison argues further that such an American Empire is a good thing, but "Only if it consciously takes up the mantle of leadership will it be able to determine what kind of empire it will be." [3]

Well, speaking of common sense, most of you will see right through these assertions to the chilling premise which underlies them, that the American Republic of our forefathers is dead and gone, replaced by a global empire. And most of you will, no doubt, agree that this leftist, globalist view is, plain and simple, immoral. But how does one counter such an argument? I have said that to get at the truth, you must first have the knowledge to do so. In this case, you must have some knowledge of history, of political structures, and more. But key to getting at the truth is to understand the power of words. You must understand not only the definitions of the words, but how they are used, and why.

For the average American subject, the word "empire" conjures up visions of Roman legions, of gladiator movies, Kirk Douglas, Russell Crowe, and Star Wars.. The idea that America itself could be an empire seems almost ludicrous. Yet the fact remains, and here I agree with Garrison, that America has, in real fact, become an empire. I disagree with Garrison on most other points, of course, but especially on when it became an empire. I would argue, as others have, that America transmogrified into empire as of 1861. But never mind, the main point is: "How does one counter the argument?" (that America should be an empire, and not, as its Constitution mandates, a republic). It is not my intent to counter Garrison's assertion that America should take its rightful place among empires. What I wish to point out is how easy it really is to expose the foundation upon which he has built his argument. In the same way, it is equally easy to expose any proganda parading as a valid thesis. A simple formula So here it is, a

simple formula that works:

1. Understand the word.
2. Understand the metaphor behind the word.
3. Attack the metaphor, not the word.

One: The word "empire" comes from the Latin word, imperium, which simply means "an order or command", and, by extension, an area (an empire) under order. An adequate translation of the word in its political sense is "sway of influence" or "area of power". In this classical sense, there is no doubt that the united States is indeed an empire. (Whether is should be or not is another question altogether. I have a hunch that the majority of those brave veterans who fought against fascism in the 1940s would not agree with Garrison.)

Two: The metaphor behind the word "empire" is a spatial metaphor. Power over an area (and the people within that area).

Three: When one considers the spatial dimensions of the American Empire, it is easy to see its size and influence. But what are the implications of this size? Consider history. History shows quite clearly that all empires are doomed from the beginning. This idea is simple fact. No empire has ever stood for long, where "long" is measured by historical time. Even the Byzantine Empire is now dust. We can trace the Roman Empire from 49 BC, when Julius Caesar, like Lincoln who followed him, became a dictator and effectively ended the Roman Republic, to roughly AD 466, the year in which the Vandals sacked Rome. Not a long stretch, by historical standards. More important, though, was the size of the Roman Empire, because "Military power was the ultimate basis of Roman empire, and it was kept up by expansion." [4]

Hmm. Does that sound familiar? Is that where Garrison's metaphor leads us? To continual expansion (imperium) over the globe by sheer military might? Why? Who says? What are the possible outcomes?

As you can see, exploring the word and the metaphor beneath it leads you to a point where you can begin to formulate a counter-argument And that counter-argument is solidly based on the metaphor beneath the word, just at the original argument was.

For example, here are some possible counter-arguments to Garrison, based upon the spatial metaphor underlying the word empire:

1. The sheer size of the world, and the inhabitants therein, make administration of a global empire a bad idea, both from the economic and practical sides.
2. Expansion (movement across space) for the sake of expansion provides no bread, builds no roads, creates no happiness.
3. The original American Republic was founded and even defined as the enemy of militaristic expansion (movement of power across space). So, to admit that America is an empire is sheer fact; to admit that it should be an empire is treason.

There are more examples I could give, but these should show you what a simple understanding of the metaphors underlying all words can do.

Words then have power. But they derive their power from the ideas beneath them. To successfully rid yourself of the power of controlling words (propaganda), you must attack the ideas (which are metaphorically based) that underlie those controlling words.

You can test the formula above by seeking out the metaphor that underlies the word "divisive" in the sentence, "The Confederate

Battle Flag is a devisive symbol. (Send in your answers to my email; the response should prove interesting to all of us.)

Once you grasp how simple it is to locate the meanings beneath controlling words, you now have the option of freedom from the tyranny of controlling words. And freedom is a good thing. So is fighting back.

It is now time to understand our own words, and fight back with them. But that's another article.

Footnotes:

1. Edward P.J. Corbett, Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student.
2. On the website: http://www.commonlang.com/Garrison.html, 02 February 2004.
3. America as Empire, Article by Jim Garrison, Lapis Magazine Online, lapismagazine.org (http://www.lapismagazine.org/garrison.html), 02 February 2004.
4. J.M. Roberts, The Penguin History of the World.

The Hind Tit, Part III: *A Better Way*

4 March 2004

> "There are also more fleeting and eternal things to be thought of; more grace, sweetness and time; more security in our instincts, and chance to follow our inmost nature, as Jesus meant when he said he must be about his Father's business; more of that last fine light to shine on what we do..."*(Stark Young, Not In Memoriam, But In Defense, I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition)*

In my earlier articles in The Hind Tit series, I responded to Terry Compton's article, Bread, Faith and the Relevance of the Southern Movement. Mr. Compton's essay contained, especially, three points which made his essay an important one. I related, in The Hind Tit: Of Bread and Faith, that these three points were:

> "...a reaffirmation of the religious foundations upon which the South was built, a move to seize control of the education of our young, and an economic model that can practically supplant the current economics of the empire in Washington, D.C."

Mr. Compton's essay is concerned with practical means by which the South can reclaim its culture and the values of that culture. (That there is such a culture is not up for debate; an interesting fact in itself.) Though commenting on the relevance of the Southern movement today, the heart of Mr. Compton's essay is his practical suggestions for reclaiming our culture, namely that the South must first return to its religious heritage, the education of its young, and an economic model that can sustain a truly Southern culture. In addition, Mr. Compton notes that the Southern movement today must have a viable "platform", a message that reaches to out to the common man:

> "In order to reach a level of relevance, that is sufficient enough to propel our movement forward to a place of real political and social force, we MUST be able to articulate to the people of the South this state of affairs, our stand against it, and then be able to demonstrate that the solutions we proffer will actually make things better."

Upon first reading Bread, Faith and the Relevance of the Southern Movement, and I encourage all to read it again, it was clear to me that Mr. Compton's essay was building, whether consciously or not, upon the main theses of the Agrarians, those twelve Southern writers and poets of 1930, whose book, I'll Take My Stand, issued this challenge to the "Union":

> "It all comes down to the most practical of points—what is the end of living? What is the end of living that, regardless of all the progress, optimism, and noise, must be the answer to the civilization in the South?" *(From Stark Young, Not In Memoriam, But In Defense)*

What, indeed, is to be the end of living? The answer to that question is just another term for "platform" As Mr. Compton notes, we have not "formulated a viable method to impute our vision to our fellows." True enough. But any platform worthy of the name must be comprehensive in its vision. I obviously haven't the space here to put forth such a comprehensive platform (though, with Mr. Compton, I am viscerally sure that we must have one), but. I would like, at least, to suggest a starting point for one. A seed of an idea that could possibly lead to that more comprehensive platform.

Where do we start? What is to be our answer to the debased "American" culture in which we now find ourselves, adrift upon a sea of immorality and meaninglessness? What do we throw back in the face of a society that promotes eternal warfare, the marriage of homosexuals, a violent popular culture, and an education system devoid of truth? What practical economic model shall we put in place? How shall we address the needs of the many for "bread and shelter"? And how shall we make sure that we are not just engaging in more "parlour talk" and "abstract pontifications"? Within the context of this article, what could be the seed of such a platform?

The answer is surprisingly simple: We must live better lives.

Before you remonstrate with me for over simplification, let me first explain.

What is at the heart of Southern culture that truly ennobles it and distinguishes it from the rest of the North American continent? Why do we not speak, for example, of a Northern culture, but easily speak of a Southern one? What is it about the South and her people that marks them as different? Obviously, there is no one simple answer to that question, but if there were it would most likely be: A better life.

That better life is born of centuries of cultural development in the South. I speak of the common Southern values: kinship, courtesy, religiosity, the enjoyment of leisure, the remembrance of a glorious past and the promise of a glorious future. In Blue Mountain, Mississippi, where my cousin, Calvin, lives, people take time to wave at each other as they drive, to chat at the local general store, to sit in the evening and watch the sun fall lightly over the Rutherford Bottoms. And folks pray too, not just in church, but at dinner and supper, and sometimes just for the joy of it. In Blue Mountain, there is no "black ghetto". There is, instead, a lane of houses filled with neatly trimmed lawns upon which children play in the sun. Unlike East Los Angeles, if a white (or Indian or Asian) man or woman stops to ask directions here, he or she will not be greeted with a gun, but with a smile and probably a map.

An idealised South? To some extent. But that's the point, isn't it? Only the South has the ability, the right, to be idealised. For only the South has a true culture worth idealising. We have been fed a diet of "New York" long enough, and especially after 11 September 2001. Do you remember the TV ads? We are all Yankees now. Well, no, we are not. New York has no culture. It has many subcultures, all of which, from my visits there, are marked by the typical yankee virtues: coldness, aloofness, and competitiveness. But Savannah? Savannah has culture. McAlester, Oklahoma, has culture. And Blue Mountain, Mississippi, has culture too.

The Southern culture, built from the fabric of years, is, of itself, the better life we seek. Our culture is at root opposed to the

madness of blind yankee industrialism, greed, and materialism. Our culture centres on people, not things. On the inherent dignity of a person's life, not on his wealth. It is for these reasons that we can easily speak of a Ted Turner, say, as a scalawag, for he does not belong to our culture (nor does his ex-wife, Jane Fonda).

Thus, the starting point for the "platform" of which Mr. Compton's article speaks, is right in front of us. We must offer to the people of the South, if not to America in general, a better way of living. And the South has that better way built into its bedrock.

Many people, probably many more than the elite media know or care to tell, are recoiling in horror from the lives they now find themselves leading. Even liberals (or pseudo-liberals, more accurately) understand the point, with the encroaching hand of the federal empire extending into every part of their lives. Certainly, the economic model offered by the empire does not work well for millions of average Americans. Then there are the jobs siphoned off overseas, our borders wide open, licentiousness rampant on "family" TV, overweening taxation, the crippling of the Bill of Rights. Clearly, the American empire has failed.

The other day I received an email from a high school student who decried the lack of morality in his high school: the "gangsta" culture, the lack of respect shown by his fellow students to their teachers, and all the rest. It occurred to me, while answering his email, that there is an answer to his questions: A better life.

Who possesses that better life. We do. The South does.

I suggest that to be and stay relevant we offer our platform around that better life. And the heart of that platform must mean something substantial, something more than "parlour talk". Practically, we have at our disposal the ready tools for such a platform. Let us consider just a few of them:

- **Political**: A return to the original American Republic and its Constitution. Folks of all stripes can readily understand a platform based upon the vision of our founding fathers, the same vision championed by the South in 1861, as proved by the Constitution of the Confederate States of America, which basically copied the Constitution of the original American Republic and insisted upon a return to the principle of "the consent of the governed." Let us, then, like Jefferson Davis, be strict constitutionalists.
- **Economic**: A concentrated effort to revive economic models such as the Master-Apprentice model offered by Mr. Compton (and there are more, including a practical agrarian model, for one, and new high-tech models also).
- **Religious**: It is probably safe to say that the South, more than any other part of America, is built on a bedrock of religious values. Though I have argued against a Christian theocracy (A Southern Theocracy? www.southernrights.tk), nevertheless it is clear that, theocracies aside, the people of the South have religion in their blood, in their lives. We must have more of it, for a culture based on secular values is doomed to drift in an anchorless sea of false values. It is equally clear, at least to me, that the culture we offer must be based on Judaeo-Christian ethics, which offer both a centuries-old moral system and, at the same time, reasonable religious tolerance. (Voodoo wont do.) It is, after all, under the umbrella of the Judaeo-Christian ethical system that religious tolerance, and not religious wars, have flourished in the world. It is the South, historically, that offered sanctuary to Jews, Indians, and other religious practitioners, while maintaining a Judaeo-Christian culture (and I use the term "Judaeo-Christian" on purpose, to steer clear of denominational disputation).
- **Education**: Until we reform what currently passes for education, our children and young adults are going nowhere fast, to that long slide into the Lie that we in the Southern movement fight against every day. Home schooling is one answer. Small private schools are another. Federally mandated schools are not.
- **Leisure**: Remember Stark Young's observation above. What is the use of any platform (ideology) unless it offers a better

life beyond just the getting of bread and shelter? We must teach our young the value of leisure, of "more grace, sweetness and time". Otherwise, why labour at all? Why replace the factory with more drudgery? It is true that the basic needs of a people must be met, but once met, we had better have something of value to offer beyond the endless round of TV sitcoms, after-work cocktails, and blind escapism.

- **Popular culture**: We had also best come up with a healthy alternative to the "pop culture" currently in vogue. But the South has a near monopoly on inventing popular culture, so we are in good shape there. (It is true that popular music, for example (rock, gospel, folk, jazz, blues) though invented largely in the South, has been perverted, but that is no excuse to falter at offering a better example.) Here at Dixie Internet, our own Robert Lloyd is just such an example of a better popular culture. There are others.

These topics are just a few of the many we must comprehensively formulate to arrive at a viable platform palatable to the common man. But they show the way beyond the tragic nightmare in which most people now live. Again, we must focus on the practical first. It is no use offering leisure, to take one example, to folks who can not even put bread upon the table or adequate shelter over their heads. It is worth repetition: practical, practical, practical.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I suggest a convention to draft the outline of such a platform. Let us gather our luminaries together for debate and consensus, and put our platform in writing, in black and white, easily understood by all. And soon. Let us decide upon our economic models, our political and religious values. Whatever the wording of that final platform, however, and particulars must be refined, the substance is already there in our own culture.

Let us offer a better and practical way of life to all, and our message shall be heard.