MacDonald King Aston

Fire Eater! Editor

The Secession Tool

(Originally published on DixieInternet.com, 3 July 2004)

Two new articles were recently published on the Colorado League of the South website (www.coloradolos.net). Both articles offered the message that secession is not now the right course for the South. Upon reflection, it occured to me that I might want to write up the other side of the issue. Although I am proud to publish views that dissent from the League's positions (or else what is freedom for?), nevertheless, I would like to respond to these two articles.

"Secession is not a goal, but the means to achieve the goal of protection of liberty."

First, I turn to my good friend, Mark Slater's, article, First Things First. Mark argues against seccesion for the South because:

A. The empire has all the guns.

Not that important in my view. The crumbling of the Soviet empire proves that ideas can be more potent than weapons.

B. The new Southern country would turn out just like its predecessor.

Perhaps, but we can at least try. That's what our Founding Fathers did faced with the British Empire.

C. The new Southern country would hurt conservative states like Idaho and Montana by its departure, leaving those states then to deal with the "liberal-left regions" around them.

This point may be true, but I do not see it affects a freedom movement a long way from Idaho or Montana. In addition, a Southern nation would naturally form ties, both econonomic and politcal with like-minded peoples. From my point of view, Montana and Idaho would be much better off with a free South, for then both states would have their own opportunity to reflect upon their own position within the empire.

Mr. Slater concludes that "First, we have to clean up our own house."

> "We must pull our young ones out of the government schools, and encourage others to do the same. We must educate our children, our family, and our friends about our forefathers, our traditions, our etiquette, our manners, and our heroes...Next, we must insist on leaders who will respect the Constitution, specifically the 10th Amendment."

Mr. Temmerman's article, approaching the issue from a European perspective, asks "But is the future truly so black for Dixie?", pointing out that:

> "Across the South men and women are standing up for their constitutional rights. They take pride in their ancestors' symbols, care not about political correctness, and are willing to sacrifice almost all of their free time and lots of money to the Cause. Projects to defend and fly the Confederate and State Flags are rising across the South and are widely supported, in and out of Dixie. I'm thinking of Project Wave in Georgia and Mr. Lacy's project in Missouri. Slowly but certainly we can reeducate Dixie's people and show them the truth, however difficult."

Mr. Temmerman argues, and not without merit, that "America is not lost: take it back." Further, "As a part of the United States the South can at least continue the fight with more effectiveness."

Both articles adopt the position that the people of the South should fight within the system. After all, as Mr. Temmerman puts it, "When Dixie secedes, it has truly become a stronghold and will be most certainly outnumbered and surrounded by enemies. Do you think that that independence would last long?" This perspective is similar to Mr. Slater's point that the empire has all the guns.

The situtation, as it stands today, is eerily similar to the position in which the American colonists found themselves in the mid- to latter-part of the 18th century. In fact, both articles could be used to argue against secession from the British empire. The British, of course, held overwhelming superiorty against the Colonists, and indeed there was no guarantee that the new "America" would not simply perpetuate the ills of the British system. And what hope was there that the newly founded nation would not be surrounded by enemies itself? Granted, the two attempts at secession, one from the British empire and today's movement to secede from the American empire, are located within different historical contexts. Nevertheless, both articles are representative of the "fight within the system" argument.

The League of the South's position paper, "The League of the South Position", states:

> Since the War for Southern Independence, the Republican system of government established by the Founders has been steadily eroded. The principles of true federalism and State's rights are no longer operative.
> The key phrase here is "no longer operative.

The chief problem with the "fight within the sytem" argument, as I see it, is that the system no longer permits such a fight. There is no American Republic within which to fight. Given that fact, the League's position is positive about self-rule in the South:

> If the South were its own nation, its GNP would rank it in the top five nations of the world. Its laws would better reflect the natural conservatism and Christian roots of the Southern people. We could enjoy low taxes, sound money, secure private property rights, and a free-market economy. We could follow a foreign policy of armed neutrality, leave the UN, and oppose the New World Order. We could once again reward merit and abolish the Welfare State and Affirmative Action. We could severely limit immigration. We could get government out of our children's education. We could remove ourselves from the current judicial tyranny. In short, we could seize control of our destiny as a distinct people.

It is this emphasis upon "kith and kin", as Dr. Michael Hill puts it, that stakes out the League's central argument for secession. The people of the Southland are, again in fact, a distinct people with a distinct culture. That culture, or what remains of it, is currently under vicious attack from the empire on the Potomac.

How then, do the people of Dixie answer this attack? The League's position is clear:

> We see no way of reforming the corruption within the present system; therefore, the League of the South shall seek to spread acceptance of the idea of secession among the people of the South.

This last point is the defining difference between the League of the South's position on secession and the "work within the system" position. From the League's point of view, and from mine, there is no such thing as working within the system. The system, if indeed it be one, is hopelessly corrupt, irrevocably beyond repair, and in the control of enemies of the American Constitutional Republic. Further, working within the system has already been tried, and the results have been disastrous. In the current empire, for example, abortion on demand is considered a "choice"; this despite the fact that murder, which is also a "choice", is not permitted, nor is theft, yet another "choice". In addition, as recent events in Alabama have borne out, the very government sworn to uphold the Constitution of the united States is committed in a big way to destroying the Constitution bit by bit, piece by piece. The assault upon the Second Amendment

hardly needs detailing here. The assault upon Christianity, the very basis of our laws and morality, is well underway, and the shredding of the Ninth and Tenth Amemdments has already been accomplished long ago. (There is also the blatant disregard for the Fourth Amendment by the Bush administration and its so-called "Patriot Act".) It is worth noting also the sheer brazen illegality of the so-called Fourteenth Amendment. If a government can "pass" such an amendment in strict violation of the Constitution itself, the same government can "pass" any other "law" it wishes. And this point is already proven in the case of the Bush administration's use of "enemy combatant" status to deny American citisens their Constitutional right to a trial by jury of their peers.

Secession should never be taken lightly. The League of the South certainly does not take secession lightly. But the League rightfully, in my opinion, holds that "No nation, notwithstanding its form of government, can be said to be free if it does not recognise the right of the people to consent to the form of government they live under."

The key question then is "Do the people of the united States of America have a government that recognises the primacy of the principle of 'the consent of the governed'"? The answer must surely be "No". And if the answer be in the negative, as I believe it is, then the same people are consenting to live under a government hostile to their interests and liberties. In short, they are not free.

A free South (or free states in the South) would return the consent of the governed to the governed. For this reason alone should all patriotic Southerners take secession seriously. At least as seriously as, say, the secessionist movement in Quebec, Canada. It is instructive to read the League of the South's paper on Quebec's move for self-rule, where the conclusions are readily applicable to the South and her people:

Secession is both a shield (something to protect rights under attach) and a sword (a means for the final victory over those who will not recognise the rights of a sovereign community). Secession is not a goal, but the means to achieve the goal of protection of liberty.

This last point is at the heart of the debate between advocates of "working within the system" and the position of the League of the South. The goal of the League of the South is not secession per se, but the results of secession. Oversight of that fact has led to many egregious errors in fact both within the League and among its detractors. No one wakes up one morning and decides to fight for secession itself. Rather, one wakes up and decides to fight for freedom. Secession is merely a tool to achieve that freedom.

The people of Quebec have exercised a right that the people of the South have been denied, i.e., the right to consent to the form of government they live under. The Union

of Canada is held together by the good will and pleasure of the people, whereas, the Federal Union of the United States is held together by bloody bayonets.

Like the people of Quebec, whose bid for freedom inches closer to reality, it is my fervent hope that the people of Dixie will realise, sooner than later, that supporting an empire whose only claim to legitimacy is the violence necessary to impose its will upon its subjects is not the hallmark of free men and women.