

Anglophiles launch secessionist 'Southern Party' in United States

by Edward Spannaus

As part of a treasonous scheme to break up the United States into at least seven different entities (the South, New England, Rocky Mountain, Upper Midwest, Pacific Northwest, plus Alaska and Hawaii), British agents and Anglophiles in the United States have launched what they call the "Southern Party."

Their professed goal is the "complete independence" of the South, "whose predominantly Celtic and British-derived religious and cultural traditions distinguish it from the rest of the country"—according to their own statements. They proclaim that among their beliefs is that "the dominant British-derived cultural institutions of the South should be preserved."

They claim to disavow racial hatred, but declare: "The Southern Party believes that the time has come to complete the work of our noble, Confederate ancestors."

This, in fact, is nothing but a continuation of the project which the British launched after they lost the War of the American Revolution, to split up the American Union through subversion, secession, and war.

A Southern League project

The Southern Party was formally launched on Aug. 7, 1999 in Asheville, North Carolina as a spin-off project of the League of the South (formerly known as the Southern League). According to the League's own account, in November of 1998, it formed the Southern Party Exploratory Committee (SPEC), and decided a few months later to form the Southern Party.

Because of disputes over tactics—such as how openly to call for "secession"—the League of the South disbanded its Exploratory Committee, and did not participate in the founding meeting of the Southern Party. But since that time, the League has—in its own words—"decided to re-engage itself," and it is now cooperating with the Southern Party. All of the top leaders of the Southern Party—including its chairman, former CIA employee George Kalas, and Michael Hill and Jim Langcuster—were leading members of the Southern League.

Tom Fleming and Ambrose Evans-Pritchard

The Southern League was founded by Thomas Fleming,

the editor of *Chronicles* magazine. Fleming has a slavish mutual-admiration pact with the Hollinger Corporation's Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, the British intelligence stringer who operated in the United States from 1992 to 1997 as the Washington correspondent for the *Sunday Telegraph* of London. While he was here, and since, Evans-Pritchard promoted every variety of separatism and hostility to the U.S. Federal government—including extensive profiling of the "militia" movement—while also being one of the principal architects of scandals targetting President Clinton.

"*Chronicles* offers a home to forlorn causes that nobody else will touch," Evans-Pritchard wrote in the *Sunday Telegraph* in 1996. "During the worst years of the violence in Bosnia, when everybody else was denouncing Belgrade and Pale for ethnic cleansing, Fleming was out there in the trenches interviewing the Serbs—or the Bosnian Christians, as he calls them—and he has since devoted hundreds of column inches to the Serb point of view."

On the other hand, Fleming, in the preface to his 1988 book, *The Politics of Human Nature*, praised Ambrose Evans-Pritchard's father, the well-known British anthropologist, whose studies on the Nuer people in Sudan, says Fleming, were a seminal influence on him. And Fleming's *Chronicles* frequently lavishes praise on the younger Evans-Pritchard as well.

The founding of the Southern League

Thomas Fleming first came to this writer's attention in July 1992, when *Insight* magazine, published by the *Washington Times*, gave prominent coverage to a band of "neo-Confederates" whom it described as still fighting for "the principles of 1860." It featured a color photo of Fleming standing alongside a Confederate flag.

The article was entitled, "Still Fighting the Civil War," and, among other things, it was riddled with vitriolic attacks on Abraham Lincoln and the idea of equality of all men. While not all "old-right" adherents, or "paleo-conservatives," are partisans of the South, *Insight* says, "all of them share the view that Lincoln's belief in equality is incompatible with true conservatism."

Fleming was quoted as expressing his "empathy" for groups such as northern Italy's Lombard League, and the

article concluded with Fleming detailing that what he really likes about the South, are the same things he likes about the Middle Ages. The Middle Ages, he declaimed, were “gritty and dirty with people fighting for what they believed in on a day-to-day level. The thing I love about medieval politics was that it was people in the street rioting day-to-day.”

Then, the February 1993 issue of Fleming’s *Chronicles* featured a piece entitled “A League of Our Own,” whose subject was also the Lombard League (since renamed the Northern League) and related separatist movements in Italy.

Already then, Fleming was calling for the creation of a similar political movement in the United States. “There are only two alternatives for this continental empire that has never been a real nation,” he wrote. “Either we find the means to decentralize decision-making and restore authority to the old institutions of family and town and country (and even state), or else we lapse into a multifaceted civil war of blacks against Hispanics against whites against blacks against Jews.”

“The revolution,” Fleming continued, “cannot be made overnight, and the first step would be the creation of a movement devoted to the long-range goals of political devolution, privatization (ours is not a free enterprise system), protection of the national interest in matters of immigration, trade, and foreign policy, and the reassertion of our old cultural identities as a European . . . and Christian nation. . . .”

This “Christian” then concluded: “If there is no movement or party willing to embrace a Leghist [Lombard League] program, then one needs to be formed, and if that is impossible, my advice is to stockpile ammunition and invest in bullet-proof doors and shutters.”

A long-lost British tribe

In mid-1994, Fleming and others finally created the Southern League, which describes itself as “a Southern independence movement seeking to advance the social, economic, cultural, and political independence of the Southern people by all honourable and peaceful means.” (The use of British spelling is entirely intentional in League literature.)

On Jan. 19, 1997, the Southern League was featured in the London *Sunday Telegraph*, which highlighted the League’s obsession with their “British” tribal origins. “Ethnic consciousness mingles easily with [S]outhern pride. . . . They belong to a long-lost British tribe of Confederates,” said the *Telegraph*. “They know the small towns and villages their ancestors came from in the British Isles and they care about that. They regard themselves as a people set apart by time and history. For them, the Civil War never really ended.” Michael Hill (also a founder of the Southern Party) was described by the *Sunday Telegraph* as being among those “who think their British bloodline is the key to understanding all this.”

“The South has the largest concentration of Anglo-Celts in the world,” said Hill. “Our culture is clearly British, more so than any other part of America. We are a distinct nation. There will be a Southern people long after the American

empire.”

Naturally, the economic theories promoted by the Southern League and the Southern Party are as far removed from those of the “American System” as one can get.

The Austrian School of Economics

On the Southern Party’s website can be found a document entitled “An Economic Plan for the People of Dixie.” It is truly a mixture of the most rabid feudalistic economics, with modern “Information Age” gobbledegook.

“The SP’s Economic Program can be summed up in a single sentence,” says the document. “We desire increased prosperity, more jobs, less taxes and regulations and more financial privacy and economic freedom for all the people of the South. The economic models we will follow have far more in common with the free market Austrian School of Economics championed by the Ludwig von Mises Institute than the failed highly centralized big government models promoted by Washington. . . .”

“If you want to see what our economic goals for the South are,” the document continues, “look at other economic success stories that have followed our free market model to see where economic growth and prosperity are occurring today.” The examples cited include “economies” which are largely offshore financial centers and havens for tax avoidance and money-laundering, such as Hong Kong, Singapore, Liechtenstein, Switzerland, Bermuda, and Grand Cayman.

Not too long ago, the Southern League published a paper trying to show that if the South were its own nation, its Gross Domestic Product would rank it in the top five nations of the world. “We could enjoy low taxes, sound money, secure private property rights, and a free-market economy,” the League asserts. “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.”

The Southern League proposes different variants of how this would work. For example: “A Southern nation composed of only the eleven States of the former Confederate States of America (i.e., Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia), would have 74 million people, the thirteenth most populous in the world. . . . In economic power, a Southern nation composed of the above eleven States would have the fourth largest gross domestic product (1990) figures, after the remainder of the United States, Japan, and Germany.”

The Southern Party has added to those five other states in which it claims to be operating, which are Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and Oklahoma. It also declares its hope that a regional party of the South “would inspire the rise of regional parties” in other sections of the United States. A new Civil War, anyone?