



KILL THE BOER! KILL THE FARMER! WHERE IS THE WORLD'S OUTRAGE NOW?

Selective morality flourished spectacularly during 60's, 70's and 80's when it came to South Africa and apartheid. Not a day went by without the righteously indignant from the four corners of the planet joining the chorus against the pariah state South Africa.

Leading the pack was the United Kingdom, a home from home for many self-proclaimed anti-apartheid activists, revolutionaries, political opportunists, clergy, academics and anyone else who took pleasure in kicking South Africa under the bus. The British press had a field day during the apartheid years, as did post-independence Africa which needed a whipping boy to deflect attention from their nascent failures.

In the early 60's already, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) and the British media in general took visceral pleasure in demonising apartheid. In April 1960 a BBC Current Affairs programme "looked at the future of South Africa in the aftermath of the Sharpeville Massacre and the 'shocked reaction from around the world.'" John Freeman interviewed members of the "all white" Cape Town parliament and probed them about the future of minority white rule and police violence.

"On 21 March 1960" said the BBC, "South African police opened fire on a large group of protesters demonstrating against the Pass Laws which required black South Africans to carry identity papers. Sixty nine people were killed and many more were injured in what became known as the Sharpeville Massacre. This violent confrontation changed the attitude of many anti-apartheid campaigners from supporting peaceful protest to seeking more radical methods".

So where is the BBC's Current Affairs journalists today in light of the EFF's Julius Malema stating publicly to "kill the Boer, kill the farmer!" Where is the BBC's in-depth series on how the ANC and its revolutionary chums are systematically destroying South Africa? The Corporation wanted to ponder on the future of

South Africa. Well, the future is here. Why don't they do a follow up on their 1960 programme?

Where is the United Nations spokesman on Human Rights declaring that Malema must be censored for calling for the murder of whites? Where are the probing Western reporters and journalists seeking to tell the world what has happened to South Africa after apartheid?

There has been no official statement from the United States Black Caucus about Malema. Not surprising when they had no comment about Winnie Mandela (whom they welcomed with open arms) after she declared that "with our matches and our necklaces we will liberate this country." And what does France Libertes, the foundation created 25 years ago by Danielle Mitterand, wife of the then French president Francois Mitterand, have to say about killing whites in South Africa by an elected politician, whose salary is paid, in the main, by white taxpayers? Ms.Mitterand was a "tireless campaigner for human rights and victims of injustice" and she focused relentlessly on South Africa, giving physical succour at the Elysee Palace to various SA "freedom fighters" while encouraging sanctions against this country.

Bishop Desmond Tutu, a life-long opponent of apartheid, declared in October 2012 that South Africa was "now worse than the apartheid state", yet his statement didn't prompt teams of Western journalists to come to South Africa and find out why. His declaration was, in a political context, extraordinary but was virtually ignored by most of the anti-apartheid media zealots of yesteryear.

UNITED NATIONS

A detailed history of the inexorable media and world organisations' assaults on South Africa during the apartheid years has yet to be written. That apartheid was declared by the United Nations a "crime against humanity" is in itself a falsehood which took on a life of its own and remains a fixed designation unaffected by facts.

The "crime against humanity" appellation was based on a decision made on 30 November 1973 during a UN convention. Article 1 declared that "the State Parties to the present Convention declare that apartheid is a crime against humanity". This decision was submitted by the Soviet Union and Guinea, and the first 20 signatories were all members of the communist Soviet bloc. They did what they were told by Moscow. Countries such as France, Canada, Germany, Israel, Italy, Holland, United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America DID NOT SIGN THE SUBMISSION. The "crime against humanity" appellation was not a UN Security Council resolution as is commonly

believed but simply one of many submissions made against the policy of apartheid to the UN from 1946 to 1994.

Yet the “crime against humanity” designation lives on, and is used by the ANC and anyone else who feels the need to censure South Africa when they get a rush of blood to the head. It is significant that the UN has done nothing to put the record straight. Thus this phrase is used by those with their own agenda. Recently president Ramaphosa told the parliamentary opposition that farm murders should not be complained about so much when it should be remembered that during apartheid, “thousands of our people were slaughtered by the apartheid regime”. Empirically those who did the slaughtering were the UDF and the ANC and this can be confirmed by consulting their own Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) submissions. But it is this sort of hyperbole that emboldens people like Malema to openly call for the killing of whites. Significantly, president Ramaphosa has said nothing, which will surely motivate Malema further.

Has the BBC interviewed Malema? What about the general Western media? Has any Western government officially censured Malema?

KILLING IS IN SOUTH AFRICA'S DNA.

Historically killing, plunder and theft from others are the hallmarks of tribal life during the 16th and 17th centuries South Africa. The Zulu king Shaka's claim to fame was military conquest. He never developed anything resembling a town. He never built roads, schools, hospitals. His enemies were impaled on sticks to die in the sun. His Zulu empire was the result of the subjugation of lesser tribes by conquest. He laid waste to many parts of South Africa, The Encyclopedia Britannica declares him to be the founder of the Zulu empire where he is “credited” (Brittanica's words!) with creating a fighting force that devastated the whole region over which he eventually ruled. For six years he was the “warrior” in the Mthethwa military service. Dingiswayo the Mthethwa king released his protégée Shaka and sent him to take over the Zulu tribe, at the time numbering around 1500. They occupied an area near the white Umfolozi river. Shaka's army rose to power. He ruled ruthlessly and it was instant death to anyone who opposed him. His role in life was raiding, capturing and killing. He was eventually murdered by his half brother Dingaan in 1828. The Zulu Mfecane depopulated large swathes of South Africa and caused suffering, bloodshed and death. Violence and killing were the conquerors' stock in trade.

Are we returning to that mentality via one Julius Malema? Is killing what he's all about? Why would he want to kill the people whose civilization produced the

South Africa we have today, the fruits of which Malema enjoys to the hilt? Or is he just tapping into the bloodlust he believes lies within the hearts of his supporters? What is the point of killing whites? Is his racial hatred and resentment so compelling that he would call for the death of fellow South Africans? Of course he has not explained the ramifications of his call to kill farmers et al. If he ignores court orders then who will stop him? He should carefully examine the Haiti option before he goes any further.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that South Africa as we know it could descend into a gangster state, with no law and order and regional warlords in charge of militia armies. Many other countries have descended into this way of life and they are not all in Africa.

THE HAITI OPTION

The history of Haiti from January 1, 1804 when she declared her independence from France has been disastrous. It is the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. It has the lowest life expectancy, the highest illiteracy rate, the lowest consumption of newsprint, lowest per capita GNP and the lowest level of political stability.

But it was not always so. Before 1789, the year of the French revolution, it was populated by 40,000 whites, 27 000 freed mulattoes and 450 000 black slaves. Under white rule, this French colony was richer than all the 13 American colonies combined. It was the most prosperous colony in the world. (Colonialism was a way of life then, as was slavery, to put matters in context.) It supplied all of France and half of Europe with sugar, coffee and cotton. But In 1791 France issued a decree ordering Haiti to give the vote to the country's slaves. This resulted in a bloody revolution resulting in extraordinary violence and cruelty. The entire white population was murdered. Rape, decapitation and mutilation were committed almost universally upon their bodies.

The descent into what it is now – a beggar state with no stability and no law and order – was the result of killing the whites. The country never recovered. Has Malema thought of what South Africa would look like without its minorities? Or doesn't he think that far?

Until president Ramaphosa puts his foot down on Malema's incitement to kill fellow South Africans, where will Malema's urging end? Who will curb him? And what role with the Western media play in telling it like it is vis a vis Malema?