

THE INTELLIGENCER

An Occasional Review of Late 20th Century Affairs

SOUTH AFRICA: THE LONG VIEW

As we write, the Republic of South Africa continues to follow Rhodesia down the path of what one commentator has termed "righteously opting for self-extinction". Any one who supposes that the forces opposed to the Republic will be satisfied with anything less simply does not understand the situation. One act of liberalisation can only be succeeded by ever more clamorous demands and pressures for more. The hue and cry may abate slightly for strategic purposes, but will always be renewed in "frustration" (for it seems the fashion these days to apply an ersatz emotional terminology to the most coldly calculated acts of policy) when further "reforms" are not forthcoming, or are progressing too slowly. This process will end only when South Africa has gone the way of Nigeria, Kenya, Rhodesia and all the rest of sub-Saharan Africa. Then, and then alone, with a corrupt, inefficient, partial and violent black-racialist one-party state firmly ensconced, it will at last be recognised by the "international community" as a true multi-racial democracy.

We wonder how many of the people involved in the shameful international harassment and bullying of South Africa really believe in the ridiculous charade they perpetrate. The hacks of the electronic "media" certainly do. Any one who has met them knows that they are almost as stupid as they appear to be. The statesmen, on the whole, probably do not—but then most of them are long past believing in anything. One could expatiate upon the monstrous hypocrisy of the whole thing—the hideous burnings-alive which are blandly accepted by the same people who cry with horror at the smallest infringement of freedom on the part of the South African Government; the acceptance as "freedom fighters" of gangs of terrorists who make the I.R.A. look humane and decent by comparison. Mr. Nelson Mandela recommended that supporters of the African National Congress should cut off the noses of negroes who spoke against the Cause (as many do and more would if they dared). When one compares this to the "necklacing" which is now favoured, one can see what the press means by calling him a moderate.

None of this, however, is germane to our purpose. We hold no brief for the South African Government, nor do we wish to immerse ourselves in the arguments of modern politics. As always, our interest is primarily in the implications of present events for future development.

What are the likely long-term results of the collapse of white South Africa? We have seen what has happened in the rest of black Africa. Thriving economies have collapsed overnight. Countries, often with vast mineral reserves and always with the full coöperation of the "international community" and with large amounts of foreign aid, are abjectly poor, perpetually bankrupt and, in short, utter failures. No one any longer attempts to deny this. Mozambique as late as the 1970s, under Portuguese rule, was prosperous and was a net food exporter. Today it is bankrupt with over 100,000 starving people fleeing over the border. When the Belgians left the Belgian Congo, it had 58,000 miles of good roads. Now only 6,200 are passable. In Tanganyika and Zanzibar, production of key export crops dropped by

40% in ten years. *The Guardian* wrote that the people "are among the poorest in the world, despite exceptionally high levels of foreign aid." South Africa, despite sanctions, the massive withdrawal of foreign investment and isolation from foreign trade, has an economy worth more than those of the whole of black Africa combined. South Africa is beset by a massive problem of illegal immigration, with negroes from neighbouring states desperately trying to get in and enjoy the high standard of living of South Africa's negro population (more cars are owned by South African negroes than by the entire population of the Soviet Union).

Of course, the press and the "international community" piously pretend to believe that under black rule the South African economy will not collapse—a pretence which forbids an intelligent assessment of future developments—but there is no doubt whatever that it will. This collapse, however, will be far more serious than all previous ones, because the entire economy of sub-Saharan Africa is dependent upon that of South Africa. Once the only real modern economy in the region disintegrates, the region as a whole will be plunged into a depth of bankruptcy and desolation yet unknown. The pretence that black African states are viable nations will become harder and harder to sustain. The stage, in short, will be set for the only possible humane solution to the African Problem in the new century: recolonisation.

This suggestion may seem very far removed from practical politics at present, and indeed, it is. But it should be remembered that the only thing which stands between the world and recolonisation is a great deal of pseudo-moral humbug which has caused, perhaps, more human suffering than any other piece of humbug this century—including Bolshevism itself. The real force behind this humbug has been the desire of the two "super powers"—especially America—to demolish the British and other European empires in order to secure (in the case of America) world economic hegemony and (in the case of Russia) whatever strategic and ideological pickings she could get.

With the Soviet Union disintegrating and an increasingly isolationist America (or perhaps even one which allowed genuine moral and humanitarian concerns to influence its African policy), the only barrier to recolonisation would be the humbug of the last half-century, and one has only to look at the "peoples' democracies" of eastern Europe to see how quickly well-established humbug can evaporate once the real force behind it has gone.

It is ironic that the forces of international multi-racialist bullying may well be helping to bring about, or at least expedite, recolonisation, which may also be a major part of the solution to Britain's racial problem, and perhaps that of America too.

More ironic still, perhaps, is the fact that South Africa's policy of the Separate Development of the races, for all its faults, was an interesting *via media* between pure colonialism and the chaos of black rule. Once it has been demolished it is unlikely to be tried again for a very long time.

THE INTELLIGENCER

An Occasional Commentary on Late 20th Century Affairs

OPTIMISM in the NEW '90s

HOW many of our readers have a small sense of optimism upon entering the 1990s? A number of our acquaintances tell us that they have. And we confess that we feel it too.

It is hard to imagine that this optimism can be felt among those who continue to inhabit the modern world. The broadcasts and periodicals are as despicable as ever, the popular "music" as vile and filthy, the dress and manner of the natives as generally unpleasant. It is not a world any sane being could wish to live in. Even periodicals supporting some traditional cause or other are filled with modern cant, false counties, metric money and every other piece of routine collaboration that can be crammed in. Even the brightest aspects of the modern world are insurmountably alien.

So what is it that makes one feel so optimistic? It is a good question and I am not even sure that we have a good answer; but one does. Even the date "1990" does not feel as distasteful as "1989". I recall looking at a black wrought-iron public bench, with "1990" picked out in gold. It seemed a symbol of the coming times. I look at the stomach-churningly disgusting new telephone kiosks with a sense of calm and an inner certainty that they will not be there for much longer. The possibility that this will be the last decade of repulsively casual dress, and the last decade of really filthy music keeps coming into the minds not only of my immediate acquaintance, but of various people I meet.

Socialism, the great power-house of modernism, lies dying. The madness no longer has method in it and the monster is cut off from its sources of life. For the first time in a lifetime of modernist stagnation, there is a breath of change in the air. If one were impatient for change, the frustration and uncertainty would be intolerable. But for we who have no intention of touching the modern world with a ten-foot barge-pole until a considerable measure of change has been established, it is possible to smile quietly and see that it is coming — slowly according to the scale of individual life, but in historical terms, very rapidly indeed.

TOEING the LINE

"WITHIN a few years of independence the one-party state became established across Africa. . . In most of Africa it was deliberately imposed by the small cliques who took power in the aftermath of [colonialism] and which wanted to hang on to the accompanying spoils."

The above quotation is taken from a report issued by the *Financial Times* news service; which is, to our mind, the only interesting thing about it.

The facts contained therein are commonplace and known to any one who has any information about Africa and any brains with which to add two and two and come up with a number between three and five. But no one actually said such things in public. Not long ago, a *Financial Times* hack who turned in a report of this sort would have been looking for alternative-employment the next day. People who said that sort of thing were "racialists" and "reactionaries".

Similarly, while it was permissible to criticise this or that "human rights abuse" in Russia or in Communist eastern Europe, root and branch criticisms of the entire communist system were the province of the political right, and very rarely heard over the airwaves or in most newspapers.

In both cases, the "line" has suddenly changed, and things which were once dangerous to be heard saying, and a sign of one's political "extremism", are accepted by every one as being what they are — the simple truth.

This is certainly not a new phenomenon. Before and for some time after his death, any one who said that Stalin was a tyrant and a murderer was branded a "far-right reactionary". Only when Khrushchev made it official Russian doctrine did the Western establishment acknowledge that the "extremists" had, after all, been saying neither more nor less than the truth. Well, in fact, they acknowledged no such thing. They acknowledged that Stalin was a tyrant and a murderer, conveniently forgot that the "extremists" had been saying so all along, and continued to berate the said "extremists" for their "uncharitable" attitudes toward the east-European tyrannies, their "dangerous" dislike of Russian tyranny and their "racialist" exposure of African tyranny.

Are these, at any rate, changes for the better? We think not. When a particular falsehood is overtaken by events and ceases to be useful, then it is discarded. That is all. New, currently-useful falsehoods take its place. What is interesting to us is the rapidity with which the "line" changes. The old "official attitude", which has been pumped out for years, is suddenly discarded without a word; the new "line" is adopted smoothly and completely and no one draws unnecessary attention to the fact that it is happening. The process is certainly subtler than the directives issued to the press in the old-style Communist regimes; but it works in exactly the same way.

But are there no directives? Sometimes it is difficult to believe that there are not. Take the case of the *Daily Express*. For years, ever since the idea had first been mooted, the *Daily Express* had campaigned outspokenly against British

membership of the Common Market (as it was then reassuringly called). Hardly a week went by without a pungent editorial on the subject. Hardly a significant piece of news was reported relating to the organisation without pointed editorial comment on its disadvantages to our national interests and aspirations. Then, when the farcical referendum on Britain's membership was instigated by Mr. Edward Heath, and when no single organ of public information (except the *Morning Star*) refrained from the chorus of propaganda for a "yes" vote, *The Daily Express* effected a sudden *volte face* and joined the chorus. No explanation was given. There was no recognition of the fact that the paper had ever said anything different. It was positively eerie.

More recently, the foreign affairs editor for B.B.C. television was asked what he felt was the cause of the "liberalisation" in South Africa. He replied that it was the same cause that had brought about the changes in eastern Europe. Soviet retrenchment. Just as the people of eastern Europe suddenly knew that if they revolted there would be no Soviet tanks, so the Russians made it clear to the African National Congress that they would no longer support its terrorist campaign, nor even give substantial diplomatic support. With this threat removed, said the correspondent, the South African Government felt that it was in a position to negotiate with the Congress. This is extremely striking. In the days before these negotiations, any one who had suggested that St. Mandela and his Congress were tools of the Soviets and that the South African Government was motivated by a genuine fear of the Soviet threat under the guise of "black nationalism" would have been howled down as a "right-wing extremist", a "racialist", a "Mac-Carthyite" and goodness knows what else. No B.B.C. correspondent would ever have breathed a hint of such a thing. Now that the situation has changed and it does not matter any more, it is freely admitted that it was true all along.

The line is changed as quickly and as shamelessly as ever was the official line of the Communist propaganda services, and because there is no one to point it out, very few people even notice it.

For every falsehood that has been quietly dropped, a hundred more are still being assiduously propagated.

For the wise man, seeing is disbelieving.

OCCULTED FACTS

IF anything, we are entering a darker age than before—at least, in the past, there has been something of an anti-Communist lobby which has worked against the distortions of the liberal hegemony. What are left now are the myths that are challenged by no recognisable body of dissidents. The standard myths of liberalism and democracy which no one will challenge. Who, for example, will give voice to the massive scientific

evidence that women are not equivalent to men — not equally capable of doing many jobs; *more* capable of doing some, *less* capable of doing others? Who will put forward the huge body of evidence against the doctrine of evolution? Paul Lemoine, editor of the biological volume of the *Encyclopedie Francaise* wrote: "... the theory of evolution is impossible. . . Evolution is a sort of dogma whose priests no longer believe in it, though they uphold it for the sake of their flocks." Many eminent biologists have said similar things, but how many people are aware of this? When will it be openly discussed? Who will speak of the extraordinary amount of evidence that the Nazis did not have a policy of exterminating the European Jews and that the gas chambers were a piece of post-war atrocity propaganda? I know of no one who has examined the evidence and not been shaken by it. The official response to such evidence, where there is any response at all, is to illegalise it! France, this year, has joined the growing list of nations which send people to prison for questioning this highly debatable portion of history. Who will bring to light the vast array of scientific evidence for the inequality of the races? Leading scientists have been threatened, abused and silenced. Press and broadcasting services keep silent and perpetuate the old myths. For how long? For ever?

These are questions of fact. Questions of evidence. Questions which, in a free world, would be discussed, considered, debated as a matter of course. They are questions to which many people know the true answers even while they continually promulgate their opposites. If the "line" changed tomorrow, the truth would be told as coolly and matter-of-factly as if no one had ever been saying anything else.

The modern world rests upon a tissue of myths and underlying assumptions, many of which are highly questionable, many of which have been exploded long ago and yet continue to be perpetuated by the schools, the newspapers, the broadcasting services and every official and unofficial agency. We are led to believe that the world is based on fact, truth and free enquiry; but many people who have tried to pursue free enquiry beyond the permitted limits have found to their cost that it is not so.

In the old Communist world there were at least "dissidents", whose dissentient opinions received a measure of publicity in the West. In the brave new unified post-cold-war world, dissent is silenced absolutely all over the globe.

Of course, when one ventures beyond the sphere of fact and evidence, the censorship is (if such a thing were possible) even tighter. No opposition is possible to the liberal-modernist outlook on life. Even the permitted Marxist critics are fading away. Is it possible that things have gone too far? That real traditionalist dissent may grow out of this stifling climate? We shall see.

B.M. PERFECT, LONDON, W.C.1.