Born of ignorance and fantasy, the EFF and MKP's end game objectives

Credit: Researched, written and compiled by Tony Stone



Julius Malema



Jacob Zuma

Some South African political leaders are criticized for using racially inflammatory language, with watchdog bodies and courts finding that certain figures cross the line into hate speech. However, the issue remains deeply contested, as politicians, the courts, and human rights organizations debate what constitutes racist rhetoric versus protected political speech.

The ongoing discourse includes

Courts and the Equality Court have found prominent political figures guilty of hate speech for using racially charged language or inciting harm against specific racial groups. Leaders and government officials frequently face criticism from the South African Human Rights Commission for using toxic or xenophobic rhetoric, scapegoating migrants for domestic economic challenges. To combat inflammatory rhetoric, President Cyril Ramaphosa assented to the *Preventing and Combating of Hate Crimes and Hate Speech Act*, which strictly penalizes the incitement of racial, ethnic, and gender-based hatred.

The good

The Preventing and Combating of Hate Crimes and Hate Speech Act provides robust protection for marginalized communities by recognizing 17 distinct characteristics, including race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, albinism, and migration status. It mandates the collection, recording, and analysis of hate crime and hate speech data. This allows law enforcement to track systemic patterns of discrimination. By criminalizing the electronic distribution of hate speech, the Act ensures that people who spread vitriol, incite harm, or organize online harassment campaigns can be prosecuted under criminal law. Civil remedies under older laws (like apologies or community service) were seen as weak. A statutory criminal charge sends a firm message that bigotry carries severe consequences.

The bad and the ugly

Critics, including the Helen Suzman Foundation and the Democratic Alliance, argue that the legal definitions of "harm" and "hate speech" are too vague. This raises fears that the Act will cause a "chilling effect," forcing citizens to self-censor out of fear of prosecution. Because parts of the phrasing are subjective, human rights watchdogs worry that powerful politicians could weaponize the law to silence legitimate critique, artistic expression, or unpopular political opinions. The law enforces severe penalties, including up to three years in prison for a first-time offense. Critics contend that locking up offenders does not address the root social causes of prejudice or encourage genuine behavioural change. Law enforcement and the courts are already severely overwhelmed. The Act creates new enforcement tasks for SAPS without providing additional resources to effectively process complex speech investigations.Civil rights groups like Free SA have heavily criticized the draft regulations tied to the law. They warn that gathering sensitive tracking metrics (like sexual orientation or HIV status) into a centralized police database creates severe digital security risks

Threats

While some view race-based political mobilization as a threat to national cohesion, certain political factions defend their rhetoric as necessary historical critique to address the country's stark racial and economic inequalities. Other parties reject the use of race-based politics altogether, campaigning on platforms of non-racialism.

Andile Mngxitama (Black First Land First Leader)

Mngxitama has a long history of utilizing extreme, racially targeted rhetoric that directly targets white South Africans.

Human rights groups and opposition parties have dragged him to the Equality Court for hate speech following public addresses where he made explicit calls to target and harm white citizens and their property

Julius Malema (EFF Leader)

He is frequently accused of promoting anti-white sentiment, racial polarization, and anti-Indian rhetoric.

The Western Cape Equality Court found Malema guilty of hate speech following an investigation by the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC). The court ruled that his public remarks at a political rally—including stating "you must never be scared to kill"—constituted direct.

Continuing anti-white sentiment

The specific political rhetoric used by Julius Malema and the uMkhonto weSizwe Party (MK Party), Jacob Zuma in particular, and high-ranking figures within the MK Party face continuous criticism for using racially inflammatory language, typically framed around attacking minority control of the economy. While the party maintains its rhetoric focuses on "economic liberation" for the Black majority, watchdog organizations, civil rights groups, and political opponents consistently argue that their language crosses the line into anti-white sentiment.

Their far-left populist platform championed by the Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) and the uMkhonto weSizwe Party (MK Party) argue that while the 1994 transition ended political apartheid, it left structural economic apartheid intact, keeping the country's land, banks, and major industries under minority white ownership while the Black majority remains systematically impoverished and unemployed.

Their versions of economic liberation rely on using state power to seize, nationalise, and aggressively redistribute wealth. Both share clear, foundational elements with communist ideology, such as state ownership of land and the nationalisation of key industries, the means of production, but they also incorporate distinct forms of racial and traditional nationalism.

Land seizure and nationalisation

Both parties view the landlessness as the root cause of black poverty, but they approach state ownership with slight structural differences.

The EFF campaigns on the expropriation of South African land without compensation, making the democratic state the sole custodian of all land. Citizens and corporations must apply to the government for land-use leases.

The MK Party similarly demands expropriation without compensation but advocates dividing ownership between state custodianship and traditional tribal authorities (chiefs), transferring massive tracts of farmland to the rural Black population.

Nationalising strategic sectors

Both factions reject free-market capitalism and argue that the country's mineral wealth and financial systems must benefit the public directly rather than private shareholders.

Both parties push to nationalise mineral resources and strategic processing infrastructure. The MK Party places heavy emphasis on strict import protections and banning the export of raw materials to force domestic manufacturing.

The EFF calls for the nationalisation of major private banks and the South African Reserve Bank (SARB). The MK Party also explicitly calls to **nationalise the SARB** and mandate it to fund black-owned small businesses (SMMEs) and a vast network of new state-owned developmental banks.

Destruction of the private tender system

A cornerstone of the EFF's "Seven Non-Negotiable Cardinal Pillars" is building state capacity and abolishing the tender system. They argue that government outsourcing (tenders) breeds corruption, inflates prices, and creates a small class of elite "tenderpreneurs." Instead, the EFF wants the government to directly insource all public sector workers (like cleaners, security, and builders) to ensure fair wages and permanent jobs.

Expansion of the welfare state

Economic liberation involves a heavily socialised state that provides comprehensive safety nets directly funded by nationalised corporate profits and aggressive taxation of the wealthy.

The EFF pushes for free quality housing, free higher education, free healthcare, and a massive increase in all social grants.

The MKP focuses on ending fiscal austerity, expanding free education, and ensuring basic utilities like electricity are fully subsidized for the poor.

Deviations from pure communism

While the economic fundamentals are aligned to communism, the underlying motivations and structures differ from classic Marxist-Leninist theory:

Classic communism focuses on a global "class struggle" (workers versus the bourgeoisie), regardless of race. The EFF and MKP frame their struggle primarily around race and historical redress, focusing specifically on empowering the Black majority over a white minority.

The EFF combines its Marxist rhetoric with Pan-Africanism, focusing on African unity, borders, and identity, rather than the borderless, internationalist solidarity championed by traditional communist movements

Traditional communism is strictly anti-feudal and anti-monarchical, seeking to dismantle royal and traditional power structures. The MK Party deviates completely from this by proposing to give massive land control and governance powers to traditional tribal chiefs and monarchs.

The SACP's official stance on the EFF and MKP

The South African Communist Party (SACP) maintains structurally distinct official stances toward the EFF and the MK Party, drawing a firm line between cooperating with the EFF as a progressive ally and rejecting the MK Party as a dangerous, "counter-revolutionary" organization.

EFF arguments in the debate

While Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) leader Julius Malema and his party consistently argue that their language is not anti-white, South Africa's judicial bodies have actively penalised specific statements.

However, in a landmark decision, the Western Cape Equality Court found Julius Malema and the EFF guilty of hate speech. The court ruled that Malema's public remarks at a rally—which included statements like "you must never be scared to kill" and "no white man is going to beat me up"—went beyond acceptable political rhetoric and constituted a direct incitement to violence and racial hatred against white males.

The EFF strongly defended the speech, arguing that the comments were taken out of context and represented revolutionary political commentary. The party announced its intention to appeal the ruling.

On certain public platforms, Malema has sought to explicitly deny anti-white sentiment, stating that a Marxist organisation cannot hate white people and that his party welcomes anyone who loves South Africa.

MKP arguments in the debate

The rhetoric of Jacob Zuma's MK Party generally frames its platform around the concepts of economic liberation and black unity, though critics frequently flag its language as racially polarizing.

The MK Party frequently directs its rhetoric against what it terms "White Monopoly Capital". They argue that the post-apartheid economic status quo keeps the black majority marginalised while concentrated wealth remains in white hands.

The party uses sharp racial framing to attack established systems. For instance, they have accused major South African banks of launching "blatantly racist attacks" and racially profiling black clients while letting white-owned corporations escape accountability.

The MK Party maintains that their language is a necessary critique of systemic economic inequality, rather than promotional hatred against individual white citizens.

Broader perspectives on the rhetoric

The perception of these video clips and public rallies depends heavily on the lens through which they are viewed:

Organisations like AfriForum and the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) view this kind of language as dangerous populism. They argue that weaponising racial identity and using aggressive metaphors fragments national cohesion and can incite real-world violence in a country with a volatile history.

Supporters view the aggressive rhetoric of the EFF and MK Party as a legitimate and uncomfortable truth needed to dismantle the lingering structural legacies of apartheid. From this viewpoint, polite language has failed to address land redistribution and economic inequality.

Ignorance and inexperience

Ignorance and inexperience are major, foundational causes of management failures across South African government structures, but they do not operate in a vacuum. Instead, they are deeply entrenched by deliberate political systems like cadre deployment, corruption, and a severe lack of accountability.

Independent reports from the Auditor-General of South Africa (AGSA) confirm that a critical deficit in technical and financial skills directly drives the collapse of local municipalities and central departments.

The impact of technical and academic inexperience

The lack of basic institutional knowledge and specialized professional skills severely cripples government functionality.

The Auditor-General's local government audit outcomes reveal a persistent trend where municipal officials are incapable of compiling compliant annual financial statements. Municipalities routinely spend billions hiring external private consultants to perform basic accounting tasks, yet because the internal staff lack the skills to even monitor these consultants, the financial reporting continues to fail.

Local government bodies face a massive shortage of qualified civil engineers, water specialists, and project managers. As a result, critical technical decisions—such as sewage treatment plant maintenance or electrical grid upgrades—are managed by inexperienced personnel. This leads to 72% of municipal infrastructure projects running over budget, getting delayed, or being delivered at sub-standard quality.

Internal oversight bodies, such as Municipal Public Accounts Committees (MPACs) and audit committees, are frequently staffed by political appointees who do not understand financial documentation or municipal legislation. They are functionally blind, allowing irregular or illegal expenditure to pass through undetected.

Cadre deployment: The root of inexperience

The presence of inexperience and ignorance in vital state organs is largely a structural byproduct of political cadre deployment.

For decades, the ruling political class has prioritized party loyalty and political alignment over academic or professional qualifications when filling highly technical administrative posts (such as Municipal Managers, Chief Financial Officers, and Directors-General).

Whenever political leadership shifts—whether due to internal factional battles or shifting municipal coalitions—capable senior managers are routinely purged and replaced with new, inexperienced political favourites. This continuous churn prevents institutions from building long-term memory, administrative stability, and baseline operational experience.

The compounding factors: graft and lack of accountability

While ignorance explains *why* many bad decisions are made, it is weaponized by two other systemic issues:

In many instances, public officials plead ignorance regarding complex supply chain management (SCM) laws to escape prosecution for tender fraud. By maintaining weak, disorganized, and un-automated bookkeeping systems, corrupt officials can intentionally obscure the paper trail of state capture and irregular expenditure.

Historically, when an official demonstrates total incompetence or loses state funds due to negligence, they have faced little to no professional punishment. They are frequently "shuffled" to different departments or given lucrative exit packages, ensuring that incompetent management practices are normalized rather than eradicated.

Current legislative countermeasures

To reverse this trajectory, the South African state has been forced to implement structural interventions aimed at professionalizing the public sector:

- The public audit amendment act grants the Auditor-General the power to bypass standard bureaucracy and issue a Certificate of Debt directly to the personal name of a municipal accounting officer. If an official loses state money through severe negligence or an inability to do their job, they can now be held personally liable for the financial loss.
- The national framework for professionalisation of the public Sector mandates strict, non-negotiable minimum qualifications, competency assessments, and mandatory training through the National School of Government (NSG) for all senior public service entrants, effectively blocking unqualified political appointments.

The economy and future if the EFF or MKP came to power

An EFF or MKP governance model would pose severe structural risks to South Africa's macroeconomic stability, likely leading to deep capital flight, currency devaluation, and intense institutional friction. However, the true outcome would depend heavily on whether they held an outright majority to dismantle the Constitution or were constrained by a coalition.

The projected impacts on South Africa's economy and future landscape break down into several critical areas:

Macroeconomic stability and investor confidence

The immediate threat of nationalising banks, mines, and factories without compensation would trigger an immediate exit of foreign and domestic capital. International investors require predictable property rights; removing them would freeze foreign direct investment (FDI).

A mass exit of capital would cause the South African Rand (ZAR) to depreciate sharply. Because South Africa imports vital commodities like fuel and specialized machinery, a crashed currency would drive hyper-inflation, rapidly eroding the purchasing power of ordinary citizens.

Aggressive state spending to fund expanded welfare programs, combined with nationalising the South African Reserve Bank (SARB) to print money or manipulate interest rates, would lead to immediate credit downgrades, making it unsustainably expensive for the government to borrow money.

Institutional capacity and governance

The EFF's policy of complete public sector insourcing and the wholesale destruction of private contracting, paired with both parties' focus on ideological loyalty, would expand the state payroll massively. Given the existing baseline of technical inexperience in government, flooding hollowed-out departments with thousands of new workers without rigorous merit-based filtering would likely paralyse basic service delivery.

The MK Party's explicit goal to replace constitutional supremacy with parliamentary supremacy—and to elevate traditional ethnic leaders over codified courts—would plunge the country into prolonged legal warfare. The erosion of a predictable, independent judiciary would make contractual enforcement impossible for local and international businesses.

Food security and agricultural collapse

Forcing all land into state or tribal custodianship mirrors historical land reform policies implemented in Zimbabwe and Venezuela. Without land titles, commercial farmers cannot secure the bank loans required to purchase seed, fertilizer, and equipment, which risks collapsing the agricultural sector and creating widespread food insecurity.

Pragmatic constraints: the coalition factor

Analysts note that neither the EFF nor the MKP currently commands enough nationwide support to achieve a unilateral 50% or two-thirds parliamentary majority on their own.

If either party ascends to power, it would almost certainly be through a coalition framework (most likely with a faction of the ANC). In this scenario, their most radical communist and traditionalist policies would likely be watered down or blocked entirely by their coalition partners, the business sector, and powerful trade unions protecting worker pensions.

The EFF changes to the constitution

Unlike the MKP, Julius Malema's Economic Freedom Fighters explicitly recognise the parameters of the existing constitutional order. Rather than tearing it down, they propose using a parliamentary supermajority to fundamentally alter specific clauses.

The EFF's primary constitutional focus is amending Section 25 to allow for the expropriation of land without compensation. Their goal is to change the law so that the democratic state becomes the sole custodian of all South African land, effectively abolishing private title deeds.

The EFF pushes for constitutional updates that would formally nationalise the South African Reserve Bank (SARB) and alter its mandate, shifting it from focusing strictly on price stability (inflation tracking) to forcing it to drive state-led employment and industrial growth.

The EFF has petitioned to amend the Electoral Act and constitutional provisions to enforce an "opt-out" system, where the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) would **automatically register all citizens to the voter roll when they turn 16**, removing the need for registration drives

The MK Party: Complete Abolition & Parliamentary Supremacy

Jacob Zuma's MK Party treats the post-apartheid constitutional order as an "anti-African" system designed to protect minority wealth rather than serve the indigenous majority.

The core of the MK Party Manifesto is to move South Africa completely away from constitutional supremacy toward unfettered parliamentary supremacy. This would mean rewriting or throwing out the current Constitution so that Parliament holds absolute power.

Under their model, the Constitutional Court and high courts would be stripped of their veto power. Judges would no longer be allowed to overturn laws or rule government actions unconstitutional.

The MKP proposes restructuring governance to grant supreme legal recognition to indigenous African laws, kings, and traditional chiefs, transferring governance and land control to tribal authorities.

The party has formally tabled approximately 20 constitutional amendment proposals to the Constitutional Review process. These include restricting full citizenship and voting rights strictly to individuals whose both parents are South African citizens.

They propose amending the Bill of Rights to enforce one year of mandatory military service for all South African citizens reaching the age of 18.

A last word

If either of these populist political parties as government successfully changed the SA Constitution to remove regular elections or independent courts, removing them from power without violence would become exceptionally difficult, though historical precedents show it remains possible through economic collapse, popular resistance, and international isolation.

Power and wealth for the leaders. Ignorance, fantasy and poverty for the followers. This is what will carry the day!!

Unless sanity prevails!!

--ooo--