

Talk:South African farm attacks/Archive 3

< [Talk:South African farm attacks](#)



This is an **archive** of past discussions. **Do not edit the contents of this page.** If you wish to start a new discussion or revive an old one, please do so on the [current talk page](#).

[Archive 1](#)

[Archive 2](#)

[Archive 3](#)

[Archive 4](#)

Contents

[Image of crosses](#)

[Noticeboard discussion](#)

[POV](#)

[Lacks credibility](#)

[Beginning of lead sentence](#)

[Siener van Rensburg](#)

[U.S. or Australia?](#)

[Mutilation and gang rape are often part of the Modus Operandi in the attacks against South African Farmers](#)

[Ttump covfefe](#)

[Basic Capitization Grammar](#)

[retake land?](#)

[Is the Wikipedia article, South African Farm Attacks, devolving into an activist editor political racewar?](#)

[Journeyman documentary about South African farm murders](#)

[South African Farmlands Documentary by Lauren Southern](#)

[Announcement](#)

[title redacted - A dispute](#)

[Intl reaction/white genocide should be merged](#)

Image of crosses

Howzit all.

I'd like to inquire as to why the image of those wooden crosses marking the deaths of South African farmers keeps getting removed from the article. I'm not an especially regular contributor to this page, but I've noticed it has been repeatedly added and taken down over the course of the past five to six years, and I'd very much like to know what the initial issue with the media was, or at least what steps were made to discuss its presence.

Again, from the perspective of a relatively neutral third party, that image does *appear* relevant. An article about the mortality rate of police officers in the US could be well illustrated by photographs of a police cemetery, for instance. Likewise, an article about violence against farmers in RSA could be well illustrated by crosses representing murdered Saffie farmers. I can understand if the pretext for removal is that it may provoke an emotive response on an already controversial topic; however, as far as dismissing the photo as outright irrelevant to the page content, I would have to disagree.

Thanks, --[Katangais](#) (talk) 02:44, 10 July 2016 (UTC)

Seeing as how nobody has objected to the inclusion of the image itself (as opposed to using it to support any contentious content, which may have been the case in the past), I have replaced it in the article. Feel free to join the discussion here if one objects to its presence. Thanks, --[Katangais](#) (talk) 20:39, 8 September 2016 (UTC)

Seeing as how my comments above have been disregarded, I'd like to ping this discussion again: if there's an issue with the image at the top of the article, please by all means bring it to light here. That's what the talk page is for (at least, what we as contributors should be using it for, as opposed to the morass of forum-esque spam some have been engaging in here since almost to the day the article was written).

As long as the crosses are not misidentified as grave markers - as was the issue in the past - I can see no way the image itself may be regarded as contentious. --[Katangais](#) (talk) 18:26, 23 September 2016 (UTC)

The image was in long ago and removed for POV. Now, I think that it can be included later on in the article if placed in appropriate context. It was assembled by those claiming a genocide has been occurring. The reliable sources don't support that interpretation. The image as an depiction of how strongly one side views this is not a problem. Placing the image at the top of the page presents the view that a genocide has occurred, which is not a Wikipedia voice. --[I am One of Many](#) (talk) 22:44, 23 September 2016 (UTC)

Images are neutral. They're not sentient. They don't present opinions.

Images actually convey information, they are not neutral. — Preceding unsigned comment added by [FishDestroyer](#) (talk • contribs) 16:02, 11 November 2017 (UTC)

The photograph itself is not contentious, only any accompanying text stating that a genocide occurred. There's fewer than one thousand crosses in that memorial. That's hardly demonstrative of mass murder on a genocidal scale, especially considering that South Africa is a country of over four million whites and fifty million people.

The photograph has been moved per your request. However, I don't see the need to put it in a new section dismissing the genocide claims if that's what you have in mind. These extreme claims themselves are fringe - I spent some time in South Africa, including the rural Free State, and never once heard anybody use the term "Boer genocide" outside of (you guessed it) the internet - and it's better if we just omitted all references to them in the article altogether, per [WP:FRINGE](#).

Thanks, --[Katangais](#) (talk) 11:33, 25 September 2016 (UTC)

Yeah, I don't understand how the image is POV. I'd support moving it back into the lede. [Zaostao](#) (talk) 17:22, 25 September 2016 (UTC)

I agree, I see the image of the crosses as illustrative of the type of protests and public activism that is conducted to raise awareness of the issue by people who feel strongly about it. I fail to see how its presence is POV. On a side note I have just re-added the image as I noticed it was removed recently for allegedly being POV. Until a convincing case can be made to show it as POV I propose that it should remain on the page.--
Discott (talk) 18:49, 27 November 2017 (UTC)

Noticeboard discussion

A discussion has been created at Wikipedia:Neutral_point_of_view/Noticeboard#South_African_farm_attacks. Ne Yorker (talk) 23:57, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

Looks as if the discussion has been removed. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 77.227.136.106 (talk) 10:32, 8 February 2018 (UTC)

POV

This is a worthless left-leaning article as is typical of Wikipedia. Wikipedia didn't even have a story on this for years and years just like the media won't report it and I almost wish it still didn't have an article on Wikipedia because this is all nonsense. The attacks are from the South African government. It's made to look random so that the government will not be criticized. It's a land grab. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 68.12.230.104 (talk) 17:40, 27 December 2013 (UTC)

Do you have reliable sources? The only thing that matters on Wikipedia is (1) are there reliable sources and (2) is the information in them neutrally summarized. I am One of Many (talk) 17:54, 27 December 2013 (UTC)

Here is the answer Do we have reliable sources? Yes! There are plenty of videos and news reports of the government (ANC) including Mandela singing songs to exhort the killing of white farmers (Boers or settlers.) And whites born in South Africa just have as much damn right to live there as anyone else anywhere in the world including an American born in America, or an Indian born in India. Even the blacks are settlers, they originated in central Africa and migrated south - Credo Mutwa. There were no blacks in Cape Town and the western Cape when the Dutch first arrived. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 198.228.217.149 (talk) 02:43, 28 December 2013 (UTC)

All you say may be true. I know no more about the situation in South Africa than what I read, but with Wikipedia, we must keep in mind that it is an encyclopedia. It is not a news paper or a fact checking organization. That is why we demand reliable, independent, secondary source. The videos you speak of may all be important evidence, but it is evidence for a newspaper or fact checking organization. We have to avoid interpretation and original research. Here is what I propose to you and anyone else who would like to make this an encyclopedic article. First, we should decide what are the reliable sources to include in this article. Second, we read them all and summarize their content in the form of an article. Third, we make sure the article does not slant one way or the other unless that is what the sources say. This will be hard work because where editors disagree, discussion will have to be held on this page until we reach consensus about some changes. I am One of Many (talk) 06:40, 28 December 2013 (UTC)

There is a corresponding article about "Plaasmoorde" in the Afrikaans-language wikipedia. (https://af.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plaasmoorde_in_Suid-Afrika) If I read it through Google translate it seems less tainted by political views than the English-language article. — Preceding unsigned comment added by [77.227.136.106](#) (talk) 10:37, 8 February 2018 (UTC)

Lacks credibility

I compare the opening lines of the English-language wikipedia article about "South African farm murders" with the Afrikaans-language article about "Plaasmoorde", as translated by Google translate:

English: The South African farm attacks refer to the claim that white South African farmers are murdered at a higher rate than the murder rate in the general population of South Africa.

Afrikaans: The term farm murders refers to murders on farms, especially the murders committed to South African farms since the end of the apartheid system in 1994.

The English-language article says it's a theory (a "claim"); the Afrikaans language article says it concerns a specific kind of murders.

English: A November 2017 analysis by the BBC found that there are insufficient data to estimate a murder rate for South African farmers.

Afrikaans: According to available statistics, 6,122 farm attacks occurred between 1991 and 2001, leading to 1,254 deaths. The number of deaths doubled in the next eight years to 3,037. Research by the Institute for Security Studies found that a farmer's probability of being killed is almost four times greater than that for an ordinary citizen and twice that of a police officer.

The English-language article says there are insufficient data; the Afrikaans language article provides data.

Plainly speaking: the Afrikaans language article is less vandalized than the English-language article. The English-language article reads as if making political statements.

does the Afrikaans language article cite reliable secondary sources for those numbers and statements? If so, can you link to them here? [Rockypedia](#) (talk) 13:23, 8 February 2018 (UTC)

For those numbers three references are given:

1 "Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Farm Attacks" <https://africacheck.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Final-Report-Committee-of-Inquiry-Farm-Attacks-July-2003.pdf> (also a reference on English-language wiki)

2 "Farm Attacks and Farm Murders Remain a Concern" <https://issafrica.org/iss-today/farm-attacks-and-farm-murders-remain-a-concern>

3 "Two more S.African farmers killed: death toll now at 3,037" <http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/267463>

A source of bilingual English/Afrikaans information is the Hansard of the SA parliament. This just popped up by typing "farm murders" in the search engine of parliament.gov.za: "If one looks further, beyond the fact that the farmer and farm murder rate is 133 per 100 000, it is the agricultural sector that contributes 6,9% to GDP." <https://parliament.gov.za/storage/app/media/Docs/hansard/2bcd8f0e-7132-4786-9641-f242800f4e55.pdf>

The murder rate for South Africa is 34 per 100 000 (according to wikipedia); if the murder rate for farmers is 133 per 100 000 that is substantial. — Preceding unsigned

comment added by [77.227.136.106](#) (talk) 17:00, 8 February 2018 (UTC)

The most recent reliable source as well as previous reliable sources simply do not support these claims: [BBC](http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-41807642) (<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-41807642>). --[I am One of Many](#) (talk) 03:14, 19 February 2018 (UTC)

Beginning of lead sentence

[@Rockypedia](#): Please read [this](#). Now, I don't see how your version is clearer than mine, but I can see how yours is redundant. From [Wikipedia:Manual of Style/Lead section § First sentence](#):

Keep redundancy to a minimum in the first sentence. Use the first sentence of the article to provide relevant information that is not already given by the title of the article. The title of the article need not appear verbatim in the lead.

[wumbolo](#) ^{^^^} 14:02, 1 March 2018 (UTC)

[@Rockypedia](#): You literally have this on your user page: [Favorite word that I learned on Wikipedia: Concision](#) [wumbolo](#) ^{^^^} 14:04, 1 March 2018 (UTC)

Okay take it easy buddy. Researching my wikipedia background isn't going to win you any friend points. I was simply reverting the lead of the page to a version that had been stable and acceptable for a very long time, because the new version read very clunky and awkward. If you want the old version changed to "your" version (see [WP:OWN](#) please), then feel free to start an RfC about it, which I will happily join. Otherwise please respect the [WP:CYCLE](#) and accept the fact that your bold edit has been reverted. [Rockypedia](#) (talk) 14:06, 1 March 2018 (UTC)

I agree, the older version was better. --[I am One of Many](#) (talk) 14:43, 1 March 2018 (UTC)

[@Rockypedia](#): Can we go step by step? Do you really need "South Africa" mentioned *three* times in the sentence? [wumbolo](#) ^{^^^} 15:03, 1 March 2018 (UTC)

I looked at the first sentence based on this question, and while I was looking for a way to remove at least one "South Africa" or "African" from it, unfortunately the only options I came up with made the sentence more confusing/ambiguous. So, yes, I'd say leave it as is. [Rockypedia](#) (talk) 16:12, 1 March 2018 (UTC)

All of the mentions of "South Africa" appear to me essential to the meaning of the sentence. The first references the title of the article, the second is needed for a definite description of the farmers as South African and the third, is a definite description of the comparison group, all South Africans. So, I don't see any problem. --[I am One of Many](#) (talk) 16:39, 1 March 2018 (UTC)

When working on opening (well, actually the entire article, but particularly the opening) should keep in mind words to watch and adhere to [WP:SAID](#), avoiding words like "revealed" and "claimed" etc. --[DynaGirl](#) (talk) 00:32, 7 March 2018 (UTC)

Siener van Rensburg

Regarding this edit (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=South_African_farm_attacks&diff=832322867&oldid=832322760):

A couple of problems. The Archive.org page really doesn't appear to be a WP:RS at all, and it doesn't mention the farm attacks, making its use here WP:SYNTH. If their belief in the "prophesies" of Siener van Rensburg are absolutely vital to understanding these attacks, this should be directly supported by reliable sources. If only a single reliable source mentions this at all, why does it belong in the lede? The lede is a summary of the body, and if this isn't mentioned there, than overloading the lede with info is inappropriate. Grayfell (talk) 08:04, 25 March 2018 (UTC)

U.S. or Australia?

The source says, "There have been similar pushes for the United States to take in South African farmers, though they have failed to gain widespread attraction or political momentum. Critics say that the movement to take in white farmers has links to the far right, which have long spread the idea of a “white genocide” taking place in South Africa."

Park3r and I have been back and forth on this a couple of times. The question is whether the second sentence is referring to the far-right in the U.S. (mentioned in the preceding sentence or in Australia (most of the rest of the article.[1] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=South_African_farm_attacks&curid=2406568&diff=830821848&oldid=830821258))

I believe it refers to the U.S. for a couple of reasons. For openers, if the second sentence in that paragraph refers to Australia rather than the U.S., it is very poor style to Frankenstein the two sentences together into a pseudo-paragraph, discussing two distant but related ideas: 1) a push for the U.S. to take in farmers has no traction 2) a movement in Australia is connected to the far-right. (In fairness, it seems to be a far-right push with little traction in both countries.)

Park3r points out that the second sentence in the source links "take in white farmers" to this article (<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/mar/16/peter-duttons-offer-to-white-south-african-farmers-started-on-the-far-right>). IMO, this article strengthens the case for it referring to the U.S, as it is discussing the "white genocide" conspiracy theory. The second article's references to the supposed "white genocide" are:

- a change.org petition directed to U.S. president Trump
- a podcast from Michigan, U.S.[2] (<https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2013/07/02/white-rabbit-radio-font-racist-genocide-claims-run-michigander>)
- "This was the province of Stormfront five, 10 years ago, white genocide in South Africa..." (Stormfront is a U.S.-based hate site, founded by David Duke supporters.) - SummerPhD^{v2.0} 04:35, 17 March 2018 (UTC)

It's a minor point in the grand scheme of things. And this movement is transnational, especially in the internet era (it seems to have taken hold in the US, Australia and South Africa). I stand by my assertion, but I'm willing to allow for the location to be removed, or for the sentence to be reworded so the location becomes less important. Park3r (talk) 07:08, 17 March 2018 (UTC)

It's happening now with Trump's tweet. I suppose this page will get a lot more heated quite soon. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 66.141.235.58 (talk) 18:25, 23 August 2018 (UTC)

Mutilation and gang rape are often part of the Modus Operandi in the attacks against South African Farmers

I added mutilation and gang rape as part of the lead, because these forms of sadistic torture are part of the modus operandi of the attacks against South African farmers. Why do these facts get removed? TonyMorris68 (talk) 18:09, 23 August 2018 (UTC)

If there is a source for this being a general modus operandi i think it can go in the article body, but it is unnecessary detail in the lead. maunus · snunew · 07:01, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

Many of the female victims in the farm attacks are often sexually assaulted by the perpetrators, it is a well-known fact in these crimes, primarily because South Africa is considered to be one of the rape capitals of the world According to the Wiki article on rape in South Africa (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexual_violence_in_South_Africa.), "The rate of sexual violence in South Africa is among the highest in the world.[1]" TonyMorris68 (talk) 07:18, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

Which is not in anyway evidence that this is part of the MO of farm attacks. We need a source that says so. And no, wikipedia is not a reliable source. maunus · snunew · 07:22, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

Wikipedia is not a place for misogyny. The article on South Africa rape and it being one of the rape capitals of the world provides numerous sources for the rape epidemic there. Moreover, the reports of torture, mutilation and rape are very widespread concerning the South African farm attacks. No one disputes sexual assault, disfigurement of victims and sadistic torture often precedes the murders in these farm attacks. It is common knowledge. TonyMorris68 (talk) 07:57, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

Wikipedia does not deal in common knowledge unless it is sourceable to reliable sources. If it is so widespread as a part of farm attacks it should be an easy task to find one or more sources that state so. maunus · snunew · 08:41, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

How many articles do you want me to post supporting the notion of a rape epidemic in these farm attacks, there are hundreds of them. In an article by RT (2018), 'South Africa's white farmers reportedly being murdered & tortured off their land' (<https://www.rt.com/business/421562-africa-white-farmers-mudered/>) and concerning the South African government's reticence of the sadistic violence occurring in these crimes. Article Quote: AfriForum is trying to work with police and government to raise awareness.

"If we see a white farmer being tortured, being burned with torches or clothing irons, gang-raped, we don't see any focus on these cruel crimes," said Ian Cameron, head of AfriForum Community Safety. Cameron explained that the government views farm attacks as "normal" crime. "The cruelty that goes with farm attacks is disproportionate compared to other crime," he said. "An urban crime might last 10 minutes, but [on farms] people can be tortured for up to nine hours.". In many of the articles of about these attacks, where there are survivors, sexual assault is commonly discussed as part of the violence. Farmers in South Africa claim they are being targeted in 'horrific' attacks (<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/africa/south-africa-white-farmers-plaasmoorde-cyril-ramaphosa-anc-economic-freedom-fighters-gabriel-stols-a8262306.html>) survivor describes being gang-raped, a common theme in the news articles about survivors of these sadistic attacks. Article: Farmers wife shot, raped in front of 'wire

... tied' children, Hackney (<https://southafricatoday.net/south-africa-news/eastern-cape/farmers-wife-shot-raped-in-front-of-wire-tied-children-hackney/>) "During an attack at Heuningkloof farm in Hackney in the Eastern Cape on Friday evening 23 March 2018, a woman (44) was shot in the lower back and also raped in front of her young children." Another article from newsweek, [A WHITE FARMER IS KILLED EVERY FIVE DAYS IN SOUTH AFRICA AND AUTHORITIES DO NOTHING ABOUT IT, ACTIVISTS SAY](https://www.newsweek.com/white-farmer-killed-every-five-days-south-africa-authorities-do-nothing-851470) (<https://www.newsweek.com/white-farmer-killed-every-five-days-south-africa-authorities-do-nothing-851470>) Hanneljie Ludik, 56, from Pretoria, told the paper that three armed men broke into her family's house, stole money and raped her. South Africa farm attacks: Brutal crimes landowners face (<https://www.news.com.au/finance/economy/world-economy/south-africa-farm-attacks-brutal-crimes-landowners-face/news-story/dfaabafca743056b6d6656ea1fff49eb>) "South African farmers have been subjected to an escalating campaign of attacks characterised by extreme brutality, rape and torture, with 82 people killed in a record 423 incidents last year." 'Bury them alive!': White South Africans fear for their future as horrific farm attacks escalate (<https://www.news.com.au/finance/economy/world-economy/bury-them-alive-white-south-africans-fear-for-their-future-as-horrific-farm-attacks-escalate/news-story/3a63389a1b0066b6b0b77522c06d6476>) "NEARLY every day, horrific acts of rape, torture and murder are carried out on a community under siege. WARNING: Graphic." and "Victims are often restrained, harmed with weapons such as machetes and pitchforks, burned with boiling water or hot irons, dragged behind vehicles and shot. Female victims are often raped during attacks." I think the intended goal to keep out the prevalence of sexual violence from the lede is misogynistic and Wikipedia is not a place for misogyny. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 20:08, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

Tump covfefe

I've tagged that section with {{Contradict|date=August 2018}} <!-- August 20 2018 --> "The [[South Africa|South African]] government begins the process of seizing land from white farm owners. [https://www.nzherald.co.nz/world/news/article.cfm?c_id=2&objectid=12110366 (NZ Herald)]" --> from Wiki's own newspaper as it's making news that Trump did not initiate or pull from thin air.--[Kintetsubuffalo](#) (talk) 15:44, 25 August 2018 (UTC)

Basic Capitalization Grammar

I am One of Many, The words white or black, should be capitalized when referring to people. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 01:47, 25 August 2018 (UTC)

Some sources used in this article follow this convention, and some do not. Neither white people nor black people (for example) capitalize these terms. South African sources do not universally capitalize the terms, so WP:ENGVAR doesn't seem to apply. Since this is a stylistic concern, consistency within Wikipedia should not be ignored either. [Grayfell](#) (talk) 02:08, 25 August 2018 (UTC)

Do you have a source on Wikipedia for determining whether to capitalize or not? For instance, I would use Jewish instead of jewish when describing people. According to

APA, racial and ethnic groups are designated by proper nouns and are capitalized: Black and White. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 02:12, 25 August 2018 (UTC)

I do not know of such a resource. [Thembu](#), [Tamil](#), [Afrikaners](#), [Greek](#)... these should be capitalized, but "black" and "white" are not always capitalized by reliable sources, and it is these sources Wikipedia uses. Note that "Black South African" redirects to [Bantu peoples in South Africa](#), which demonstrates how important context is when trying to tackle these issues.

I do not think everyone who capitalizes black and white is wrong to do so, but I think it is outdated. Reducing entire peoples to only a handful of simplistic categories and then treating these categories as special is a relic of [scientific racism](#), and should be discarded. Again, I don't think every source which capitalizes is racist, but if sources are doing this merely because of habit or inertia, that's a sign it's time to update. [Grayfell](#) (talk) 03:11, 25 August 2018 (UTC)

Did I understand you correctly that you're asserting the issue of whether or not to capitalize words used to describe common racial designations is a form of scientific racism?! Please, can we please have a civil discussion about capitalization grammar without trying to racialize it with accusations of bigotry and prejudice? All, I'm asking for is a direct source on Wikipedia which provides guidelines on when to capitalize a word or not, this doesn't need to devolve into a discussion about pseudo-scientific racism. It is my understanding that broadly defined racial groups, Arabs, Hispanic, Asian, Jewish, Black and White, are capitalized as proper nouns and nouns due to mostly common cultural, genetic and even geographical locations. When I looked up the issue on the Internet the APA stated White and Black should be capitalized when referring to people. Now going back to the race issue, but trying to be more objective, the reason I believe we should capitalize white and black, is because race advocacy websites often capitalize one word to the detriment of another. To quote Merrill Perlman: A website originally registered to the man accused in the Charleston killings, Dylann Roof, capitalizes "White," but not "black," as do many other white supremacist sites. Publications aimed at blacks often capitalize "Black," but not "white," and there are strong feelings that "Black" should be capitalized...some have argued that "Black" and "White" should both be capitalized, the way Asian, Hispanic, Arab, etc. are. DiversityInc. has a column called "Ask the White Guy," and in 2009 its author, Luke Visconti, explained, "Why the 'B' in 'Black' Is Capitalized at DiversityInc." His reasoning, in part, is that "Our capitalization of 'Black' is both a reflection of reality and of respect" (Merril Perlman, Columbia Journalism Review). Would it be better if I went back to the references, and looked to see whether or not they capitalize the words or not. It seems disrespectful to not capitalize hispanic or black when it refers to Black people or Hispanic people. I'm trying to be racially sensitive to spelling, and not depreciating Black people by lowercasing the word black. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 03:40, 25 August 2018 (UTC)

You seem to be conflating ethnicity and race. The former uses proper nouns. While I prefer capitalized racial categories, it's not what wikipedia does. [EvergreenFir](#) (talk) 03:54, 25 August 2018 (UTC)

- Ah yes, "accusations". I twice said, in a single paragraph, that not everyone who capitalizes these terms is wrong or racist, and only that we should consider updating our language. It's not possible to discuss this issue without "racializing" it, because it is a question about race in

an article about race and racism. [Grayfell \(talk\)](#) 04:10, 25 August 2018 (UTC)

Historically, neither "white" nor "black" have been capitalized in this article. Also, as I stated in my edit summary, for some reason, "white" was capitalized more often than "black", which suggests possible [WP:POV](#) in the original efforts to capitalize. Finally, this article has had a long history of problematic edits. Indeed, several years ago, I was outed on the [Stormfront \(website\)](#) for my efforts to remove bias from this article.--[I am One of Many \(talk\)](#) 04:24, 26 August 2018 (UTC)

Wikipedia is not a place for your racism and bigotry. Historically bad grammar is still bad grammar, whether some words are lower case and others aren't. Neo-Nazi, White supremacist websites, usually spell Black people, as black people, it is meant to depreciate them, as if they are not worthy of capitalization respecting a proper noun or proper name. You are engaging in racism by spelling Blacks as lowercase "blacks". Please stop dehumanizing people of African descent. [TonyMorris68 \(talk\)](#) 05:34, 26 August 2018 (UTC)

[@TonyMorris68](#), be careful with the unwarranted personal attacks. By the way, you were the one that repeatedly reverted to a version with "white" always capitalized and "black" capitalizes only a few times. I agree that Neo-Nazi and white supremacist websites like to capitalize "white". Wikipedia is not a Neo-Nazi or white supremacist website, and so don't engage in such garbage.--[I am One of Many \(talk\)](#) 21:28, 26 August 2018 (UTC)

retake land?

"Some South African blacks have sought to retake land which they have made claims to". Retake, really? Can this be more biased? When did they own it in the first place? Second, even if they (blacks) had is it the same owner or its descendant? Most certainly is not! — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [93.142.87.34 \(talk\)](#) 08:23, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

Is the Wikipedia article, South African Farm Attacks, devolving into an activist editor political racewar?

Conversation continues on reddit. [Drmies \(talk\)](#) 14:32, 28 August 2018 (UTC)

*The following discussion has been closed. **Please do not modify it.***

Is it time to lock this article? Is it time to get major admin overview and control established here? This article is devolving into a vicious circus sideshow, it's like watching patriot prayer fighting a street battle with Antifa. This article is becoming a kind of Charlottesville Riot 2.0. It is so racially charged now, that we are going to need it closely monitored and the activist editors put on close watch.

There seems to be a problem brewing with this article in an explosive way, with left-wing anti-White racist activist editors trying to downplay the violence against these White South African farmers, especially with the relentless effort to erase sexual assault, rape, mutilation and torture from the lead. I added rape to the murder part in the lead and it keeps getting deleted. I provided articles above in another talk section about these attacks also involving rape, and undoubtedly this is being done as a form of terrorism to frighten the White South African farmers. Most leads of articles don't always put sources and references, this is a fact in many articles. I provided sources however to talk section above.

I'm becoming very concerned that the complicated issue of White farmers being the overwhelmingly targeted in these racist and terrorist farm attacks is being suppressed by Wikipedia activist-editors who are playing partisan politics and trying to control the narrative. I think we should put a lock on the article immediately and get a team of admins to watch this article closely. It seems as if it's being racialized with accusations that it's a kind of Nazi talking point to indicate that it is white south African farmers who are the super majority of the victims. This is very insulting to Jews, that people are surreptitiously trying to nazify anyone who helps to expand the article in a fair and balanced way. These (white and black) farmers are being tortured, raped, mutilated, murdered and it's clear the violence is being done as a form of terrorism. It looks like we have Antifa, Left-wingers and pro-Communists trying to control this article and make it seem like only extremists are bringing up the fact this is all very clearly primarily targeting european south africans. Please call in a team of admins, this article needs meticulous monitoring. I don't like seeing all the racism in this article, especially the false accusations of smearing people White Nationalism over these talking points. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 03:02, 28 August 2018 (UTC)

um... [WP:BATTLEGROUND](#) and [WP:NPOV](#) apply to everyone. If you think a specific editor is violating that, go to [WP:ANI](#). But to me your language suggests you yourself have a strong POV on this topic already... please tone down the polemics [EvergreenFir](#) (talk) 03:45, 28 August 2018 (UTC)

I agree, [TonyMorris68](#) you appear to be pushing a white-nationalist POV in the language you are using, which comes straight from white nationalists. I strongly suggest you back away from editing this article.--[I am One of Many](#) (talk) 03:58, 28 August 2018 (UTC)

As the grandson of Holocaust survivors I find it vicious and disgusting that you two (and others) obvious racist, bigoted, prejudiced anti-White, pro-Communist activist editors would even dare try to accuse me pushing a White nationalist POV. It is an indisputable fact the land redistribution laws are aimed at mostly White south Africans, and that has nothing to do with White nationalism. It is an indisputable fact that the attacks against these White South Africans are being done as a form of extreme terrorism to send a message and ethnically cleanse them more broadly, while these people are being raped, mutilated, tortured, and murdered in cold blood. It's obvious your agenda is to suppress, downplay, censor what's really going on in this article, you make every effort to do so and I think it's time this article get LOCKED and team of admins closely monitor this article with an electron microscope, because your political agenda is very clear. I've seen the edit warring and revert warring going on with this article. It's clear the pro-communist and antifa crowd, want to control the narrative and smear people as White nationalists, even the grandson of Holocaust survivors, who don't push their political agenda. It's TIME TO LOCK THIS ARTICLE. I'm calling right now for it to be locked and for the anti-White and pro-communist activists editors to be closely monitored here. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 07:03, 28 August 2018 (UTC)

This message is not helpful in the least. Your "indisputable facts" are not in fact supported by reliable sources, but largely contradicted by them. There is one editor here with an obvious agenda, and that is you, regardless of any of your

grandparents experiences. Literally every single sentence in the above post is couched in white nationalist rhetorics and talking points. [maunus](#) · [snunew](#) · 07:45, 28 August 2018 (UTC)

Wow, I want to remain neutral in this. but this talk page is getting pretty charged, I was the one that made the statement about what Carlson said on fox, and the night I wrote it he did one show with no segment on it, and the next day stories pop up in my feed that say he "backed-down" even though the segment I mentioned actually provided more evidence.

Also, while I may be a conservative, I am not racist, and am also still in my middle school years. is it not sad that we have to be politically active at this age? hence I take this header title at great offense, I know well enough that editing should be kept to a minimum, after all wikipedia says, that the information has to be credible and verifiable. — Preceding unsigned comment added by [Billster156234781](#) (talk · [contribs](#)) 21:28, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

Journeyman documentary about South African farm murders

I added an external links section and started it with a documentary. [How Long Will The White Farmers Of South Africa Survive?](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u71xPaIyF8k) (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u71xPaIyF8k>) Documentary by Journeyman Pictures. Please feel free to add other external links. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 05:29, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

First, Wikipedia articles are not repositories for links, and the one linked here, which lean white-nationalist is not acceptable.--[I am One of Many](#) (talk) 06:17, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

Please stop edit warring. Never implied Wikipedia was a repository for links. When someone talks about their family being murdered, it doesn't make them a White Nationalist. The video was relevant to the events going on in South Africa, as conflict escalates. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 06:33, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

When a link is challenged it stays out until there is a consensus for inclusion. [maunus](#) · [snunew](#) · 07:23, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

Do you have a source for that? Shall we take it to the resolution board?
[TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 07:56, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

Feel free to take it wherever you like. just don't editwar to put in external links without being supported by a consensus of editos on the talkpage. [maunus](#) · [snunew](#) · 08:42, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

I brought up the documentary hear for discussion, so lets discuss this documentary. Does it provide fair and balanced insight about the situation in South Africa to warrant it's inclusion? The documentary seems to be non-biased. Are there Wiki guidelines about adding external links? I know Wiki is not a link repository, but some external links provide contextualization. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 05:36, 26 August 2018 (UTC)

It's a youtube video. Even if it isn't some piece of white nationalist twaddle, it's still not a reliable source. [Simonm223](#) (talk) 18:13, 31 August 2018 (UTC)

South African Farmlands Documentary by Lauren Southern

Would like to discuss the addition of the documentary by Lauren Southern known as, "Farmlands" (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a_bDc7FfItk&t=764s) 2018 documentary about South African farm land confiscation to external links in the article. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 06:39, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

Wikipedia isn't in the habit of adding links to videos by alt-right activists ... please see [WP:EL.EvergreenFir](#) (talk) 07:14, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

The documentary seemed to take more of an alt-left or left leaning position that the accusations of genocide were overblown, that it was more an epidemic of racial violence, not a race war. The documentary also appeared to talk with people of all color and on all sides of the issue, including government officials who were seeking to change the laws of the country/constitution. Many Africans had the opportunity to voice with clarity their positions on bridging the economic inequality with land reform/redistribution. Which seems fair. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 07:46, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

[Alt-left](#) isn't a thing. Regardless, it runs afoul of [WP:ELPOV](#). [EvergreenFir](#) (talk) 15:18, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

If the documentary was alt-right, at least it would have some significance, but right now, it's basically "I don't know anything and here's a handful of interviews with the victims' families". The "External links" section is a part of the encyclopedia, and it should contain links to knowledge, not videos without even speculation. [wumbolo](#) ^^ 18:43, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

The documentary gives voices to people on all sides of the discussion, Black, White, those creating the land reappropriation laws and those suffering from them, including voices from those cleaning up the massacres of South African farmers. The documentary appears to give all sides an opportunity to voice their opinions. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 19:36, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

A bunch of opinions don't add much value. [wumbolo](#) ^^ 19:47, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

Wumbolo, I pretty much agree with your assessment of the video, it provides no information. I do think it is highly biased toward the white-South African farmers since it uncritically focuses on them. South Africa is very complex, which is the more reason to keep this article as neutral as possible and stick as closely as we can to reliable sources. --[I am One of Many](#) (talk) 21:29, 24 August 2018 (UTC)

On what basis should we determine whether a documentary provides information on the highly complex SA Farmland murders? [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 00:06, 25 August 2018 (UTC)

Reliable sources? has it been favorably reviewed? [.maunus](#) · [snunew](#) · 07:21, 25 August 2018 (UTC)

LOL. You expect the brainwashed anti-white swine that edit this "encyclopedia" to include this documentary? The "alt-right" aren't a "reliable source", for some unexplained reason. The giant cultural Marxist shit that's become the excuse for Western academia is however, again for some unexplained reason. [146.255.14.121](#) (talk) 09:02, 26 August 2018 (UTC)

Hey that's totally unacceptable calling Wikipedia editor's swine. Go take a long hike and chill out. Meditate on this: do you think you're ever going to convince people of your political position, desire to contribute or concerns, by equating them with the filthiest of unkosher domesticated farm animals? Do you think that kind of verbal strategy is going to appeal to someone's reason, commonsense, fair-mindedness or logic? Try to learn how to make your case and point, without resorting to 8th-grade playground bullying tactics. Why the IP address? Do you not even know the Wikipedia basics of signing up and reading the rules for participating in a dignified manner? I know this subject about terrorism against South African farm owners and workers is very contentious and controversial, and many of the editors seem to have alt-left activist political agendas here, but would you please mind keeping it calm, cool and civil to a great degree, without invoking dehumanizing pejoratives like "swine", which are obviously unproductive. Do you think you are going to get a consensus amongst the anti-Boer / pro-communist activist editors who dominate this article here by calling them pigs?! Not a chance, troll! Wikipedia is not a place to vent frustrated emotions. If you have reliable news article links to back up your position then present them here, but throwing ad hominem personal attacks is not going to fly here at all. Put up or shut up. In other words, don't come back until you have something intelligent and productive to provide here in the form of research, scholarship, reliable news articles, etc... In the meantime, I hope someone bans your IP address. [TonyMorris68](#) (talk) 10:22, 26 August 2018 (UTC)

Lauren Southern is not a reliable source. [Simonm223](#) (talk) 18:13, 31 August 2018 (UTC)

Announcement

I have notified dispute resolution, please remember to stay civil.[Billster156234781](#) (talk) 18:11, 31 August 2018 (UTC)

And you did not file it correctly. [funplussmart](#) (talk) 00:03, 2 September 2018 (UTC)

title redacted - A dispute

The user D.Creish mass-removed reliably sourced content about Tucker Carlson and Trump's rhetoric on discrimination against South African [white] farmers, and completely misrepresented what Trump said and whether it was factually correct or not^[3] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=South_African_farm_attacks&type=revision&diff=856842545&oldid=856841330). The user stalked me to this page (never edited it before), just as he stalked me to another page yesterday (where the user also mass-removed reliably sourced content). The content should be restored immediately. [Snooganssnoogans](#) (talk) 21:36, 27 August 2018 (UTC)

Please remove the PAs. I restored a version that had been basically stable for a few days (although I removed a copyrighted youtube clip of the Tucker Carlson show.) What about the current version "misrepresents" what Trump said? [D.Creish](#) (talk) 21:41, 27 August 2018 (UTC)

Trump talked about land seizures AND widespread killings. There were literally more than half-a-dozen high-quality RS that debunked Trump's statements, which you of course did not feel that it was pertinent to mention that. [Snooganssnoogans](#) (talk) 21:54, 27 August 2018 (UTC)

Most of those sources were good. If you can use them neutrally minding BLP go ahead. [D.Creish](#) (talk) 21:56, 27 August 2018 (UTC)

"most of those sources are good" are you sure about that? NBC would be considered a biased source by anyone in their right mind. also tucker (who I watch on fox news frequently) came back to this subject after trumps statement, and showed video of the leader of the african national congress, stating in a speech "let's wipe this whiteness from our land", basically the ANC leader is endorsing the seizure and killing. thats racism if I have ever saw it, and im not for racism of any kind. — Preceding unsigned comment added by Billster156234781 (talk • contribs) 22:13, 27 August 2018 (UTC)

I would like to clarify, just in case that sounded like a personal attack. I tend to write very informally, and also have a strong conservative opinion, which I feel bars me from making edits on very controversssial subjects such as this. Think of it like me failing a jury test for a hypothetical trial on this subject. What I meant by "anyone in right mind" was that everyone knows that everyone but FOX an OAN are always saying something bad about trump and his agenda, and in doing so disqualify them from being reliable sources (or at least put a limit) on the subject of trump, or anything he gets involved in. Because they will oppose all his viewpoints as well. This can easily be proven by watching FOX for a day (the national not the local), and then the next day, watching another "mainstream" channel like (MS)NBC, CNN, CBS, ABC. Now not to say that they only say ill things about trump, but watch MSNBC and tell me its an RS. The bias is so huge that you need a heckuva lotta salt to take with it. So Creish, I am sorry if I offended you, but I just wanted to make clear where i'm coming from.Billster156234781 (talk) 18:04, 3 September 2018 (UTC)

It's even worse than that. Malema said he would "cut the throat of whiteness" [4] (<https://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/we-are-cutting-the-throat-of-whiteness-malema-on-plans-to-remove-trollip-20180304>) and led a group in singing "kill the Boer".[5] (<https://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/Malema-charged-over-kill-the-boer-20100310>) He also has a crazy conspiracy theory that "Jews" are training white snipers to kill EFF members [6] (<https://www.thesouthafrican.com/julius-malema-jewish-snipers-comments/>) This section needs a serious rebalance. D.Creish (talk) 22:29, 27 August 2018 (UTC)

User Snooganssnoogans just edited the page to add back the words "false narrative" and "pushing right wing talking points" to describe Tucker Carlson's segment. I don't give a crap about the politics of all of this, but you can't just add loaded terms and value judgements into a wikipedia article like that. Even the White Genocide wikipedia page doesn't label it as 'false' since wikipedia is never supposed to take a stance on political issues. Can't something be done to prevent politically motivated users like Snooganssnoogans from adding their value judgements to pages like this? — Preceding unsigned comment added by Grobtak (talk • contribs) 11:25, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

The language mirrors those of RS. Snooganssnoogans (talk) 11:36, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

are we encyclopedia or are we "RS"?
WP:EDITORIALIZING. wumbolo ^^ 11:42, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

Easy. We're an encyclopedia based on RSEs.
[Volunteer Marek](#) 13:41, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

This has nothing to do with language or tone. You are explicitly labelling an idea as 'false' which you are very definitely not allowed to do. This is equivalent to editing the page on the Republican party and changing it to "the racist republican party" and then defending your action by linking to a source that calls them racist. You can quote someone else calling them racist, but you cannot declare it as truth. Do you understand? [Grobtak](#) —Preceding [undated](#) comment added 14:09, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

The sources don't even use that language in this case. [wumbolo](#) [^^^](#) 14:11, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

That's a blatant lie. You cry and moan about an encyclopedia basing content on reliable sources but can't even be bothered to read what the RS say?
[Snooganssnoogans](#) [\(talk\)](#) 14:14, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

- [@Snooganssnoogans](#): I didn't notice that I reverted content about white genocide in general, but none of the sources support your version of what **Carlson** did. And stop your bad faith assumptions. [wumbolo](#) [^^^](#) 14:18, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- This is not the first time that you misrepresent what sources clearly say and try instead to whitewash fringe content or introduce fringe spin. If you can't be bothered to read RS, and opt instead for edit-warring and requesting that others to waste their time reading and quoting the sources that you refuse to read, then you're going to be called out on it. [Snooganssnoogans](#) [\(talk\)](#) 14:25, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- [\(edit conflict\)](#) See [WP:ONUS](#). Before reverting you, I looked through each of the three sources cited directly after the sentence about Carlson. *Not one* of them supported your version. I'm not sure how I can be "called out" on expecting editors to review sources before restoring their version of the article. And now you accuse *me* of OR? **This is not the first time** well it's *your third*. [wumbolo](#) [^^^](#) 14:32, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- That's a misapplication of [WP:ONUS](#). It's not a carte blanche for editors who can't be bothered to read what sources say and seem openly hostile to Wikipedia's [WP:RS](#) policy delete things they disagree with. [Snooganssnoogans](#) [\(talk\)](#) 14:36, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- Now that you've used up your three reverts, you resort to [personal attacks](#)? I will no longer respond to this thread. [wumbolo](#) [^^^](#) 14:39, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- For Pete's sake, stop with the personal vendettas. If you want to mention that e.g. the New York times declares White genocide to be false, write up a version that quotes them as saying so. That is allowed under wikipedia's neutral POV (though it's still questionable if you use quotes to push your own narrative). Just don't lead

with "THIS IDEA IS FALSE AND PROMOTED BY RIGHT WINGERS". That's not allowed. Grobtak —Preceding undated comment added 14:29, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

- No, we stick to what RS say and it's perfectly fine to say it in Wiki voice. It's been made clear again and again on page after page that we do not need to say "News outlets ABCDEFGH have described this as false". We can simply say "This is false". Snooganssnoogans (talk) 14:36, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- That's only true for factual, verifiable matters. Not for stances on political issues. No matter how many times the mainstream media calls Trump a racist, you are not allowed to edit his page to say "Trump is racist". You are allowed to say that he is "controversial" and that "some sources denounce him as racist", but you cannot call him a racist. Nor are you allowed to say "Trump falsely claims that white people are under attack", since that's a matter of interpretation. Now, if "White Genocide" were to literally mean "there is a genocide happening in South Africa right now", then you would be in the right. But "a false narrative is being pushed by right wingers" fails all standards of neutral POV and all the reliable sourcing in the world won't change that. Grobtak —Preceding undated comment added 15:15, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- Which RS have described Trump as a "racist" in their news reporting? Snooganssnoogans (talk) 15:18, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

The way it was put in seems to have an issue with WP:LABEL and WP:EDITORIAL. There should be a way to do it a bit better. PackMecEng (talk) 15:25, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

- There was a lot of that after the "shithole countries" comment: <https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/show-me/video/trump-racist-media-calls-out-president-1136969283704> That's not the relevant point here though. Grobtak —Preceding undated comment added 16:07, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- Joy Reid's show is not a RS. Your point was that "RS" were calling Trump a racist, and that this somehow shows that RS are incendiary and unreliable, and that we have to attribute claims to "RS" as if they were biases and opinionated and subject to WP:ATTRIBUTEPOV. Snooganssnoogans (talk) 16:50, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- The clip discusses the fact that mainstream newspapers were calling Trump racist. Anyway, you missed my point. I was telling you that Wikipedia does not allow you to use sources to dodge Wikipedia's neutral POV requirements. As an example of that, you cannot use the NYT calling Trump's Africa remarks racist as an excuse to edit his page to say "Trump is a racist". This has absolutely nothing to do with whether the NYT is biased or whether Trump is, in fact, a racist. Also, in relation to the objection made by the last reverter: It's kind of weird calling White

Genocide "Fringe" while at the same time claiming that the President of the United States publicly defends it. Take one or the other, you can't have both. Grobtak —Preceding undated comment added 18:36, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

- I'm not going to watch a talk show video. If the NYT called Trump racist, link to the NYT piece. If the NYT and other reliable sources describe someone or something as racist, then yes, it's fine to add it. In fact, the Steve King lede does say in Wiki voice that King has made racist comments *because that's what RS say*. Snooganssnoogans (talk) 18:41, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- This is a strange edit[7] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=South_African_farm_attacks&type=revision&diff=857126015&oldid=857108833). For two reasons: (1) The text does not say this is fringe. (2) RS do say it's fringe[8] (<https://www.cnn.com/2018/08/23/nw-trump-is-having-a-twitter-spat-with-south-africa-over-land-reforms.html>). Bizarre edit summary. Snooganssnoogans (talk) 19:12, 29 August 2018 (UTC)
- I'll say this, I find it odd that Grobtak comes straight to this obscure talk page (after not editing since March 1, 2018) to push an agenda similar to TonyMorris68, who was indefinitely blocked yesterday. I hope this is just a highly improbable coincidence.--I am One of Many (talk) 21:26, 29 August 2018 (UTC)

I am going to create a separate Wikipedia talk page where we can continue this discussion. can we all agree that this article's talk page should only be filled with edit requests, not this dispute. I will copy and past the dispute section into this talk page. when it is complete I will submit the link.Billster156234781 (talk) 19:51, 30 August 2018 (UTC)

Just looked at the article guide, and it says the article has to be notable. Would my idea be notable? I will check back in a hour to see what reponse I get. Billster156234781 (talk) 20:03, 30 August 2018 (UTC)

Intl reaction/white genocide should be merged

As a matter of common domestic crime, this issue creates little interest on the international level. The only measurable international responses to this issue as far as I can see are in response to the charges of conspiracy. The section regarding statements made by foreign figures should be included in the discussion about the white genocide conspiracy theory as they have no other stake in this. By separating "international reactions" (to the conspiracy theory) from the conspiracy theory itself, it feels that the article is inadvertently giving more credence and undue weight to this part of the topic. Ham Pastrami (talk) 22:34, 19 September 2018 (UTC)

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:South_African_farm_attacks/Archive_3&oldid=905832688"

This page was last edited on 11 July 2019, at 18:51 (UTC).

Text is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License; additional terms may apply. By using this site, you agree to the Terms of Use and Privacy Policy. Wikipedia® is a registered trademark of the Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization.