# My thoughts on where the Nation of South Africa is headed in July 2014.

Yes a woeful situation indeed.

The great rainbow nation is going red. What we see unfolding before us is nothing other than the establishment of a communist state in Africa. The reaction of most to this statement is one of "isn't that an exaggeration?" Hopefully my reply may well give you some insight into what is truly driving this chain of events.

In the 1<sup>st</sup> post-apartheid election the Communist party failed dismally to capture the imagination of the electorate, and neither did the PAC that offered a slightly more palatable version in the form of National Socialism. The leader of that momentous occasion –Nelson Mandela- stood for a free South Africa, where potential prosperity and the freedom of creative expression was made available to all South Africans.

In the last election the Communist Party they did not even compete. From the outside it appears that the nation of South Africa is not interested in the State owning all production resources —that is after all what Communism fundamentally amounts to. South Africans were not interested in giving up their hard earned right to be free in exchange for the National Government owning everything on their behalf. At the core of every African is the belief is that he is master of his own destiny. We are merchants by heart, love our cattle and our land, and are proud of our people's ability to survive oppression.

The African has survived being stripped of his dignity and freedom. Be it by Colonialism, or by the misguided policies of Apartheid. The latter being nothing more than the Puritanical zeal of a few fanatics who saw their mission as a God ordained right to take possession of the legacy of other South Africans. South Africans have long struggled to be free to own their production resources. To be their own masters and own their own land. To boldly take up both the responsibility, and the opportunities, that being stewards of their own destiny offered.

## Then the rainbow nation began to blush.....

With the 20 years that followed, the ANC government experienced two forces that began to shape its future.... Firstly the task of filling the shoes of Nelson Mandela proved too much for the party leadership. The quality of leadership became progressively worse, and the squabbles for power became more and more disturbing. Secondly the lack of leadership opened the door for a lack of vision. The biblical version being "For lack of vision, my people will perish", or in a more secular expression...." If you don't believe in something your will eventually believe in anything". The politicians of the day became infatuated with the ideology of Communism. The idea that the ultimate answer to their ineffectual contribution to birthing the new rainbow nation, was to take up total bureaucratic power. To take possession of all productive resources, and coerce the nation into becoming a more egalitarian society —or at least what they believed to be ideal.

Slowly but surely the "simple solution" became more and more appealing to our poorly led and vision starved politicians –nationalise everything and thereby make all citizens equal. Today it is believed that 60% of the cabinet are card holding member of the communist party. The thought of having all production resources under their control is extremely tantalizing – the promises of

power and untold wealth has become the vision of a leadershipless bureaucracy. Leadership through force is always more appealing than leadership through sacrifice.

Let's look at the track record of the last 20 years when it comes to the freedom to own production resources....

A grand housing project to house the nation in "acceptable" houses was launched, and indeed many acceptable homes were built. The only problem is that almost none of them went with right and title! The populace was being housed in homes paid for by the taxes of the wealthy and owned by the government. No right and title means; I cannot build up wealth, I cannot raise a loan to educate my child, I cannot sell my home and buy another in an area where I desire to live in order to exploit an employment opportunity that has presented itself. I believe that I am "lucky" to have this house given to me by such a caring government. I am simply a tenant in a house that someone else owns.

Because of a legacy of never being allowed to own anything, many have yet to see that their house belongs to the State and not to them. They have yet to comprehend that this is not freedom, but a very seductive form of enslavement –not very much different to the legacy of colonialism or apartheid.

For every home "given away" many queue in the hope of also getting a 'free' home too. The government has affectively duped the average South African into believing this is freedom, and in so doing captured their political loyalty. The truth however looks something quite different.

Writing as a farmer in this country, I have 3 categories of employee working in my organization. Firstly we have the tribal man, then the landless local family, and finally the foreigner.

#### The Tribal Man.

This man has access to land in a tribal homeland. His family may well have had access to these productive agricultural resources for generations, but better employment opportunities have presented themselves elsewhere, and he has moved away from these resources. The tribal system is nothing more than Feudalism (A social system where the common man cannot own production resources). The Count –or "Padrone" as my grandfather would have said- owned everything. He grants you access to resources if you are physically there to contribute.

Now in a free society, the employee in question would have been able to sell his house there, and buy a new house closer to his place of employment. This man cannot! The only options open to him are, to leave his wife and children behind —and in so doing leave his home fatherless- or take his family with him and become a landless sojourner. Now it is this man that arrives on your farm hoping to be "housed" as he has made the decision to keep his family with him while he embraces this perceived better future for his household.

The farmer he approaches is helpless to influence his predicament, and willingly offers what he has. How unfair on both these men. How short-sighted of a government to have left intact —for 20 years- a feudal system that holds free men in the bondage of being denied the opportunity to own land. The prospect of being housed by his employer can only be a short term solution. The worker still has no rights of ownership, and has simply changed one feudal lord for another -his chief for the farmer who employs him.

Once again a feudal type arrangement –"The Count owns everything and he grants you access to resource if you are there to contribute".....nothing has changed! Now for whatever reason when he ceases to be employed by the farmer, he is asked to leave. (The farmer has to give the house to the new employee taking his place who is also landless). The government has given this process a wonderfully deceptive name- a "farm eviction". The fact that it is an expression that masks the failure of government to address this issue of the right of tenure for farm workers in farming areas. This truth is deliberately avoided and concealed from general public understanding. Instead of solving problems, government fuels old racial paradigms and vilifies farmers claiming that they are responsible for this man's predicament.

The attentive reader may well argue that perhaps if the farmer paid better wages the employee could afford his own home. Fair enough let us consider this observation....

Many farm workers are earning good salaries (R15000 /month and more) yet still have no prospects of owning their own home. The case of applying for a government house is denied to them as the qualification criteria state that **their salaries are too high** —not forgetting that they would not get right and title with an RDP house even if they got access to one. The case of buying a residence is also denied to them by the agricultural land act that forbids the subdivision of agricultural land, so there are no residential titles available to them.

The only other option open to them, is that they can purchase a farm, which is not affordable, or even desirable, to a professional person who has no desire to be a farmer. After all just because a man or woman sells his/her skills as a driver, or artisan, or agronomist, or clerk to a farmer does not imply that s/he desires to farm. An interesting observation is that government stubbornly fails to see that people employed on farms are not farmers, they are professional people marketing their skills. Pretty much the same argument that a receptionist in a dentist's consulting rooms is not a dentist. The bottom line is that even with a good salary this man cannot house his family and own ground in a rural area. This tribal man has two rather miserable options; live in a squatter-camp, or live like a feudal serf on the employers ground.

Is this really the lot of a free men? A man who earns well for his household, a man who's forefathers has struggled through centuries of oppression, a man who has voted for a government who promised him the freedom to be able to better his lot and hopefully own his own home. So how then does this government respond? Do we give tenure right in the feudal homelands so that he can sell his ground and move on? He could then after all simply spend the proceeds on a house closer to his new place of employment.

Such a simple right, and a right taken so for granted by the privileged few who can buy and sell their homes on a whim. My mother-in-law has to spend six months in the tribal area, where her family comes from, and six months here on the farm to see her grandchildren. She does this as she has lost her husband, and has only one daughter. If she failed to return, the chief would then —after a grace period- be obliged to grant tenant rights to someone else, and she would be left without access to this land. Land that has been with her family for generations. I wonder if the bureaucrats that rule still have any personal issues with feudal oppression, but then keeping a "Rural Count" on your side always goes a long way to win votes. Why bother, it's so much easier just to scapegoat the farmer.

How then does the government of the day accommodate the dire shortage for small titles in rural areas? For one it incentivises land owners to consolidate smaller titles into more "economical agricultural units". It forbids the subdivision of titles —by law- for the purpose of catering for the needs of those wishing to own homes in rural areas. It forbids the construction of more than one home on a title. It initiates projects that promote feudalism by sponsoring ventures where farm workers get shares in the farm, and the farmer is expected to build multiple labour homes on the farm. It enthusiastically promotes these share deals of farm co-ownership, even calling for employees to receive voting rights on the decision making body of a family farm.

Imagine this man having to sit in on a meeting discussing the intricacies of running an agricultural concern, when all he wanted was to be able to get a good salary for his professional skills, support his family, educate his children, and own his own home.... Something that so many people just take for granted in their lives. Imagine being this rural man; stepping out of the board room, to go "home" a pretty little cottage that does not belong to him, and then he is told this is freedom!

To the average uninformed urban man, this humane option of sharing land with the landless may seem to hold some credibility. But pray tarry a while, put yourself in the worker's position for a moment, stop and think. The worker is there to get the best offer for his professional skills. The day will come when a better job offer will arise, and he will want to move on. Can he sell his house? Can he force his landlord to pay him out? When this rural man choses to improve his lot, and take up a better employment opportunity on the neighbouring farm, he must still bow to the feudal laws that his government has created around him. He loses his 'pretty cottage' and must resign from the decision making body of the farm. He steps away from the farm to approach his new feudal master to ask if he can have a 'house' with the job, and the *cycle of indifference* begins all over again.

Now how does the government react? It accuses the employer of having a bad racial attitude, and blames the departure of this man on a legacy of abuse and labour instability -so typical of farms. Stereotyped thinking that is perpetuated by the media and swallowed by the general urban population of this country. The fact that urban jobs are faced with a similar level of labour mobility is simply not perceived.

The fact is that he is a tenant on a piece of land owned by another –the farmer and the government, for it was the government after all who paid for his cottage. His lot has not changed one little bit, he is still a landless man looking for the right to own his own home!

How insensitive has government become? They tell him this is the solution to his dream, or has this rural man become their pawn? Surely he has become the excuse used by government to conceal their own communist agenda to take possession of the nation's land resources? Was that what he voted this government into power for? Did this man expect that his government would make him an instrument of their abuse, lie to him, and tell him that they will own the land on his behalf? Not to mention using his predicament as an excuse to force their way into the affairs of a farming family, by taking their land in the most deceptive of all ways. The worker will never own a house, and the farming family lose its hard earned land. Only a Communist government can see this as a victory, because any free nation will see this as madness.

Many may ask, well then what is the solution? My dear reader it's so simple that even a child could see it; subdivide a few agricultural titles and make residential stands available to farm workers in the area. A simple stroke of the bureaucrat's pen, and the problem is solved. No millions spent by government to buy shares in farms. Don't forget that this worker is not an invalid, he is a highly capable hard working and passionate family man. He is a man of means and will be able to build his own house that he will expect to have right and title to. Being a proud home owner will bring him and his family a new dignity, they will begin to create wealth for their futures, be able to raise additional funds to educate their children, be able to have access to the better state schools. Set free from the being forced to enrol at the dreaded 'farm' schools, because presently without property rights they are regarded as being non-resident in the area.

Farm workers could buy and sell homes, and in the future, as business opportunities present themselves they will have the privilege of labour mobility. The family could benefit from capital gain generated from the sale of their home. The cycle of poverty would be broken, the cycle of abuse would be broken, homes would become more stable, and society would benefit.

Henry Drummond said "Sacred and happy homes are the surest guarantee for the moral progress of a nation." Our farm workers would become at last free men and women!

So why then does government not see this? Because, it goes against Communist ideology. In Communism all houses must belong to the government. The most powerful weapon of social enslavement is to own a man's home. Such a man is at your mercy.....colonialism knew it, apartheid knew it, and so does our (communist) government. The only poor fellows who do not know this are the farmer and his farm worker. They are the victims here, and the man in the street is told that they are the villains. That the farm worker is not capable of owning his own home as he is inept and unskilled, and that the farmer desires to perpetuate the old system of rural enslavement. The man in the street is told that the government is the hero. All I can do as a farmer is plead with you, think about our land, think about your rural people, and think before it is too late! Terrible things happen to a nation when good men fail to boldly speak out.

#### The Landless Local

Many families that have been living in our area for years, and they have never been allowed to own land. These families have left their tribal lands years ago. After having left their feudal resources behind many years ago, they have become the most desperate and disillusioned of all. Very few could imagine their circumstances. I ask you to stop and think for a moment; where would your family be if your family had not been able to own land for the last three generations? Owning land is the key to wealth creation. Wealth creation is not about decadence and easy living —a common communist perception—, it's about security, self-dignity, educating children, becoming self-employed and creating jobs for others, and the creative advancement of a nation. Wealth creation is about the freedom to have your own destiny placed into your own hands. It always starts with a family owning its own home!

This disillusioned landless local is fast becoming the most radicalised element of the population. They are the youth that have seen their parents work long hours to better their financial lot. Every cent earned has had to come from labour, never a cent from wealth creation —no capital gain from the sale of a house, or the sale of an inherited parental home. Never having had the privilege of

raising financing through the security offered by a home that is owned. Funds that could be invested in a better future -like an education or the starting of their own business.

How then does the government respond to this? By claiming that there is an unfair balance of the ratio of black and white farmer. That the majority of the agricultural resources should be in the hands of black farmers. That these families have been deliberately shunned by white farmers and kept out of the agricultural sector. What insanity, how could any rational person come to this absurd statement of reason? I agree that there should be a majority of black farmers, that's great and any farmer welcomes the idea.

The observation is obvious, but the cause is simply years of political abuse of local black people. The group areas act being the most formidable, and the entrenchment of feudal land ownership principles made sure of that too. The patient is sick, but what has the current agricultural community got to do with years of political cruelty to the landless local? I truly believe that in time to come 80% of your farming community will be black farmers —and many will be darn good at it too.

Many myths are being perpetuated in South African society nowadays, and one of them is that if you don't own a farm, you will never be able to afford to own one. Farms are handed down through the generations, and ordinary people can never acquire one. It's the privilege of the rich — and by that read white farmer. The truth of the matter is that the majority of successful farmers are 1<sup>st</sup> generation and self-made. 24 years ago, I had nothing —not even a bed- but today I am a highly successful produce farmer. Was I just an exception? I do not believe that for a moment. I believe that if the doors of opportunity have been opened, many young men will throw their weight into agriculture, and will be tomorrow's heroes. This country has vast agricultural resources —especially idle ones. Africa has the fastest growing population on the globe, and it needs to eat. The question is, can we grasp the opportunity of this day and feed them? We need now more than ever before, young blood to take the reins of agriculture in our land, especially young black men. Their future is their oyster.

Have the doors of opportunity have been opened, or not? Does government facilitate the establishment of fledgling black farmers in order to grasp this wonderful entrepreneurial opportunity that has presented itself to our nation? No, it focuses on disproportionate land ownership and makes it their political agenda. Claiming emphatically that it is their elected mandate to do. Believe me, land ownership proportions will correct itself rapidly if young up-and-coming black men are given the necessary support in these exciting times.

So how then does government go about establishing new black farmers? It goes on a grand land purchasing drive to take away resources from the white farmers —reducing our nation's chance of exploiting this golden opportunity—with the excuse of wanting to establish black farmers. Dear reader do you have any idea of how much idle agricultural resources exist in our land? But, does government establish new black farmers, or does government further its Communist agenda once again by exploiting society? Government lies to the landless local black man, by promising him land and support, and then systematically steals productive land from established food producers by lying again —that there is no more land.

Surely part of becoming a young black farmer means that you have access to being able to own a farm? Does it empower black farmers with land tenureship so that they can get on with their lives as free men? No! It places black men on a piece of land as a tenant of the government —it perpetuates feudalism and broadens its own objective of taking possession of the nation's productive resources, namely its land and its water rights. The government has now becomes the landlord, and the black farmer is no better off that he was before —he is still held in bondage by a feudal system. He has no right and title, no capacity to raise funds so that he can get on with the development of his farm, and most disturbingly, his right to use the land is dependent on his physical presence. Nothing has changed for him in 1000 years of feudalism, and the white farmer is blamed for his plight? How, what has the current farming community got to do with this absurd course of government reasoning?

The emerging farmer must fail! Running your own farm needs capital, and raising capital needs security, and security can only come from land that is owned –the right of tenure is imperative for his success. This farmer that the State has promised to establish on the land, has remained to be a frustrated landless local. S/He placed his hope in a government that has promised freedom to live a better life, and what did s/he get? A new landlord, the government! The very people who they voted for to set them free of the tyrannies of the past. This time it was not the tribal chief, nor the white farmer, this time round his newly elected government became his master. 20 years ago everything looked as though it was going to change for us all, and now nothing has changed.

Now the biggest joke of all....why does everyone in agriculture fail?

The government claims the landless black farmer doesn't have the necessary skills, and it is the lousy attitude of the all-knowing white farmers who are refusing to mentor him. Ironically it's the white South Africans who still believe this absurd apartheid myth. So, an elaborate and intricate moral coercion is forced upon rural society; white farmers are expected to nurture black farmers. But don't forget the black farmer has no access to funds, so the nurturing amounts to nothing more than the white farmer using his tractors, his seed, his fertilizer and his employees to get the job done so that he can get the BEE score, and by so doing be released to get on with running his own farm. These two farmer neighbours often become the best of friends, but my dear reader, stop and think, think how absurd this interaction is. The black farmer is nothing more than a tenant on government land, he has nothing to contribute, he is exceedingly humiliated by virtue of the fact that he has nothing to contribute, and so all he can do is stand there and be polite.

So by what rhyme or reason does a government expect this nonsensical parody to have any beneficial outcome? It's simple; the government wants the land —they are Communists don't forget—so their agenda is to keep, and grow, the land that they have already stolen from the nation. They have to find more ingenious ways to keep any black aspiring farmer from getting hold of their land, and then also find even more ingenious ways of stealing more land from white farmers —even if the excuse that they continue to use is that they want more land in order to empower more black farmers. They have been buying farms for years now—with the nations taxes—but there are still no examples of new established black farmers. Isn't it time that the nation woke up to this fraudulent game?

The fact of the matter is that they have an ideology that is contrary to the will of the nation. South Africans never wanted to be communists, we chose not to vote for that party, and we never have.

The fact of the matter is that we elected this government with the expectation that they would honour the constitution of the land. In this constitution we see that we the people desire to be a free nation. That we as South Africans want to own our own land, and be free to get on with our lives. We never gave the government the right to steal it from us, or to perpetuate the nation's frustrations as an excuse to conceal their evil plans.

To keep the black farmer from getting their land, government keeps telling the black farmer that he must 'prove' himself first before he can get his farm. Government knows that he will never be good enough, even if he gets 'good enough' they will simply up the bar. The government delights in every failed black agricultural venture, as it endorses its case. Government keeps him interested by lying to him; telling that he is very fortunate to get this opportunity, and should he get too much like a 'Bolshevik' they will simply give this privilege to another unfortunate landless local — and then continually reminded that there are plenty standing in the queue behind him.

The ingenuity of the plot thickens, as the elaborate BEE laws are enforced. This, like the performance that black farmers have to meet in order to receive 'their' land, BEE is the performance that white farmers must meet in order to keep their land! No matter how conscientious a white farmer becomes, he will never be good enough, and by continually upping BEE standards, he will be coerced into parting with more and more of his land and water rights. The man in the street is told that this has to be the case. The black farmer has to learn how to farm, or else the nation will starve, and then white farmers have to pay for their sins, otherwise the country will never find racial harmony. What nonsense! Black farmers fail because they are given tenant status only, not because they cannot farm, and by the way why should white farmers be blamed for the sins of the politicians that went before them —not to mention the sins of the current deception we are all being subjected to.

### The Exploited Foreigner.

The exploited foreign worker has become the focus of much hatred and violence. We could discuss the reasons why, but, to me, this behaviour of South Africans toward foreigners is simply the *mirror of our national soul*. We have become a xenophobic people! We are a nation that for generations has had politicians driving wedges between our people. Wedges that have served to foster their political agendas. Divide and rule is the old saying! Apartheid was the prime example of this. White people feared the numbers of the black populace, and the black people feared the power of the white man. We were continually told that we are different and would never be able to trust one another. But, we were blessed with a visionary in the form of Nelson Mandela. A man who looked beyond these small minded fears and embraced the vision of a rainbow nation. He embraced the fact that all men are created equal and that we are one people.....South Africans. He was a brave and courageous leader, a man of influence and a man of character, and he got the job done. Then what in heaven's name happened? A series of weak men stepped onto the stage, and his vision perished. The fanatics saw their opportunity to play them as puppets, Marxist fanatics who saw their opportunity and took it with both hands.

Communism needs chaos to establish itself. "Chaos is a time of opportunity" is the old Marxist saying. When people are scared, they are easier to manipulate, and more willing to compromise.

Compromise like give away their rights in order to have peace return to their land. So we now have a government that —like the apartheid and colonialist era before it- see fear as their ally. It is not in the government's interest to keep law and order, the more chaos the better, and so the more those who have ownership of production resources will be willing to negotiate with them.

Let the reader be reminded of the chilling words of Mao Tse-tung "All communist revolutionary governments must eventually kill their own children" (From Mao's Little Red Book). In other words the culture of lawlessness that is inculcated in the psyche of a country, only serves the entering communist government while it is engaged in taking possession of production resources. When it has control, then this lawlessness must be violently and definitively dealt with. Not a very pleasant thought for a people who so bravely -and humanely- won their freedom not so long ago.

Another observation gleaned from the predicament of our abused foreigners is to ask the question, why they keep coming to our land? The answer, for any thinking person, is that this lousy deal must still be better than the one that they have back home. So what is happening in our neighbouring countries? Well it's not too hard to see that their governments have put such communist agendas into place sometime before us, and their people are leaving because things have gotten really bad for them —worse than what our xenophobic people offer them! Just goes to show, what we have got might have a lot of faults, but it is still better than the choice of a communist government. Do we wait until it is too late before we say "enough is enough"? Where are our leaders, where are our thinkers? Where are the Nelson Mandela's of today?

Why do we keep letting miserable minorities -like Puritan fanatics and now Marxist fanatics- take control of our land. Are we not tired of the perpetuation of the myths of our society? *We live in a land where everyone feels like they do not belong*. There is no national consciousness and pride, no celebration of having got so far down the road of freedom. Myths are perpetuated designed to divide; black farmer from white farmer, industrialist from factory worker, mine owner from mine worker, farmer from farm worker, job provider from job seeker, and then there is the good old BEE myth. The myth that still enshrine racial fear and suspicion. These divisions are not only reinforced by a media owned by the State, but are the expressed text book strategy for the establishment of a Marxist (Communist) regime.

The only reason that this is being allowed to proceed is that we -as average South African's -have stopped thinking.....and we will get what we ask for! The rainbow nation is still alive and well for now, but it is fast taking on a very red hue. Are we brave enough to exterminate this plague at the ballot box, or do we wait for the "one-party-state" to establish itself? Those who still own production resources can still influence the general population for now. When you are a stewards of the nation's production resources, then you have a responsibility to the people of this land; to preserve its freedom and not to negotiate its surrender. If we fail the State will claim that it can do a better job by enslaving everyone.

## A comment on Water Rights.

In 2005 the new water rights law was birthed. It is a well-designed piece of legislation, and was based on the Australian experience. To put it in a nutshell....

The years 1996 to 1998 were chosen as the years where a common law right of water usage was identified and verified. In other words any farmer using water in these years could apply for a verification of his claimed usage by a State sanctioned legal entity. When successfully executed, the farmer would then receive a certificate of verification. The Department of Water Affairs was then expected to assess whether this historical usage verification level was over, or under, the long term sustainability of this water resource. If the source was over utilised, at these 1996-98 levels, then usage would have to be cut back on a pro-rata basis for all. If it was believed that the water source was being underutilised, then additional usage verification for those who did not have, was expected to occur.

The bottom line is that water usage verification was seen as the forerunner of water rights being issued to these citizens. The constitution of our land expects this to occur, and so too does the water law -as it is currently written. When water rights are issued the free market takes over, and it brings about the most efficient usage of this scarce national commodity. Those who use water most efficiently will be willing to pay more for it, so inefficient water users will start to sell their rights. If a farmer -for whatever reason- cannot use his quota for the year can rent it to a neighbour for the season. Renting it is better than letting it flow into the sea needlessly. We are a nation that has to be responsible with how we exploit our water resources, and the law that was passed is good. The law that was passed, was passed by our government. So did we do it? After all, we employed some of the best minds on the globe to give us the best solution, so did we listen to them?

The answer is a flat NO. Nearly 10 years later not a single water right has ever been issued. Farmers are taxed for water, but based on a verification letter only. In the minds of any free citizens, a tax implies ownership, and the words "my water rights" are commonly used by citizens—both bankers and farmers alike. But, the truth be told, the verification letter is just another form of "tenant status". We are back in the days of feudal control; the state owns it and we are simply there as tenants. Yes all the issues around tenant status still apply; they are linked to the man occupying the land only, and they cannot be legally bought or sold.

The citizens of this country —both white and black- are expecting the next phase of the law to kick in, but what is happening instead? Now the government is instituting measures like; use it or lose it (tenant status) water leasing is illegal (tenant status). None have cottoned onto the fact that these statements are against the constitution, and contrary to the water act passed some 9 years ago. The government simply ignores the constitution, that it has sworn to uphold, and breaks the very laws it itself has passed.

To add insult to injury, zealous government officials are going around "selling water rights". Government officials selling "rights" that don't exist you might be asking. How can that be? Well now, many citizens have not yet to grasp this, and really believe that they are "beating-the-system" so to say by paying the bribe they believe that they are in fact buying water rights. Come to think of it, how many RDP home "owners" have paid government officials for the new home that they were allowed to move into. They also believed that they were "buying" their house. (Probably that they were beating-the-system as well)

You see we live in a society that believes in rights to ownership –both rich and poor, black and white. It amazes me to see how an educated farmer will laugh at someone paying for an RDP

house that will never be theirs, but will go straight ahead and do the same for water rights that he will never own. The only difference is the price tag; a house costs a few thousand rand, but water rights cost in the millions. I have personally been asked 5 million rand for "guaranteed water rights". The worst case was a poor soul who fell for 12 million rand bribe. A lifetime of labour squandered in a moment of fear! Well that goes with the deal of allowing communism in –corrupt bureaucrats! This is the reason why many a politician so zealously promotes the institution of a communist regime, it's a get rich scheme of note.

Bribery is the order of the day in communist regimes. There will always be a market "price" for everything. The only difference is that in a free country, those who work are rewarded, but in a communist country, it is the exclusive politician who is rewarded. Yes, that man who spread fear and division in your land, that man who promised you that he would make everyone equal by pulling down the rich, yes he made you compromise your better judgement by filling you with greed or fear, and then stole your freedom. The lies of communism makes apartheid look like a toothless tiger!

The thoughts of a concerned South African Farmer.

Mr Vito. I. Rugani CEO Greenway Farms (Pty) Ltd