



TRANSLATED VERSION BY: Julie Jansen van Rensburg.

14 June 2018

The Chairperson
Constitutional Review Committee
Ms Pat Jayiya
Committee Section
P.O. Box 15
Cape Town 8000
pjaiya@parliament.gov.za
021 403 3661
081 441 0345
W/S 091, 3rd Floor 90 Plein Street Building

RE:

National Assembly and National Council of Provinces has mandated the Constitutional Review Committee to *review section 25 of the Constitution and other sections where necessary*, to make it possible for the state to;

1 *- **expropriate land in the public interest without compensation*** and

2 *- propose the necessary constitutional amendments where applicable with regards to the kind of future land tenure regime needed.*

The Co-ordinating Committee for the People of the Vow [CCPV (Geloftevolk Koördineringskomitee –GKK)] accepts the invitation to join in the debate and reacts as follows regarding the proposed amendment of Article 25 of the Constitution with the aim of restitution of property without compensation in the interest of the public:

We as Boer-Afrikaner People may not leave the proposed restitution unopposed. By doing that we would be admitting the accusations of sin against ourselves; would be hating our destiny as Protestant refugees to South Africa and betray our Vows to GOD Triune.

Our faith in GOD Triune does not allow this!!!

With this we reject the proposed legislation and the motivation thereof, which is directly in conflict with our origin existence, survival, faith and culture.

A: The CCPV is of the opinion that the proposed amendment of Article 25 of the Constitution is not in the interest of any resident of the country for one or more of the following reasons:

1. **Common Law doesn't support the proposed amendment.**
2. **Use, application and interpretation of the definition of property-rights (national and international) does not support the proposed amendment. Land can only be expropriated by the present Expropriation Law and not via Article 25 of the Constitution (subsidiary principle), the proposed amendment of the Expropriation Law of 2016, has still not been finalised.**
3. **The proposed amendment is agenda-driven, as this agenda is to give vent to the determinations of the proposed New World Order (footnote 15 & 16, and Pres Ramaphosa's 2018 Freedom Day Speech). The finality of the proposed amendment will adversely affect the whole nation, as the amendment directly forbids private ownership. The CCPV invites Government to confirm the opposite, thus explaining this.**
4. **The criteria and prerequisites for any valid land restitution in terms of all the reformed constitutions in the present regime, is that the person making demands must present concrete proof that will enable him to make a demand. Without factual documents restitution is invalid and disallowed. The view that land has been stolen is without any factual proof. The same applies that the land belongs to the indigenous people – meaning the non-whites – See Attachment 1, p14. Indigenous means someone's country of birth through which he/she gained citizenship. Adding to Attachment 1, Julius Malema said on 25th May 2018 that black people (who are presently making demands on white property) all came from Central Africa, which renders the allegation of stolen property from their kraal absurd. – ¹**
5. **The proposed amendment is directly in contrast with the Boer-Afrikaner Nation's Religious-, Cultural- and Social principles.**
6. **The proposed amendment is directly in contrast to the Vows of Blood River and Paardekraal.**
7. **The proposed amendment sets a justified-ground for the Boer-Afrikaner Nation to make a demand in terms of the Restitution of Land Rights, read with the Property-clause of the Constitution and any other applicable land-reformation laws. (The effect thereof will accomplish the restitution of the territory of Transvaal and the Orange Free State, as this land belongs to the Boer-Afrikaner People).**

¹ The Citizen 25.05.2018 - The commander in chief also spoke directly to those South Africans who referred to African foreigners as "makwerekwere" to stop it.

"We hate one another today; we kill one another today, because we don't know who we are.

"We call people Zimbabweans, we call people Malawians, we call people who come from outside makwerekwere (a slang word for foreigners in South Africa) where else we are makwerekwere ourselves because we come from where those people come from.

"None of us. We come from where those people come from," Malema said.

He said the Khoi and San people were the original inhabitants in South Africa and that no one else was from South Africa.

"We came from the north and the Khoi and the San people were in Southern Africa. The Khoi and the San welcomed us here and we settled here," Malema said.

He said EFF supporters should welcome people from other countries the same way the Khoi and the San welcomed them.

"This is our history," Malema said.

Malema said fellow South Africans should not see people from Tanzania as their enemies, but rather celebrate African leaders such as Dr Kenneth Kaunda of the former Northern Rhodesia, Julius Nyerere of Tanzania and Thomas Sankara of Burkina Faso, who had welcomed the ANC and PAC in exile.

The merits verifying the proposed demand are contained *inter alia* in the following:

- The run-up to – and the conclusion – of the Treaty of Vereeniging.
- The contents of the Treaty of Vereeniging confirm the territory, as well as the ownership of the land.
- The contents and legitimacy of the Blood River - and Paardekraal Vows confirm the deeper right to this territory.
- The Paardekraal Vow dealt with the recovery of the Transvaal and the Free State. This was granted by God. We cannot add or take away any of it. No claim can be made on the rest of the country outside Transvaal and the Free State, but that does not mean that compatriots who are currently landowners in the Cape and Natal do not eventually form part of this order.

The CCPV confirms that they represent the Boer-Afrikaner People of the Vow) associating themselves with the following events in their history.

1. The Great Trek from the Cape Colony since 1838 and the reasons given for the Trek.
2. The battle of Blood River on 16 December 1838.
3. The direct causes and results that led to the Vow of Blood River.
4. The Vows of Blood River and Paardekraal (See End notes, p.22)
5. The independent republics that were established fourteen years after the battle of Blood River, known as the “Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek” (Transvaal) and the Republic of the Orange Free State (Free State).
6. The two Wars of Independence (Anglo Boer Wars) during the periods 1880 – 1902.
7. The flags under which the burghers fought, namely the Vierkleur (Four-colour) and the War Flag.
8. The Treaty of the Peace of Vereeniging, preceded by and between Britain and the representatives of the Boer Republics.
9. The contents of the Blood River- and Paardekraal Vows confirm the right to this territory

B: During the approach to the parliamentary session on 27 February 2018 (and even thereafter) Pres. Ramaphosa made several utterances that must be brought into perspective regarding the proposed amendment of the constitution:

Herewith a portion of Pres. Ramaphosa’s rejoinder to his state address:

CAPE TOWN – President Cyril Ramaphosa on Tuesday [20 Feb.] said expropriation without compensation was the only way to resolve the land issue in South Africa.

He made the comments while delivering answers on the State of the Nation Address (SONA) debate in Parliament, Cape Town.

Members of Parliament (MPs) on Monday unpacked his maiden SONA speech, which he delivered on Friday night [16 Feb].

A recurring question from the opposition is how the government plans to deal with expropriation of land without compensation, while the Democratic Alliance (DA) wanted to know how and when Ramaphosa would deal with the size of his Cabinet.

WATCH: Land issue heats up at SONA debate

DA leader Mmusi Maimane on Monday suggested that expropriating land without compensation is a conflict with a flourishing economy.

In his response on the issue, Ramaphosa said: **"The taking of land from the indigenous people of this country was the original sin..."**

"We are called on to heal the divisions and the pain of our past and this is a **collective task**," the president said. "It's not the task of the ANC alone, **it's our task as a nation...** Yes, [EFF leader Julius] Malema, it is your task as it is mine. Maimane - it is your task as much as mine. It will **heal the divisions of our past**, whether we like it or not that pain persists... I met a man who said he was moved from District Six to Athlone and that is a pain we must address - a division we must heal." <https://www.timeslive.co.za/politics/2018-02-20-in-full--Ramaphosas-reply-to-the-state-of-the-nation-debate/>

From this it is clear that:

- a. The colonisation of the indigenous people's land was the original sin committed,
- b. The territorial area of the RSA actually belongs to the indigenous people of the country.
- c. Confiscation of land owned by Whites is the only way to solve the land reform-question.
- d. The segregal policy of the past was painful and that it would take a collective effort from the nation to set aside the detrimental results of these divisions.

1. Pres. Ramahosa's accusations:

a. Colonialisation of the indigenous people's land – as the original sin – refers.

This follows an utterance during his SONA² during which he said that the land which had been taken from the indigenous people during apartheid must be returned. During the week before the 106th celebration of the existence of the ANC [6 January 2018], he honoured the ancestors/ancestral spirits by visiting the graves of previous ANC presidents³.

² PARLIAMENT - President Cyril Ramaphosa on Friday said the December 2017 resolution by the ruling African National Congress (ANC) of expropriating land without compensation will not be taken off the table.

"We are determined that expropriation without compensation should be implemented in a way that increases agricultural production, improves food security and ensure that the land is returned to those from whom it was taken under colonialism and apartheid."

³ Ramaphosa told the just over 1000 guests – businesspeople, ANC office bearers, party leaders, fraternal party leaders, and even former ministers – **that he appealed to higher powers in the past week during a "revolutionary pilgrimage" to the graves of former ANC presidents. We were "shaking those bones" he said, explaining that it was a way of bringing alive the spirits of those who had departed.**

The purpose of these visits was to rekindle the spiritual powers of the dead presidents with the aim of reaching their goals.

Pres. Ramaphosa's traditional rituals link up with those of his predecessor, Jacob Zuma, who opened the events during the 103rd commemoration of the existence of the ANC by banning out the "spirit" Jan van Riebeeck.

According to CITY PRESS of Saturday 10 January 2015, the ANC celebrated its 103rd birthday in the Cape Town Stadium. According to the report, after singing the Nkosi National anthem and accompanying prayers, a sangoma-type praise-singer declared that the place first had to be purified from the spirit of Jan van Riebeeck [a Protestant]. Take note that the Nkosi National anthem is one of the ANC's freedom-songs and that the words thereof refer to a prayer to an African "holy" spirit.

With this, the ANC as ruling party started an official spiritual war.

According to another report, the 'sangoma' used the word "exorcise". This illustrates spiritual out casting or exorcism as part of spiritual warfare:-
Exorcises;

- Drive out or attempt to drive out (a supposed evil spirit) from a person or place
- "An attempt to exorcise a spirit".

From this it is clear that the Holy Spirit of GOD Triune, under whose leadership Van Riebeeck came here, and to whom he gave recognition for the blessed settlement years by way of a vow (1654), is not welcome in the RSA, and also not reconcilable with the Nkosi-spirit in which the ANC festivities took place.

Following the above event, Jacob Zuma [as leader of the ANC and State President] declared during this dinner that the problems in this country originated when Jan van Riebeeck stepped ashore on 6 April 1652, and that whites should never have come here.

In these terms Zuma and his sangoma praise-singer attacked white Christianity, as if white Christianity represented a demonic spirit and followed 'driving out' the Spirit of Christianity.

"We saw this pilgrimage as a way to rekindle the spirits of our former leaders, and as we were there, we felt we were in hallowed ground," he said, giving a rundown of the names of the former presidents usually evoked in speeches.

It's clear that he went there to draw inspiration and courage for his task ahead, which is likely to include removing Zuma from the SA presidency.

Zuma, who had in previous years told voters that the ancestors would not forgive them if they didn't vote ANC, must have been moved by Ramaphosa's ancestral visits in some way. It really is his thing, as are the traditional leaders, who Ramaphosa3 PARLIAMENT - President Cyril Ramaphosa on Friday said the December 2017 resolution by the ruling African National Congress (ANC) of expropriating land without compensation will not be taken off the table.

"We are determined that expropriation without compensation should be implemented in a way that increases agricultural production, improves food security and ensure that the land is returned to those from whom it was taken under colonialism and apartheid."

Therefore there is no doubt that the Spirit of Christianity differs from the spirit of the black indigenous nations and that that difference is being confessed by Zuma and the ANC.

By specifically referring to white people as the origin – and therefore referring to existence of the problems in the country, and adding their religion to this, Zuma launched a racial and spiritual war that cannot be ignored by the white Protestants.

This uncalled-for criticism by Zuma negates Jan van Riebeeck's disposition which urged him on 6 April 1652 to pray that: "...among these brutal wild people YOUR true Reformed Christian Teachings will eventually be propagated widely."

The contempt towards Western civilization by this head of state, and the accompanying actions of mission since 1652; the supporting applause from the supporting crowd, and the absolute silence of black and coloured "theologians" confirm that they are not receptive for the HOLY SPIRIT of GOD TRIUNE of true Christianity [John 14:16-17].

Furthermore, the silence of Protestant theologians is of concern, as the diatribe/invective against the HOLY SPIRIT is accepted through this.

There is a marked difference between the Nkosi-spirit of the African person and the Holy Spirit of the white Protestant, and are irreconcilable.

The CCPV admits and accepts that the Protestant religion differs greatly from the religion of the original indigenous nations of Africa.

Van Reinbeck's settlement paved the way for the settlement of Protestants who had to flee before the murderous powers of the Catholic Church for their faith. They discovered a continent that had been undeveloped for 5600 years since Adam and Eve, and developed it according to Western norms.

Now the ANC and their followers, existing on previous disadvantage, now want to confiscate the welfare that they could not create over a period of 5600 years, through legislation, and accuse Van Riebeeck's arrival here as the **original sin**.

These so-called sinful white colonials developed South Africa to the role model of African states over a period of 340 years.

After 24 years of ANC rule, that which the colonials had developed, reached – to quote Pres. Donald Trump = "shithole" status.

The CCPV suggests that Parliament reconsiders their proposed constitutional amendment.

The so-called New South Africa's efforts towards sustainable multicultural democracy does not appear sustainable and the so-called 'Rainbow Nation' stares failure in the face.

b. The territory of the RSA actually belongs to the indigenous people⁴ of the country:

He also said the **land belongs to all** who live in it⁵, and on 27th April he said the Free State province was where the movement to liberate **his people** was launched more than a century ago.⁶

From this it is clear that the **people** Pres. Ramaphosa refers to as **his people [our people]**, are according to him the indigenous people and logically those whose freedom movement was launched in the Free State.

This excludes whites, as

- Whites are not part of his century-old freedom movement,
- and are not what he means with indigenous,
- and who – according to him as head of state – “committed the original sin”.

Pres. Ramaphosa’s statement that the land belongs to all who live in it – meaning the indigenous nations, thus excluding the Whites – does not upset almost of the Whites, but also [as far as it is known] the following opposition parties: VF+, DA and COPE. According to Pres. Ramaphosa, Whites do not make out part of the legitimate residents of the country. Their properties must be confiscated, as they obtained these through sin.

The Whites of this country are therefore **disenfranchised**. He does not acknowledge the Whites as part of **his people**, as well as his nation⁷. This boils down to Whites having no residential rights in the country.

During Van Reinbeck’s colonisation of the Cape, the Black tribes had not yet lived in South Africa – see Attachment 1.

If Pres. Ramaphosa’s claim that the country belongs to the indigenous people is correct, then it belongs to the Khoisin people, and not to the rest of the people that settled here over a period of time. The Khoisan were the original inhabitants of large parts of Southern Africa, long before the black indigenous

⁴ In his response on the issue, Ramaphosa said: "The taking of land from the indigenous people of this country was the original sin..."

⁵ As we did our minds of all negativity, we should reaffirm our belief that **South Africa belongs to all who live in it**. – Sona 18, 16 Feb.2018 SONA

⁶ This is the province where, more than a century ago, the movement that championed the liberation of our people was born.

It was in this province that the women of Bloemfontein, Kroonstad, Winburg and Jagersfontein in 1913 organised the first anti-pass protest in the country.

⁷ “We are called on to heal the divisions and the pain of our past and this is a collective task,” the president said. “It’s not the task of the ANC alone, it’s our task as a nation... – 20 Feb. 2018 – Comment re: SONA.

people arrived here. [Attachment 1]. Even Julius Malema is better-informed than Pres. Ramaphosa about who the actual aborigines are.⁸

Adding to Pres. Ramaphosa's utterance, during the 2015 festivities in Cape Town, Zuma said that the willing seller/willing buyer Land Reform system is not working and that 2015 would be the year of land restitution.

Zuma's and Ramaphosa's utterances are in terms of the constitution a gross disregard of among other – **freedom of religion, property rights and citizenship**, and Whites of the RSA can be sure that the ANC is planning to strip them of everything, as set out in the **Freedom Charter** – Freedom Manifesto of the ANC.

According to a report, Zuma also concluded his performance in the stadium by leading the festival-goers in singing "Umshini Wami" with the following intent:

"We are going to shoot them, and they are going to run. We are going to shoot them with the machine gun."

The White Protestant is therefore not welcome within the borders of the New RSA and is therefore being stripped of his citizenship, dignity and right to a life.

c. The only way to solve the land issue lies in the restitution thereof without compensation:⁹

The parliamentary process that was launched on 27 Feb 2018, during which White peoples property in this country could be legally confiscated by the alleged original owners, boils down to blatant theft, **and according to the Christian belief, sinful**. The original sin¹⁰ which Ramaphosa was referring to in his SONA, must be interpreted within a religious context.

⁸ The Citizen 25.05.2018 - The commander in chief also spoke directly to those South Africans who referred to African foreigners as "makwerekwere" to stop it.

"We hate one another today, we kill one another today, because we don't know who we are.

"We call people Zimbabweans, we call people Malawians, we call people who come from outside makwerekwere (a slang word for foreigners in South Africa). Where else we are makwerekwere ourselves because we come from where those people come from.

"None of us. We come from where those people come from," Malema said.

He said the Khoi and San people were the original inhabitants in South Africa and that no one else was from South Africa.

"We came from the north and the Khoi and the San people were in Southern Africa. The Khoi and the San welcomed us here and we settled here," Malema said.

He said EFF supporters should welcome people from other countries the same way the Khoi and the San welcomed them.

"This is our history," Malema said.

Malema said fellow South Africans should not see people from Tanzania as their enemies, but rather celebrate African leaders such as Dr Kenneth Kaunda of the former Northern Rhodesia, Julius Nyerere of Tanzania and Thomas Sankara of Burkina Faso, who had welcomed the ANC and PAC in exile.

⁹ CAPE TOWN – President Cyril Ramaphosa on Tuesday [27 Feb.] said expropriation without compensation **was the only way to resolve the land issue** in South Africa.

¹⁰ In his response on the issue, Ramaphosa said: "The taking of land from the indigenous people of this country **was the original sin...**"

Ramaphosa's reference to sin links up with that of his predecessor, the previous president, Jacob Zuma's action on Saturday 12 January 2015 during the 103rd anniversary festivities of the ANC in Cape Town as referred to above.

The White Protestant's presence in the country is the core-problem in the current regime. We are not allowed any right to life here. We are not seen as **burghers** [citizens] of this country, according to Pres. Ramaphosa's declaration that the land belongs **to his people**, and that confiscation thereof must become a national action.

The deep-lying difference in religion, and the untenable position that religion takes in the various cultures, causes the sin for the indigenous people to be a different sin for the Protestant.

The interpretation and application of the present constitution by the indigenous people; does not find application for their purpose. The fact that the constitution and property-clause that was promulgated by the ANC is almost ironic per se. The constitution and property-clause as it is being applied now, is the result of the history of the country. The request to change the property-clause makes no sense however, and there are no grounds for doing so.

However, it is clear that colonized land as the original sin must be corrected within Africa-context by way of decolonisation of the land.

Just before outbreak of the Anglo-Boer War, Pres. Paul Kruger told Milner that Britain does not want voting-rights for the fortune-seekers, but that Britain wants the Boers' country.

The 1994 Democratisation of the country was thus not about one man, one-vote, but about property-rights. This is the country that Mandela – and his master-negotiator – Ramaphosa – wanted at the time and is in agreement with their “Freedom Charter”.

Today ex-president F.W. de Klerk admits that at the time they were outmanoeuvred by Ramaphosa.

The Constitutional Amendment Committee will have to amend the Charter of human rights, and religious freedom must be redefined to bring an amended article 25 within constitutional perspective. Pres, Ramaphosa said that the opinion – *that the proposed amendment is destroying the spirit and meaning of the constitution* – must be addressed.¹¹

¹¹ We need to respond to the view that **what we propose** represents **a violation of the spirit and intent of our democratic Constitution**. -- <https://www.timeslive.co.za/politics/2018-02-20-in-full--Ramaphosas-reply-to-the-state-of-the-nation-debate/>

d. That the racial/ethnic divisions of the past cause pain and this must be addressed.¹²

Adding to that is the Natal Provincial Legislature opened on 27 Feb 2018, and Zulu King, Goodwill Zwelithini called on his people to prevent the unbinding of the Ingonyama Trust.

This follows on advice of a parliamentary committee that the trust to which Zululand belongs, is unconstitutional.

If President Ramaphosa wants to heal **the divisions of the past** that are causing pain, he will – as aimed with the parliamentary committee under leadership of the previous deputy-president, Kgalema Mothlanthe, **have to nationalise the Ingonyama Trust.**

When the independent TBVC states, viz. Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei were unlawfully disbanded at the end of the previous dispensation, and incorporated into **the ‘New South Africa’**, the Zulu King registered their traditional territory in a trust.

This means that the Zulus are the only ethnic group to have their own land, and which boils down to a partial **continuation of the segregal dispensation from before 1994.** According to a parliamentary committee this is unconstitutional and must the trust – according to the parliamentary committee – be dissolved.

Alternatively the previous homelands must be returned to the various ethnic groups, which would mean a return to the previous dispensation.

The recommendations by the parliamentary committee led to the Zulu king calling for his people to each contribute at least R5.00 in order for legal representatives who can assist in preventing the disbandment of the trust.

The Zulu king said that the Zulu nation – **like any other nation – has the right to fight for its rights.**

Hence it seems that the divisional pain of the past that Pres. Ramaphosa spoke of, is not seen in the same light by the Zulu king. He wants to defend the division [segregation] at all costs.

The president made the following remark to Dr. Buthelezi during his replication: *“We will always seek to do what is in the interests of our people. This includes, Honourable Buthelezi, how we will handle the Ingonyama Trust issue. **No-one is saying that land must be taken away from our people.** Rather it is - how can we make sure that our people have equitable access to land and security of tenure.”*

¹² “We are called on to heal **the divisions and the pain of our past** and this is a collective task,” ... the president said. “It’s not the task of the ANC alone; it’s our task as a nation... Yes, [EFF leader Julius] Malema, it is your task as it is mine. Maimane - it is your task as much as mine. It will heal the divisions of our past, whether we like it or not that pain persists... **I met a man who said he was moved from District Six to Athlone and that is a pain we must address - a division we must heal.**”

In this quotation he repudiates the aims of the parliamentary committee who wants to end the Ingonyama Trust. Furthermore, everything is made possible for **his people** to gain land and ownership while the Whites' properties must be confiscated.

Over and above the Zulu nation's intended retainment of their ethnic and geographical Trust, the Khoisan people also have a problem with Pres. Ramaphosa's claim to original endemic origins, and on 24 September 2017 session applied secession on land that - according to them - belongs to the original indigents of the Cape: *"On the 24 September 2017, King Khoebaha Calvin Cornelius III engaged in a legitimate and lawful ceremony of secession at the Castle of Good Hope in Cape Town. This ceremony was broadcast live on Conscious Consumer Network, an independent media network, and was completely ignored by the government controlled mainstream media."* [<http://sovereignstateofgoodhope.org/>]

This means that the divisions from the past want to be maintained by at least two groups at the cost of the Athlone man who moved to District Six and to whom Pres. Ramaphosa referred to during his speech. Does the man's painful move now weigh more heavily as motivation for Ramaphosa's reprimand to the segregal policy of the past as distancing it by the Zulus and the Khoisan?

Perhaps Pres. Ramaphosa does not know that the Boer-Afrikaner nation lost about 30 000 women and children who died during the Second War of Independence (aka Anglo Boer War) under the most appalling conditions in British murder camps/concentration camps? These events caused far more pain than what any other indigenous nation had ever experienced here in our country. These events can - and will not be forgotten, and cannot be mentioned in the same breath as the Athlone examples quoted by Pres. Ramaphosa.

The divisions are as old as the hills, and the ANC cannot push them out of the way. The Nguni tribes moved down the east coast, and the Sotho tribes in the central region of Africa. The Khoi (Hottentots) and San (Bushman) lived here long before Whites and Blacks. They lived right across S.A. , especially in well-watered areas east of the Drakensberg (where Bushman drawings are still to be seen) - see Appendix 1.

The indigenous peoples of Central Africa (Race - Negroid) drove each other and murdered each other out when they moved here - see Difaqane¹³. Blacks (Race - Negroid) are not related to the Khoi and San (Race -Capoids)

¹³ Mfecane (IsiZulu pronunciation: [mfe'kla:ne][note 1]), also known by the Sesotho name Difaqane or Lifaqane (all meaning "crushing, scattering, forced dispersal, forced migration"[1]), was a period of widespread chaos and warfare among indigenous ethnic communities in southern Africa during the period between 1815 and about 1840.

As King Shaka created the militaristic Zulu Kingdom in the territory between the Tugela River and Pongola River, his forces caused a wave of warfare and disruption to sweep to other peoples. This was the prelude of the Mfecane, which spread from there. **The movement of people caused many tribes to try to dominate those in new territories, leading to widespread warfare;** consolidation of other groups, such as the Matabele, the Mfengu and the Makololo; and the creation of states such as the modern Lesotho.

The efforts by the ANC [that is a conglomerate of indigenous people], to end the so-called painful divisions of the past by replacing/integrating the various indigenous peoples with non-identical Communism, cannot – and will not – succeed. It will lead to the destruction of the present dispensation. The only solution for peaceful co-existence of various nations is ethnic self-government like Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana, who were previously all part of the British Colony.

The continuation of the British segregal policy will be to award independence to the Ingonyama Trust, as well as leading the other ethnic trust territories to self-determination. This also applies to independence for the Whites, Coloureds and Khoisans of the country. It is contrary to the idea of incorporating S.A. into a New World Order where no individual property rights will be permitted – Addendum 1 and footnotes 16 & 17.

The only way to solve the land issue is not located in the expropriation of it without compensation, but in cultural [ethnic] self-determination.

2. On 27 Feb parliament decided to amend article 25 of the Constitution in order for government to appropriate land without compensation.

The amendment clause of the Constitution renders it the weakest constitution imaginable.

Democracy can only function fairly within a homogenic ethnic (cultural) community.

Multicultural democracy leads to the destruction of minority groups, as can be proven with the majority amendment of the Constitution. Eventually it will also affect the minority of indigenous peoples adversely, as the Khoisan people can testify.

The majority claim for themselves the indigenous status that is due to the Khoisan, and accuse the White colonials of theft. They – who were the original people of South /Africa, now have no say and are disenfranchised of their status as the first people and claimants. That – while the claim has no legal grounds.

There are well-documented historical sources of how land was obtained in this country. The president's accusation that White colonials stole it is a blatant lie. Malema confirms this.

Mfecane refers to the period when Mzilikazi, a king of the Matabele, dominated the Transvaal. During his reign, roughly from 1826 to 1836, he ordered widespread killings and devastation to remove all opposition. He reorganised the territory to establish the new Ndebele order. The death toll has never been satisfactorily determined, but the whole region became nearly depopulated. Normal estimates for the death toll range from 1 million to 2 million. [2] [3][4][5][6]

3. During Pres. Ramaphosa's 17 April 2018 visit to Minister Theresa May, Prime Minister of Britain, she said Britain is ready to support the ANC government's transformation and National Development Plan , and also grant £50-million to make the country more attractive for – among others - British investors.¹⁴

This means that Britain supports the land restitution by the ANC and **do not fear that British investors will be disadvantaged as a result**. This means that Britain – and probably other international investors properties **are already ensconced in terms of the proposed amendment of Article 25**, and do not stare restitution in the face.

Thus – restitution seems to only face White South Africans. If this is the truth, then Britain is still the fly in the ointment as before and behind the scenes is the founder of discord with self-enrichment in mind.

The fact that Britain supports the proposed action of the ANC is a direct breach of contract of the Treaty of Vereeniging during which the Boer-Afrikaner Nation's land rights were clearly set out (31 MAY 1902).

4. Freedom Day:

With the celebration of Freedom Day on 27 April 2018, Pres. Ramaphosa said among other things that they were grateful for the support from the international community, and that they want to be international champions of democracy, peace and human rights.

He further said that the position as leaders and membership of SADC, BRICS, G20, Commonwealth and other international communities, they will use this to create a new world order, based on equality, dignity and mutual respect.¹⁵

The CCPV is NOT in favour of participating in a new world order. Although a NWO has been prophesied for the worldling in Revelation 13, it goes against the Spirit of the Protestant, who will not accept the Mark of the BEAST.

As already has been seen, the attitude of mind, [culture] of the Protestant and that of the African indigenous people differ greatly.

¹⁴ They discussed the potential for "reinvigorating and revitalising the partnership between the UK and South Africa, and May said Britain was ready to support South Africa's transformation and National Development Plan.

"They agreed £50m (R857m) new UK funding across the next four years to help South Africa improve its business environment to make it more attractive to investors including in the UK, and ultimately lift some of the poorest people in South Africa out of poverty by creating jobs and opportunities. The funding will be used to help identify and dismantle barriers to trade within Africa and beyond, creating a wealth of opportunities for UK business over the coming years,"

<https://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/ramaphosa-scores-R857m-uk-funding-from-prime-minister-May-20180417>

¹⁵ We remain grateful for the solidarity and assistance that we received from the international community, and are determined that we ourselves should be champions of democracy, peace and human rights across the world.

We will use our leadership and membership in SADC, BRICS, the G20, the Commonwealth and other international bodies to forge a new world order founded on equality, dignity and mutual respect. Our democratic breakthrough was a huge victory for this continent and the freedom-loving nations of the world.

With reference to the various organisation, the CCPV warns that the government is allowing itself to be swept away through international programmes in which private land ownership will be illegal, and the revision of Article 25 links up with Agenda 21^[16] and the Illuminati's programme of principles.¹⁷

Thus far the government only has 6.3% of land¹⁸ transferred to black owners under the land restitution-scheme. 93% beneficiaries of land restitution prefer financial compensation. A mere 1% inhabitants of the RSA believe that land restitution will improve their quality of life. [End note **iii / Adendum 1**]

The ANC's land restitution and confiscation of land are rather political footballs than addressing a public requirement. Rather it is a step toward internationalisation of land to fall in with Ramaphosa's intended installation of the New World Order. It is not the execution of the broad public's will.

The CCNV also wants to issue a warning to the present dispensation to not give themselves over to greed as was the case of King Ahab. He dished up lies and statutory murdered Naboth to acquire his land. This led to the death of King Ahab. See Appendix 2, p.20.

End

The aim of the CCPV is to order the home for the Afrikaner Boer within the providing Hand of GOD ALMIGHTY. This links up with the unfulfilled clause of the Vow of Blood River with reference to the building of the house where it will please our GOD.

The CCPV admits that the Boer-Afrikaner People (People of the Vow) was negligent with reference to the maintenance of various Biblical instructions and did not maintain their various Vows, thus now being punished under the present dispensation as judged: Deut 23: 21-23 and Ecclesiastes 5:4-6.

The CCPV also realises that the territory related to the Paardekraal Vow, geographically boils down to the Boer Republics of the Transvaal (ZAR) and the Orange Free State. This means that God awarded these Republics to the People by means of the Vow/s. **Therefore it is the aim of the CCPV to restore this territory by means of this document and from arising actions.** The CCPV is of the opinion that this People's maintaining of the Paardekraal Vow is a prerequisite of this aim.

Yours faithfully,

¹⁶ <http://finalwakeupcall.info/en/2015/10/21/agenda-21-converted-into-2030/>

¹⁷ The Illuminati and The Council on Foreign Relations - address by Myron C. Fagan, one of the pioneer Conspiracy scholars of the Twentieth Century - <http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/illuminati.htm>

¹⁸ Regarding the demand for agricultural land, AfriForum today revealed that 57,8% of land claims up to now had been for urban land – and not agricultural land. It is also common knowledge that 93% of people who submitted land claims indicated that they preferred financial compensation rather than land restitution. The Institute of Race Relations also found that only 1% of people in South Africa believe that land reform would improve their lives.

In terms of the third problem, Government conceded that more than 90% of farms that the State had transferred to black owners had failed. Although the South African government has already spent more than R45 billion on land reform, only 6,3% of land procured by the State has been converted to private ownership.

Flip Swanepoel (On behalf of the CCPV)

Appendix 1.

PROPERTY RIGHTS IN SOUTH AFRICA

By Dr. Jann Schlebusch.

1. DID WE STEAL THE LAND?

1.1 THE LIES

“After all, it is a ‘fact’ that they colonised us and stole our land,” Pres. Jacob Zuma outspokenly stated in reaction to Zelda la Grange’s “Zelda van Riebeeck” tweet from the previous weekend.

The CCPV admonished compatriots not to leave the lies of our enemies unquestioned.

It is a lie that Blacks were first in S.A. and that we also stole their land. Unfortunately these half-truths and blatant lies are also being announced in the media, in schools, in agricultural circles and even from the pulpit.

1.2 DID WE STEAL THE LAND?

Read the truth regarding the settlement-patterns and land claims of the various nations in Southern Africa: in order for us to be spiritually armed against the psychic war that our enemies are waging against us.

God decrees the fates of nations and people, and history also indicates HIS hand in our Nation’s White origins.

1.3 WHO WAS HERE FIRST?

The Khoi (Hottentots) and San (Bushmen) lived here long before the Blacks and Whites. They lived right across S.A., especially in the well-watered areas east of the Drakensberg (where Bushman paintings/art can still be seen).

The Blacks drove them all away and murdered them when they (the Blacks) moved into the country.

Blacks (Race: Negroid) are not connected to the Khoi and San people (Race: Capoid).

1.4 SETTLEMENT OF BLACKS

The Blacks migrated southwards from Central Africa, and by the 15th century their forefront was still by the Limpopo River. The Whites only met the first Blacks at the Fish River in 1702.

The Blacks can be divided into two main groups: Nguni and Sotho. The Ngunis moved down the east coast and the Sotho in the central areal The Black nations settled in the most well-watered areas.

1.5 EUROPEANS SETTLE IN THE CAPE

In reaction to the Great Church Reformation in the 16th century AC, the Roman (Catholic) Church and Roman rulers decimated the Protestants in Europe.

The Netherlands became a refuge for Protestant refugees from all over Europe, particularly from Germany and France. However, there was not work for all.

In 1652 the Dutch seafaring company (VOC) issued orders to establish a refreshment post at the Cape. Religious refugees could immigrate here, but only immigrants with a Reformed creed were allowed. Our roots are therefore set on the pure Word of GOD. Two years after the arrival of Jan van Riebeeck he also made a VOW that on 6th April every year out of gratitude we will think of our FATHER’s protective and blessed hand during the first years of the settlement in the Cape.

1.6 WHITES TREK INTO THE INTERIOR.

Just after the Trek-farmers began trekking to the Eastern Cape, a smallpox epidemic broke out among the Hottentots and almost wiped them all out. **For that reason the Eastern Cape was unoccupied when the Farmers entered that area!!!**

1.7 THE GREAT TREK.

By 1836 the Voortrekkers went to seek their freedom northwards in the Free State, Transvaal and Natal. They drew up a manifest with a code of conduct. In that it stated that they would not molest any nation and take not the smallest portion of property from anyone, but that they would defend themselves to the limit if they were attacked. Following this, they then only occupied land that was unoccupied, or had bought or exchanged and gained according to agreement. In some areas they confiscated border areas from the Blacks to serve as 'buffers' (buffer zones) because the Blacks were forever stealing their livestock.

When the Boers trekked inland, it was totally depopulated through the Zulus' obliteration wars! There were just empty kraals and skeletons. Mzilikazi murdered the Sotho people in the Northern Free State and Transvaal, while Shaka and Dingane murdered the Pondo's and Swazis in Natal. The few Basotho that survived were so grateful towards Potgieter that they gave him the whole of the southern Transvaal. Retief also closed a deal with Dingane for their area in Natal. The following king (Mpande) also recognised the agreement. At the same time areas in the present Mpumalanga and Northern Natal were obtained through agreement with the Swazi king. There are many more such examples.

1.8 BORDERS

The British gave self-rule to Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana, but did not want to do so for Zululand and the Transkei, for they had coastal areas and the British were afraid these two territories would give harbours to the Boers. However, their borders were also acknowledged internationally. These areas were not determined by the Whites. These are the areas where Blacks took occupation of their own accord.

1.9 'NATIVE LAND ACT' 1913 AND THE 'NATIVE TRUST- and LAND ACT OF 1936.

It is also a lie that these "laws aimed at benefitting the Whites at the cost of the Blacks who were hindered to buy land in White areas." Furthermore that Blacks were deprived and thrown off their properties for Whites to settle there."

The truth is that the purpose of these laws was **to stop Whites** from buying traditional Black lands. Furthermore, to expropriate White land to consolidate Black areas. Where Blacks had been moved, they usually received better and larger areas. If Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana were added, Blacks had almost half of the land during the Apartheid years. At the same time they also had the highest rainfall areas. On only 30% of S.A. was permanent settlement possible without Western technology to extract ground water.

1.10 THE BRITISH IMPERIALISTS

There is also written evidence that the farmers in the Cape Colony had bought their land from the British queen. We refute the view that Whites stole the land from the Blacks, but even if there was truth in this, then British imperialists must be involved, for the original deeds show that Queen Victoria was the seller.

2. WHO DOES THE LAND REALLY BELONG TO? THERE ARE VARIOUS VIEWS ABOUT THIS.

2.1 Introduction:

There are major misconceptions about property rights. These conceptions are diametrically opposed to each other and are irreconcilable. The different views about property rights have led to major wars and even to genocides in history. We have seen in the past century how Communists murdered millions of people to take away their land. The worst genocides were committed by Stalin in the Soviet Union and by Mao Tse Tung in China. Also in South Africa these different views cause great tension and threaten to ultimately destroy the 'New South Africa'.

2.2 Humanistic views:

2.2.1 The Classic-Liberal view.

According to this view, private property is untouchable. The free market (voluntary buyer and voluntary seller) regulates the exchanging of all assets and consequently also assets such as land. The state is an ordinary party to such transactions. In highly exceptional cases the state could expropriate land for the creation of infrastructure. Normally the state's function is restricted to the protection of the legal interests of parties and the registration and administering of acts of transport. As a result this view respects the existing property rights of the past. This is a humanistic view which elevates individual man to the highest authority.

2.2.2 The Marxist view

According to this view there are no private property rights. The state determines the allocation and use of assets and also regarding fixed assets like land. All existing rights on property are consequently denied and are considered communal (state) property. Neither is it necessary to pay any compensation for the dispossession of property according to this view. This is a humanistic view which elevates the collective community to the highest authority. In practice the state are venerated as the highest authority.

2.2.3 The Imperialistic view

According to this view it is justified that a state/nation/emperor take control over another's land by merit of their superior status, power or intellect. The ancient empires are well-known examples of imperialism. The British Empire; the Soviet Union and the Nazi-Reich are more recent examples. We are currently living in the era of American imperialism. Depending on the imperial view, private property may be allowed, but then still subject to the over-arching property rights of the state. This is also a veneration of the state.

2.2.4 Liberalistic view

This view is also known as the 'democratic' view. This view try to reconcile the Classic-Liberal, the Marxist and the Naturalistic (which are discussed below) views. In practice it means that private property is allowed as far as it is approved by the so-called 'public

opinion'. The media propagates the 'public opinion' and the masses follow. The Illuminati¹⁹ controls the media and they manipulate the masses of people to support their hidden agenda. The property rights of big corporations are recognized as long as they support the Liberalist agenda. Property rights of small landholders are recognized, but the state dictates how they are to manage their property. This is a humanistic view which elevates the collective community to the highest authority. In practice the state is venerated as the highest authority.

2.3 The Naturalistic view ("Environmentalist")

This view in its most extreme form, considers man as a parasite on earth. They are even in favour of mass extermination of people. They not always, however, propagate these extremist views, but rather 'softer agendas' which find acclamation among people who consider protection of the environment as important and are disgusted by animal cruelty and industrial practices that ruin nature. Eventually environmental protection is abused to further their extremist measures. This view also subjects private property rights to collective naturalism. It idolizes nature and considers the state the highest authority to enforce the naturalistic views.

2.4 The Africa-view.

According to the Africa view, the strongest rule and therefore everything belongs to the chief. He is the highest authority, but he is himself subjected to the supernatural powers of the forefather spirits, the nature gods and the witch-doctor. As long as he can remain in their favour, he is the highest earthly power. The Africa culture is characterized by continual power struggle. The strongest survives and his authority is accepted unconditionally. This view recognizes no private property as far as land is concerned. Neither does the African cultural history know private landownership. It is different from the Western collective views. The Western collective views which reject private property, does have a concept of it, because private property comprises an integral part of Western cultural history. The Africa culture, however, does not have a concept of private land ownership.

2.5 The Biblical View

Ps 24:1,2 (ASV) *A Psalm of David. The earth is Jehovah's, and the fulness thereof; The world, and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas, And established it upon the floods.*

Ps 50:12 *If I were hungry, I would not tell thee; For the world is mine, and the fulness thereof.*

From this it is clear that God is the owner of everything. We are merely **stewards** over the property. God appointed man in Gen 1:26-31 as steward to rule over nature. The Bible recognizes private property throughout in the sense of private stewardship: the eighth commandment is "*Thou shalt not steal.*" From this it is clear that we should respect private property. See also Deut 22:1-4. The Bible also stresses the importance of private land ownership: Job 24:2; Pro 22:28; 23:10; Hos 5:10. It is furthermore apparent from Acts 5:4, for example.

Also inheritance of land is prescribed by the Bible: Num 27:8-11; Num 36:7-9; etc. We see here that our Father considers it very important that land should stay within the tribe

¹⁹ Secret organization with the purpose of world domination.

(greater family). This was also Naboth's motive for refusing to sell his vineyard to the king (1Ki 21:3).

3 Conclusion:

The Biblical view is diametrically opposed to the humanistic view in that God is the sole owner, whereas humanism exalts either the state or the individual as the highest authority and owner. The superficial similarity with the Liberal view of voluntary buyer and seller, is an illusion, because the supreme authority of God must always be central to a true Biblical view. The Biblical view is also irreconcilable with naturalism's exalting of nature and with the Africa view which denies private landownership.

The Bible also clearly teaches that it is an illusion that the state has absolute power to dispossess and redistribute land according to socialistic (Marxist) egalitarianism.

1Sa 2:7 *Jehovah maketh poor, and maketh rich: He bringeth low, he also lifteth up.*

Dan 4:32 (c) *... know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will. (viz also Job 40)*

From this we learn that God controls ownership of property. He gives to, and taketh away from whom He wishes. It is therefore an illusion that the ANC has the power to dispossess property (like farms) by its own power. Like Jesus told Pilate in Jn 19:11 (a) *Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above.*

We may, however, not deduct from this that our ownership is untouchable and that God won't allow its dispossession. On the contrary! God frequently use foreign governments to punish His 'volk' (people) if we are disobedient. This also includes dispossession of property.

Deu 28:33 *The fruit of thy ground, and all thy labors, shall a nation which thou knowest not eat up; and thou shalt be only oppressed and crushed alway*

Deu 28:43 *The sojourner that is in the midst of thee shall mount up above thee higher and higher; and thou shalt come down lower and lower.*

The true Biblical perspective is therefore total dependence on the almighty God. Our whole life – including the land over which we are appointed, should be *a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God* according to Rom12:1. Trusteeship means responsibility unto God (not unto the state) – also concerning nature. If we do not fulfil this responsibility, or if we deny God's Lordship over all property, we transgress God's command and we should expect the punishment accordingly.

We may not fear the apparent power of the earthly rulers (Rev 21:8). We must fear God alone and trust in Him alone (Mat 10:28; Ps 28:7)

Neither should we believe the false prophets who pretend that our situation is not all that serious.

Jer 6:14 and 8:11 *And they have healed the hurt of the daughter of my people [=“am”]: meaning ‘tribe’ or ‘kinfolk’] slightly, saying, Peace, peace; when there is no peace.*

Ps 24:3-6 *Who shall ascend into the hill of Jehovah? And who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart; Who hath not lifted up his soul unto falsehood, And hath not sworn deceitfully.*

He shall receive a blessing from Jehovah, And righteousness from the God of his salvation. This is the generation of them that seek after him, That seek thy face, even Jacob. Selah.

The CCPV regards it as its Biblical duty to admonish faithful compatriots to relinquish the illusion that the constitution will protect our property, as well as the delusions of grandeur that **we** will not permit them to confiscate our property. We must subject ourselves in humility to GOD's authority and in dependence from HIM fulfil our stewardship and also the battle for survival of our nation (and the protection of our property). We also have a duty to preserve and protect the land we received from our FATHER. 1 Kings 21:3 And Naboth said to Ahab, The Lord forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee.

We also regard it as our Biblical duty to admonish our compatriots who participate in spreading lies about our history and who do not subject themselves to GOD's authority, that they are facing the wrath of GOD.

We furthermore admonish the government and all who are hostile towards us, that we call on the Almighty GOD of heaven and earth that they will be accountable before HIM.

Ps. 2:1 Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing?

² The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, saying,

³ Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.

⁴ He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the LORD shall have them in derision.

⁵ Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure.

⁶ Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.

⁷ I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.

⁸ Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.

⁹ Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

¹⁰ Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth.

¹¹ Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling.

¹² Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in HIM.

Appendix 2

1. We, as the representatives of the Most High and Almighty God, YHWH (Jehovah) and His Son, Jesus, the King of kings:-

have the responsibility to warn you that the Almighty YHWH is the rightful owner of everything, including all land. We urge you to respect Him and His ordinances.

2. Ps 24:1,2 (ASV) *A Psalm of David. The earth is Jehovah's, and the fullness thereof; The world, and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas, And established it upon the floods.*

Ps 50:12 *If I were hungry, I would not tell thee; For the world is mine, and the fullness thereof.*

From this it is clear that God is the owner of everything. We are merely **stewards** over the property. God appointed man in Gen 1:26-31 as steward to rule over nature.

3. The Bible recognizes private property throughout in the sense of private stewardship: the eighth commandment is “*Thou shalt not steal.*” From this it is clear that we should respect private property. See also Deut 22:1-4. The Bible also stresses the importance of private land ownership: Job 24:2; Pro 22:28; 23:10; Hos 5:10. It is furthermore apparent from Acts 5:4, for example.

4. Also: inheritance of land is prescribed by the Bible: Num 27:8-11; Num 36:7-9; etc. We see here that our Father considers it very important that land should stay within the tribe (greater family). This was also Naboth’s motive for refusing to sell his vineyard to the king (1Ki 21:3). From this passage it is also clear that **it does not become the state to dispossess privately owned land. God’s revenge upon the government’s abuse of power to confiscate privately owned land is spelled out in 1Ki 21:17-24:** *And the word of Jehovah came to Elijah the Tishbite, saying, Arise, go down to meet Ahab king of Israel, who dwelleth in Samaria: behold, he is in the vineyard of Naboth, whither he is gone down to take possession of it. And thou shalt speak unto him, saying, Thus saith Jehovah, Hast thou killed and also taken possession? And thou shalt speak unto him, saying, Thus saith Jehovah, In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine. And Ahab said to Elijah, Hast thou found me, O mine enemy? And he answered, I have found thee, because thou hast sold thyself to do that which is evil in the sight of Jehovah. Behold, I will bring evil upon thee, and will utterly sweep thee away and will cut off from Ahab every man-child, and him that is shut up and him that is left at large in Israel: and I will make thy house like the house of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, and like the house of Baasha the son of Ahijah for the provocation wherewith thou hast provoked me to anger, and hast made Israel to sin. And of Jezebel also spake Jehovah, saying, The dogs shall eat Jezebel by the rampart of Jezreel. Him that dieth of Ahab in the city the dogs shall eat; and him that dieth in the field shall the birds of the heavens eat.*

5. The Bible clearly also teaches that it is an illusion that the state has absolute power to dispossess and redistribute land according to socialistic (Marxist) egalitarianism.

1Sa 2:7 *Jehovah maketh poor, and maketh rich: He bringeth low, he also lifteth up.*

Dan 4:32 (c) ... *know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will.* (viz also Job 40)

From this we learn that God controls ownership of property. He gives to, and taketh away from whom He wishes. It is therefore an illusion that the ANC has the power to dispossess property (like farms) by its own power. Like Jesus told Pilate in John 19:11 (a) *Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above.*

You have been warned.

End notes:

i

Die Geloofte - 16 Desember 1838

"Mijne Broeders en mede-landgenoten,
 hier staan wij thans, op eene
 Ogenblik voor een Heilige God, van
 Hemel en aarde, om een belofte aan Hem te beloven,
 dat, "zoo de Heere ons de overwinning geven
 mogt, een Huis tot zynes Grooten Naams
 gedachtenis te stichten, alwaar
 het Hem zal behagen" —
 en dat zy ook moesten afsmeaken,
 de hulp en bystand van God, om
 deze geloofte zeker te kunnen volbrengen,
 en dat wy den dag der overwinning, in een boek zullen
 aantekenen, om dezelve bekend te maken,
 zelfs aan onze laatste nageslachten, op dat het ter
 Eere van God gevierd mag worden."

ii

PAARDEKRAAL GELOFTE

13 DESEMBER 1880

Op 13 Desember 1880, het tussen 5000 en 8000 gewapende burgers, op 'n voorstel van Paul Kruger, elkeen 'n klip kom neersit op die plek waar die monument vandag staan en is daar 'n geloofte afgelê dat,

"Indien de Lieve Heer ons helpen en zegenen wilde, en wij ons land terug zouden krygen, dat den het volk elk jaar daar zouden komen feestvieren, juist by dezelfde steenhoop, en den Heer onze geloften komen betalen. En deze steenhoop is de eeuwige getuie daarvan."

iii

Andendum 1

The real state of land ownership - AfriForum

Ernst Roets | 24 April 2018

Rapport says the state owns a substantial proportion of ECape, KZN, Limpopo, Mpumalanga and NWest

AfriForum reveals new information on land ownership, as well as memorandum to international community on expropriation without compensation

The civil rights organisation AfriForum will send a delegation to the USA next week to launch the first leg of the organisation's international campaign against expropriation without compensation. The organisation plans on meeting with government representatives, research institutions, the media and potential investors abroad.

AfriForum plans on mobilising the international community to pressurise the South African government into setting aside its expropriation policy.

The memorandum that AfriForum will use to this effect was made available to the media today. According to the memorandum, Government's attempts to expropriate land without compensation have a clear racist motive. "Furthermore, Government's viewpoint on land reform presents three core problems," says Ernst Roets, Deputy CEO of AfriForum. These problems are:

1. The policy is based on a distortion of South Africa's history.
2. The allegation that there is a great demand for land is false – especially regarding agricultural land.
3. In terms of Government's interference in land ownership so far, results have been catastrophic.

The distortion of the past relates to the assumption that white land owners inevitably obtained land through oppression, whereas most of the land owned by white people was legally bought. There were also cases in the 1800s where the Voortrekkers took possession of uninhabited land. Furthermore, it is true that conflict between white and black tribes indeed occurred during the Great Trek. However, the fact is swept under the carpet that conflicts for the purpose of conquering land had at that stage been a common practice among black tribes.

Regarding the demand for agricultural land, AfriForum today revealed that 57,8% of land claims up to now had been for urban land – and not agricultural land. It is also common knowledge that 93% of people who submitted land claims indicated that they preferred financial compensation rather than land restitution. The Institute of Race Relations also found that only 1% of people in South Africa believe that land reform would improve their lives.

In terms of the third problem, Government conceded that more than 90% of farms that the State had transferred to black owners had failed. Although the South African government has already spent more than R45 billion on land reform, only 6,3% of land procured by the State has been converted to private ownership.

AfriForum also released a report titled Land in South Africa – A Geospatial Perspective. This report was compiled by Burgert Gildenhuys, Executive Director of MapAble. The report reveals the following:

1. 24,03% of land in South Africa is state-owned. This land includes land owned by the State, former homelands and parts of former homelands, as well as areas under nature reservation. It can be split per province as follows:

Eastern Cape: 34,65%

Free State: 6,5%
 Gauteng: 19,90%
 KwaZulu-Natal: 52,32%
 Limpopo: 42,66%
 Mpumalanga: 32,72%
 Northern Cape: 11,20%
 North West: 31,99%
 Western Cape: 15,59%
 Total: 24,03%

2. Data on land ownership is deficient and should be corrected if an informed decision is to be taken.

3. The land issue in South Africa is linked to race. The Land Audit Report 2017 attempted to link land to race. This attempt was inaccurate, however, as data provided by the Department of Home Affairs no longer includes the race of citizens of the country. Read the report here: AfriForum – Land and land reform. - PDF

Text of memorandum:

1. Expropriation without compensation

Once the ruling ANC had adopted a policy that land should be expropriated without compensation at its 54th National Conference in December 2017, Cyril Ramaphosa, its newly elected President, said that taking the land owned by white farmers should increase food production and that “South Africa could turn into the ultimate paradise if the implementation of the policy of expropriation of land without compensation leads to higher food production”. He added: “We can make this country the Garden of Eden.”¹ On 27 February 2018, the South African Parliament adopted a motion that a process had to be started to amend Section 25 (the property rights clause) in the South African Constitution to allow for expropriation of land without compensation.²

“Almost 400 years ago, a criminal by the name of Jan van Riebeeck landed in our native land and declared an already occupied land by the native population as a no-man’s land,” argued Julius Malema, Leader of the EFF, as he introduced the motion in Parliament, which was supported by the ruling ANC. “Van Riebeeck, a first descendent of the Dutch to arrive in the Cape would later lead a full blown colonial genocide, anti-black land dispossession criminal project, arguing that simply because our people could not produce title deeds, this land, that they have been living in for more than a thousand years, was not their own.”³ He continued: “The time for reconciliation is over; now is the time for justice.”⁴

David Mabuza, Deputy President, threatened white farmers with a “violent takeover” should they not volunteer some of their land.⁵

Other than the clear racist motivation that serves as a foundation to this motion, here are at least three major problems with the South African government’s stance on land reform. The first is that it is based on a distorted perception of history. The second is that there is no real “hunger for land” – in fact, the vast majority of black people in South Africa have no interest in owning agricultural land. The third is that where the government has intervened with regard to landownership, it has had catastrophic results. But before these issues are addressed, the dishonesty of the South African government regarding expropriation of property should be pointed out.

2. Dishonesty regarding expropriation

President Cyril Ramaphosa described his pilgrimage to the World Economic Forum (WEF) in January 2018 as “very, very successful”. The main aim of this trip was to encourage international investors to invest in South Africa.⁶ Less than a month after the wooing of international investors under the assumption that property rights will be

protected in South Africa, the South African Parliament decided that the South African Constitution would have to be amended to allow for the expropriation of property without compensation.

It is argued that this policy must be executed so that more black people can own property. It is however evident from the policy documents of both the ruling ANC and its supporting EFF, that the intention is for the state to own the land, not private individuals. This point is further proven by the fact that only 6,3% of land that had been bought by the state, has been transferred to private ownership.⁷

Furthermore, the motion to expropriate property without compensation is based on a flawed state-driven land audit that is soaked with fabrications and methodological errors.

3. Flawed perception of history

It is often argued that land reform had to be executed in order to correct historical injustices. While it is certainly true that a variety of injustices occurred throughout South Africa's history, it should be pointed out that the history of land ownership in South Africa is more complex than that which is regularly argued by political leaders. The truth is that white owned land was acquired in three different ways, namely occupation of empty land, acquiring of land through negotiation and conquest.

The focus of this report is not to provide a historic account of events. Two comments should however be made regarding the obtaining of land through conquest. The first is that it was a common practice among black tribes at the time.⁸ The second is that obtaining of land through conquest was not that common among white people who settled in South Africa. The majority of land was either acquired through the occupation of empty land, or through negotiations with local black tribes.⁹

4. No "hunger for land"

The Restitution of Land Rights Act¹⁰ allowed for people to institute claims for land of which they had been deprived of as a result of racially discriminatory practices such as forced removals. By the time the cut-off date was reached in 1998, about 80 000 land claims had been filed. The government was not satisfied and opened the process again in 2014, claiming that they believed that 400 000 land claims would be filed in total.¹¹ A little known fact is that 57,8% of land claims were for urban land, as opposed to rural land.¹² Furthermore, what came as a source of frustration to the government was the fact that 93% of those who had instituted land claims indicated that they did not really have an interest in owning agricultural land and that they would prefer to receive money as compensation. The government responded angrily to this, stating that it was "hurting land reform". Bheki Mbili, in charge of Land Restitution Support in KwaZulu-Natal, explained what black land claimants say:

"Many of the claimants already have small pieces of land and some don't even live in those areas where their forefathers were removed from. Some say to us that they don't want more land than they already own and the risk involved if they ask us to buy them those huge pieces of land that will go out of production."

He then explained why this was a problem for the government:

"The problem with this is that if you look at the outcome of first phase of the land audit, the amount of land that is private land particularly that is owned by white people in this country is still in the region of between 70 and 80%. We can only change the land ownership pattern if people opt for restoration. If they opt for financial compensation the pattern stays the same. If you take the money you don't dent the problem that currently exists."¹³

Notwithstanding the fact that the figures of white landownership provided by Mbili are inflated (at least 34,5% of South African land is black-owned),¹⁴ the problem is therefore that the South African government is dedicated to reducing the amount of land owned

by white people, while this is not regarded as a priority by the majority of black South Africans.

This is also evident from the rapid pace at which urbanisation among black South Africans is taking place. Black South Africans, more than any other group, seem to want to live in cities, rather than in rural areas. From 2000 to 2015, the population of so-called black Africans in Johannesburg increased by 76,7%. The corresponding number for Cape Town is 122,4% and for Pretoria it is 71,6%. During the same time frame, the number of white people in Johannesburg declined by 8,1% and in Cape Town by 0,7%. In Pretoria, the number of white people increased by a mere 2,7%.¹⁵

With regard to the intention to enter agriculture, Statistics South Africa (SSA) found that only 2,8% of all university students enrolled to study agricultural science and similar courses.¹⁶

Furthermore, when the Institute of Race Relations (IRR) surveyed South Africans and asked them what they believed had to be done to improve their lives, a mere 1% indicated that they believed that land reform would improve their lives.¹⁷

5. Failure of land reform

According to the South African government, about 9% – almost 8 million hectares – of agricultural land has already been distributed to black African people.¹⁸ However, it was admitted that more than 90% of farms distributed by the state to black African communities failed and usually reverted very quickly either to subsistence farming or to squatter camps.¹⁹ A study by the Land Bank found that approximately 4 000 farms had been acquired since 1994 at a cost of R10 billion, of which only 10% were productive.²⁰ While the South African government had already spent more than R45 billion on land reform, only 6,3% of the land that had been acquired by the state had been transferred into private land.²¹

6. Conclusion

Land reform is a political ploy, a policy that is rigged for failure and one that only serves to escalate the friction that already exists with regard to South Africa's food producers. It is clear that the South African government's push for expropriation without compensation is founded in racist sentiment and a distortion of history. It is also clear that the so-called hunger for land is largely non-existent – particularly with regard to agricultural land. Furthermore, it is clear that land reform has already been disastrous to the extent that it has been executed in South Africa.

While the primary targets of this policy are clearly white farmers, the primary victims might just as well be the very people that the South African government claims to represent.

1 News24. (7 January 2018). Taking land should increase food production – Ramaphosa.

2 News24. (27 February 2018). National Assembly adopts motion on land expropriation without compensation.

3 Hansard (Unrevised). National Assembly. (27 February 2017). pp. 25–26.

4 Hansard (Unrevised). National Assembly. (27 February 2017). p. 28.

5 IOL. (7 April 2018). Mabuza appeals to white farmers to share their land.

6 Fin24. (28 January 2018). Ramaphosa vows Davos money.

7 Interview with Johann Bornman. (19 April 2018).

8 Changuoin, L. and Steenkamp, B. (2011). *Omstrede Land*. Pretoria: Protea Boekhuis. p. 30.

9 Changuoin, L. and Steenkamp, B. (2011). *Omstrede Land*. Pretoria: Protea Boekhuis.

10 No. 22 of 1994.

11 The Citizen. (10 July 2014). 400 000 Valid land claims remain.

12 Agri Development Solutions database. Interview with Johann Bornman. (19 April 2018).

13 TimesLive. (30 May 2017). Land claimants want the cash not the land, says KZN Land Claims Commission.

14 Landbou.com. (4 March 2017). Landbougrond in SA: 34,5% in swart besit.

15 Institute of Race Relations. (2017). South Africa Survey 2017. pp. 28–29.

16 News24. (26 February 2017). Land reform is a political ploy.

17 Report by the IRR. (February 2017). Race Relations in South Africa: Reasons for Hope 2017. p. 3.

18 TimesLive. (10 March 2018). Land debate is clouded by misrepresentation and lack of data.

19 Mail & Guardian. (2 March 2010). Land reform: Use it or lose it, says minister. See also Johnson, R. W. (2015). How Long Will South Africa Survive?

20 Source

21 Interview with Johann Bornman. (19 April 2018).

ENDS