



South Africa Officially Begins Its Program of Seizing White-Owned Farms

The South African government recently offered to buy two farms for \$1.8 million when they are valued at \$18-million. When the owners refused, the communist government evicted them from their land. This is the beginning of a previously announced program that will apply to the entire country. There is little doubt that this will cause a decline in agricultural productivity and an increase in poverty and hunger – but the communist government places the political value of a single-race program above all other considerations. -GEG

The South African government is believed to have seized at least two farms owned by white South Africans after those farmers refused a government offer of one-tenth their land's value, beginning what experts believe to be a country-wide "expropriation" of white-owned land.

According to reports, the South African government offered to buy land from two white farmers in the country's northern region of Limpopo. After the two farmers quoted their price (around \$18 million) the government came back with offers one-tenth of asking, a mere \$1.8 million. When the farmers refused the offer, the government issued a summons, evicting the farmers from their land.

[Read full article here...](#)

An award-winning South African winemaker foresees a potential catastrophe as government steers the country from socialism to a communistic failed state.

Josef Dreyer of Raka Wines addressed the developing land expropriation process and the danger South Africa faces if it further cripples private industry and entrepreneurs who are barely propping up a populace heavily dependent on tax dollars being contributed by a precious few.

“We are one of the countries with a wide gap between the rich and the poor, where 13 percent of the South African population of 56 million people are the ones paying income taxes,” Dreyer said in his [interview with RT](#). “Yes, 13 percent make the country run. 18 million of the 56 million is reliant on social grants, and unemployment is at 37.5 percent, so yes it is much easier to hand out land as the money is drying up.”

[Additional Reading...](#)



**Journalist Jon Rappoport Says
Google, Facebook and Other
Social Media Censor Their**

Critics, Not Only Because They Are Left-Leaning, But Because They Are Appendages of the State

Jon Rappoport argues that Big Tech and social-media corporations are serving mainstream news outlets by silencing their competition – commentators like Alex Jones, Dennis Prager, and Stefan Molyneaux. Rappoport shows that Google, Facebook, and YouTube are deeply influenced by government intelligence agencies. Facebook received \$13-million in 2004 from Accel Partners, which is indirectly funded by the CIA and DARPA, a research division of the US military. Google works closely with the military-industrial complex and has huge contracts with the US national-security apparatus. Rappoport concludes: “Google and Facebook are nurtured creatures of the national-security state.” -GEG

Several of the biggest “conservative/libertarian” figures on the Net—[Alex Jones](#), Dennis Prager, Stefan Molyneux, among others—have recently been banned/censored by Google, Facebook, Twitter, and other social media companies.

When you ask why this is happening, one obvious answer pops up right away:

These social media corporations are fulfilling desperate pleas from major news outlets, who have been losing audience, in massive chunks, to the likes of Jones, Prager, and Molyneaux.

The newspapers and TV news networks came to end of their rope. They had no solutions to their problem—so they went to Google, Facebook, and others, and said, HELP US. Meaning: Censor our competition.

On one level, understanding censorship is that simple.

But then you have to ask yourself this question: Why would Google, Facebook, and other social media giants bend to the needs of mainstream news outlets?

These social media operations are richer and bigger than mainstream news. They could easily have said: "No, we like open forums and a wide variety of opinion, and we think people should be able to deal with ideas they don't like. We stand for an open society, and we vigorously defend the 1st Amendment."

But they didn't say that. Instead, they're enacting bans and censorship. Why?

The obvious answer staring us in the face is: Google and Facebook and You Tube, for example, the largest social media corporations, are not "free companies."

They've been in bed with the intelligence community for a long time, and they favor wall to wall surveillance of the population. They favor the "liberal" version of a policed State, where correct opinions are let in the door and incorrect opinions are shut down.

Let's quickly review a bit of Facebook history:

The big infusion of cash that sent Mark Zuckerberg and his fledgling college enterprise on their way came from Accel Partners, in 2004.

Jim Breyer, head of Accel, attached a \$13 million rocket to Facebook, and nothing has ever been the same.

Earlier that same year, a man named Gilman Louie joined the board of the National Venture Capital Association of America (NVCA). The chairman of NVCA? Jim Breyer. Gilman Louie happened to be the first CEO of the important CIA start-up, In-Q-Tel.

In-Q-Tel was founded in 1999, with the express purpose of

funding companies that could develop technology the CIA would use to “gather data.”

That’s not the only connection between Jim Breyer and the CIA’s man, Gilman Louie. In 2004, Louie went to work for BBN Technologies, headed up by Breyer. Dr. Anita Jones also joined BBN at that time. Jones had worked for In-Q-Tel and was an adviser to DARPA, the Pentagon’s technology department that helped develop the Internet.

[Read full article here...](#)



After Forty Years of ‘One-Child Policy’, China Now Considering Rewarding Young Adults Who Have More Children

Two Chinese academics floated a proposal to tax all working adults under 40 would subsidize a “reproductive fund” to reward families who have more than one child to encourage people to have more children. This is a complete turnaround after a one-child policy, which fined women for having more than one child and forced them to have abortions or to be sterilized, a policy that lasted nearly four decades but ended three years ago. China now is worried about a rapidly ageing

society, a shrinking workforce, and a falling birth rate that is creating a demographic time bomb. -GEG

The idea was the most controversial among a series of measures floated by two academics from prestigious Nanjing University in an article published by Communist Party mouthpiece *Xinhua Daily* on Tuesday.

It comes amid a nationwide campaign to encourage people to have more children – a drastic turnaround after a one-child policy that lasted nearly four decades and only ended three years ago – as Beijing worries about a rapidly ageing society, shrinking workforce and falling birth rate creating a demographic time bomb.

But the proposal was roundly criticised, with some saying it was reminiscent of the way the Chinese government controlled its population for so many years. Under the policy introduced in 1979, people were fined for having more than one child and women were forced to have abortions or sterilisation procedures. Critics said both the old policy and the latest proposal violated basic human rights.

Couples can now have two children but the birth rate is falling despite the new policy. The academics, Liu Zhibiao and Zhang Ye, predicted the rate would drop significantly in the coming years, citing official data.

In the first six months, the number of births in mainland China fell by 15 to 20 per cent in many provinces from a year ago, according to local government data. Last year, some 17.58 million babies were born – down by 630,000 from 2016, according to the National Bureau of Statistics.

To tackle the problem, the academics proposed ways to encourage people to have more children, including taxing women and men under 40 for a “reproduction fund” that families with more than one child could claim subsidies from. Those who were not eligible would receive their contributions back when they

reached retirement age.

They said a certain proportion of people's wages would be taxed and the government could top up the fund as necessary, without giving further details.

[Read full article here...](#)