



EXPANSIVE: President Jacob Zuma's home in Nkandla is being revamped.

PICTURE: DOCTOR NGCOBO

Income from tax and state funds surely come down to same thing

I AM NOT sure how people are reacting to the latest Sars television campaign in which we are told, in long and I am sure very expensive advertisements, how our tax money is being used to uplift the community.

So far we have built bridges, sent people to university, etc. Projects that are worthy of our taxes. I don't think anyone can argue with this, maybe a slight adverse feeling about the cost of these adverts, maybe I am wrong, and the costs are coming out of "state funding"?

What is the difference between "State Funding" and "Public Funding"? The reason

I ask is the statement that came out of the Presidency in which it was said that we did not have to worry about the money being poured into Zuma's homestead, Nkandla, as this money was not public funding but was being paid by the state.

If this is the case, can someone please explain where the state gets this money from.

I was always under the impression that money pouring into state coffers was money raised through the imposition of taxes and duties.

I read in an article that Zuma did obtain a questionable home loan from FNB to finance part of the upgrade. It would

appear that he was given a loan of R900 000, this was only granted when his benefactor, Vivian Reddy, stood as guarantor. If this is the case, and we have no reason to doubt it, where did the balance of about R190 million come from? This does not include the amount of about R500m spent on new roads to reach his village.

Isn't it time our illustrious President Zuma appeared on television as part of the tax authority's thank you campaign? After all, it is our tax money that is supporting his very expensive lifestyle.

Robert Ashton
Deneysville, Free State