and crack the whip. The only point of dispute is how best to oppress and exploit the blacks. Is it going to be:–

(a) The way of the AWB-CP, that is, the unrestrained use of the sjambok? or

(b) The way of the Nats, that is, the sjambok plus the rubber carrot? or

(c) The way of the PFP, that is, the use of the sugar-coated bitter pill?

The oppressed and exploited have watched this game for over 300 years. The results have always been the same as far as their lives are concerned. Hence our boredom and indifference. Hence our belief that not even the grave will cure a hunch-back.

But the oppressed do reel and are reeling presently from the unbridled violence which is sweeping the country and the helplessness of the victims. They reel from starvation caused through unemployment and slave wages. In all this, how would "better" election results have helped? What if the PFP had gained 6 seats instead of losing the same number? How would that have resolved the fundamental conflict of our land?

For the PFP the gain of 6 seats would have been VICTORY. For the oppressed it would have been meaningless!

THE HYPOCRISY OF THE ENGLISH PRESS

The results of the "Whites-only" elections left the PFP staggering like a punch-drunk boxer. Post election depression set in and urgent psychotherapy was indicated. The English Press hurried to the rescue. An acceptable reason had to be found for crushing defeat. That reason turned out to be the mighty propaganda machine of the Nationalist Party which swung votes away from the PFP.

According to Dr van Zyl Slabbert, the extraparliamentary spokesman of the PFP:–

> "Information was ruthlessly and cynically controlled, the television was used by the Government to create a seige theory . . . The maligning of opponents was ruthless, brutal and consistent . . . It was all such putrid demagoguery . . ." (Sunday Tribune – 10 May 1987).

The Sunday Tribune took up the same theme:

> "Mr President, we acknowledge your skill and determination as a political campaigner. You called for a mandate on security. You whipped up a near-war psychosis and you used every trick imaginable to exploit the fear and uncertainty of voters to secure for yourself what is undoubtedly for you a great triumph."

Both Dr Slabbert and the Editor of the Sunday Tribune have **conveniently omitted mention** of the role of the English Press in the "putrid demagoguery" and "every trick imaginable".

We refer to the massive campaign of full page advertisements inserted by the Nationalist Party in the English Press where it was able to engage in the "putrid demagoguery", etc. The target was the PFP. While we hold no brief for the PFP, we do level an indictment against the English Press for its role as an accomplice. By publishing these advertisements, **the English Press joined the propaganda machine of the Nationalist Party**.

No doubt, we will be assailed with a sermon about the freedom of the press and how the English Press was honour-bound to publish those advertisements. We say that that stance is nothing more than hypocritical hogwash. The Queensberry rules of boxing do not apply when you have to face a streetfighter armed with a flick knife and knuckle-duster. If the scales were heavily tilted in favour of the Nats because of the latter's use of the radio and television, the Munnik Commision, etc, the principle of the free press does not impose a duty to add more weight in favour of the Nats. In truth, there is nothing **free** about the "free press". You need MONEY, and lots of it, to enjoy that free press. Those advertisements cost hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of rand. MONEY TALKED AND THE ENGLISH PRESS PRINTED. Being capitalists, they will not let slip an opportunity to make profit. Thus it came about that the English Press sold the horse it backed for the infamous thirty pieces of silver.

Having done that, the English Press now seeks to present the Nats as the arch-villain of the piece. It reminds one of the hired assassin palming off the blame of the foul deed on those who hired him to do it.

There, in a nutshell, you have it – the hypocrisy of the English Press.

REPLY TO OUR CRITICS ON "PMB 2000"

APDUSA'S analysis and condemnation of the project "PMB 2000" has been met with hostility from the liberal establishment.

The "Natal Witness", in its editorial, accused us of being "defeatist" while Mrs Ann Grayson has publicly expressed disappointment to our response. She claimed that we were being negative.

We are genuinely surprised by the criticism. We believed that our statement is a serious one, which was presented only after a great deal of thought and study. We have fully set out our objections to the project and we say why it must fail.

If we are wrong in our analysis and conclusions then we must be shown where we erred. This means that our critics must show that:–

(a) We have not set out all the **relevant** facts

(b) Our information is inaccurate or incorrect

(c) Our conclusions are wrong because "PMB 2000" is viable and CAN work.

Nothing of that sort was done. All the "Natal Witness" did was to present the public with an analogy about it being "better to light a candle than curse the dark-