

Three million 'white' voters will indulge on 6 May in a grand illusion that this election can bring peace and joy into their lives and those of their children or of twenty-six million voiceless oppressed.

The pre-election stunts have brought into the open fascist gangs who seem to enjoy the confidence of ruling class parties; dirty tricks specialists whose stories of foreign agents, 'rooi gevaars', 'swart gevaars' and secret funds make a mockery of free elections; and media 'specialists' who outshine the Goebbelses and Lord Haw-Haws of past history. Buying votes has been made a national occupation. A quarter of a billion rand is being given to 'white' farmers while 'black' peasants are being driven off their lands and 'black' pupils sit in schools without desks, books and food. Such is the moral base of this election.

We say to all the oppressed masses in South Africa:

The 6 May election is yet another threat to our very existence. They show once again that the present rulers are illegitimate and unfit to govern.

Only the organised, united political struggles of the masses and their allies can bring democracy to South Africa.

Only the extension of the full franchise to all South Africans can produce honest, truly democratic elections in the interests of all South Africa.

We must turn our backs upon this fraudulent election.

Our road is FORWARD -- FORWARD in the struggle for nothing less than full democratic rights, ONE South Africa, ONE parliament, ONE NATION.

APRIL 1987

Issued by the National Co-ordinating Committee of the New Unity Movement

OUR VIEW OF THE "WHITES-ONLY" ELECTION RESULTS

"All thinking, caring people are reeling from the shock of the election where we witnessed the most shameful accusations, innuendos, slander, smears and hypocrisy . . ."

So wrote Mrs A. Grayson in a letter to the "Natal Witness" of 20 May 1987.

Mrs Grayson clearly moves and lives in a limited circle of PFP types. The millions of the thinking and caring blacks are, decidedly, NOT reeling from the results of the Whites-only election and the propaganda techniques of the Nats. This is so because the oppressed have become accustomed to right wing politics dominating the Herrenvolk scene.

Elections to the Whites-only House of Assembly is like a bizarre game we witness -- a game played by the Herrenvolk to decide who is going to hold the reins of power

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”.