

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 Commission, 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-

ness". Now, the trouble with analogies is their abuse. Analogies can be effectively employed to ILLUSTRATE a point or argument. But, by THEMSELVES, analogies cannot PROVE the point or argument. That can only be done by logical and factual argument. There is no escaping that process. Analogies cannot be a short cut to a conclusion.

Of course, a lighted candle is preferable to total darkness. But we need to be told exactly what the candle is supposed to represent; what does it entail, and more important, how is it to be achieved? That, the Editor does not do. The analogy is supposed to take care of that. Well, we have outgrown fairy tales and entertaining analogies. We need hard facts, solid arguments and flawless reasoning. Until that comes to light, we adhere to our standpoint and reject the accusation of defeatism.

As for Mrs Grayson, we find it difficult to believe that she, in the light of her remarks, has studied our pamphlet. If she had, she would have realised that we were stating our views on a project as a single entity. Our rejection of the project has **nothing to do** with those people, who in their own ways, assist other people in need of help. We are **not** saying: Don't help. We recognise that as long as there is need and suffering, kind and caring people will always render assistance out of charity and humanity. We do not and cannot stop this process, although we make it very clear that if there is to be an end to such suffering, we must attack the root cause and not to confine our activity to the symptoms of an unjust social system.

Our objection to "PMB 2000" is NOT that we want to prevent people from rendering help, but we do want to prevent people from being led up the garden path by being made to believe that the project will significantly alter their way of life.

---

## **MISUSE OF MAYOR'S MERCY?**

When the people of Pietermaritzburg were told that R110 000,00 was to be spent for the purchase of a new Mercedes Benz for the Mayor, they were outraged at the extravagance. We were then told that a new car, at that price, was essential for the upholding the dignity of the Mayor's Office. We are aware of the existence of a certain breed of people whose dignity needs to be held by luxury cars bought with public funds. Our view is that dignity cannot be bought. We believe that dignity in a public office flows from a sense of dedication to serve people from honesty, humility, uprighteousness and sensitivity.

Be that as it may. We now hear that the Mayor had used the new car to convey his dogs to the SPCA. Again, an outraged people. People want to know whether Mr Mark Cornell, the Mayor has no car of his own. If he does, as he should, then why didn't he use his private car to cart his private dogs?

But no! According to "knowledgeable" people, the Mayor is entitled to use the new car, bought with public funds, to convey his dogs. In other words, the dignity of the Mayor's office also extends to his dogs. So we now have Mayoral Dogs! Interesting.

Caligula, a Roman Emperor (born 12 A.D., died 41 A.D.), according to some historians, made his horse a Consul of Rome. History, it is said, repeats itself.

Will it?