

**PROPAGANDA OR COUNTER-PROPAGANDA:  
MEDIA STRATEGIES FOR PRESENTING TABOOED NEWS**

Christine Anthonissen  
Dept of Linguistics, University of Western Cape

In pragmatics one of the linguistic phenomena which is under scrutiny, is the ability of utterances such as 1 and 2 below to communicate more than is encoded in the grammar.

1. If he passed his driving test, I am a Dutchman.
2. You would like to walk the rest of the way home, wouldn't you?

Of such utterances we want to know *how* 1. can be used to mean 3. or how 2. can be used to mean 4.

3. I don't believe that he passed his driving test.
4. Either you stop criticising my driving, or you get out of the car.

Also, we want to know *why* speakers actually use utterances such as 1. and 2. while more direct possibilities such as 3. and 4. are available to them.

There are of course certain circumstances under which speakers are prohibited from saying things directly. Then it is clear *why* they choose alternative ways of communicating: the only option open to them is to speak indirectly. The question which remains then, is *how* people succeed in saying, and communicating, things that are by law unmentionable.

In keeping with the Critical Linguistic idea of being explicit about the particular position from which one is working, I must confess that my interest is not primarily in such seemingly innocent utterances as the ones I started out with. I am interested in texts which are popularly identified as propaganda, in the particular kind of prejudice exhibited in such propagandistic texts, and in linguistic responses to such texts. Our recent history provides some useful examples.

During the late 1980's a successive number of States of Emergency were declared in South Africa. The government could already rely on certain statutes which had long been in place, such as the Public Safety Act of 1953 restricting e.g. 'riotous assemblies', or the Publications Act of 1974 prohibiting the publication and circulation of 'undesirable publications' ranging from pornography to novels dealing with politically sensitive topics. Included in the Emergency regulations were further restrictions on the publication and dissemination of particular kinds of information. The State President personally obtained extensive powers to

proclaim certain restrictions - powers which he did not hesitate to use.

The government felt that the security of the State was threatened to such an extent that it could not allow the media to apply the selection criteria' which generally operate when a free press decides on what is newsworthy at a given time in a specific community. Consequently it was declared illegal to publish "subversive matter". Soon a Bureau of Information was set up to perform a gatekeeper's role in deciding which unrest related information newsmedia would be allowed to report, and which not. The Indicator (30 June 1986) published the following comment on the State of Emergency regulations which were applicable to the media:

#### COMMENT

ANYONE deemed to have published 'subversive' statements in terms of the State of Emergency regulations faces a fine of R20 000 or 10 years' jail, or jail without the option of a fine. In this issue of The Indicator, the information contained in news items relating to unrest comes from the government's Bureau for Information or from speeches in Parliament. In terms of the Emergency regulations, The Indicator and other media are not allowed to publish any information on unrest except that given by the Bureau for Information. Several people from Lenasia, including prominent members of Azapo/National Forum and Transvaal Indian Congress/UDF, are among the undisclosed number of South Africans detained since the start of the national State of Emergency.

Their names have been released for publication.

In effect, this means that for those who subscribe to the code of ethics of giving more than one side of a news story there is a

### NEWS BLACKOUT

In 1939, Pastor Martin Niemoller of Germany wrote:

"They first came for the communists and I did not speak up because I was not a communist.

"Then they came for the Jews and I did not speak up because I was not a Jew.

"Then they came for the trade unionists and I did not speak up because I was not a trade unionist.

"Then they came for the Catholics and I did not speak up because I was a Protestant.

"Then they came for me and by that time there was no-one left to speak."

In terms of the Emergency regulations, the Minister of Law and Order has the power to ban any publication if, in his opinion, it contains 'subversive' matter. In effect, the government has passed a suspended death sentence, without needing a trial, on those media that dare to publish the truth as they see it.

As a result, we too are suffering from the Niemoller Syndrome.

Such comment clearly was more than just informing the public of a "news blackout". It presented a challenge to the restrictions the Emergency Regulations put on the media. So,

during that time an interesting discourse of propaganda and counter-propaganda started to take shape in public. My particular interest is in the voices which resisted the taboo placed on unrest related matters. These voices tested the boundaries of freedom of expression in a society where state censure appeared to be increasingly oppressive. I would like to consider what the characteristics are of texts which are referred to as 'propagandistic' or 'counter-propagandistic'. To illustrate how a particular kind of counter-propaganda succeeds in communicating restricted information, I shall analyse such a counter-propagandistic text by means of a critical strategy which Rob Pope calls "textual intervention"<sup>2</sup>.

#### **PROPAGANDA AND COUNTER-PROPAGANDA**

Many guardians of human rights agree that the right to free expression, which is embodied in Press Freedom, is not an unqualified freedom. However, communities differ as to where the boundaries lie between the right to speak freely, the right of the public to be informed and the rights of individuals or groups to privacy and to protection against indiscriminate circulation of harmful information. Often a text is categorised as propaganda if it presents information perceived to be harmful to some or other group in a divided society, i.e. if the text carries an ideological bias. Propaganda attempts to promote the interests of one group at the expense of the interests of an opposing group. Fowler (1991:19) indicates that selecting certain views or events for publication, i.e. deciding what is newsworthy and what is not, already involves an 'ideological act of interpretation'. If a government selects certain information for publication and at the same time disallows the reporting of other information, the news it circulates is propagandistic. In such circumstances challenges to the regulation of *what and how* news may be published, constitute counter-propaganda.

Fowler (1991:10ff.) assumes that news **represents** people and events in a way which directly or indirectly expresses the **point of view** of the newswriter, or at least of the institution which circulates and profits from presenting the news. He finds it important on the one hand that we recognise *there is no such thing as direct unbiased and unmediated reporting of the truth*. On the other hand, more and less overt disclosures of the writer's point of view are not automatically deliberate distortions. *Deliberate distortions would amount to propaganda*. Fowler finds it unacceptable to classify all news representation as, to a greater or lesser degree, propagandistic: presenting one's own point of view does not equal publishing propaganda.

Foulkes (1983:1) defines propaganda as "messages and recommended interpretations of

events" which desire to, or in fact already do shape the social and economic reality of a particular community. Such forms of discourse support and strengthen the interests of powerholders at the cost of the interests of those over whom they hold power. He supports Jacques Ellul's (1973:58) view that although propaganda may at times represent things untruthfully, it is not simply to be equated with lies; it is an enterprise for perverting the significance of events behind a facade of factuality.

Blatant propaganda is generally easy to recognise, thus what Ellul (1973:257) calls "paper tigers" are fairly easy to oppose and to render ineffective. It is **invisible propaganda** (Foulkes, 1983:2,3) which succeeds, because it establishes and perpetuates itself as the commonsense of an individual or a group. The power of such propaganda lies in its "capacity to conceal itself, to appear natural, to coalesce completely and indivisibly with the values and accepted power symbols of a given society".

It is customary to associate propaganda with totalitarian forms of government, as if in a democracy such a thing either does not exist, or has negligible effect. One of the essential characteristics of a democracy is the acknowledgment of basic human rights such as freedom of speech which finds expression in a free press. Nevertheless, even where the necessary respect for freedom of expression obtains and where this right enjoys constitutional protection, we encounter what can formally be recognised as propaganda. Zwelake Sisulu<sup>3</sup>, then editor of the New Nation commented on the position of the media in South Africa during the 1980's as follows:

"In our situation the question is not whether one is a propagandist or not, but whether one is a collaborationist propagandist or a revolutionary propagandist. Because we have expressed a desire for radical change in the scheme of things, we must be propagandists for change.

If expressing the aspirations of the people is propaganda, if propaganda denotes one who opts for a commitment as an alternative to non-commitment, then surely we are propagandists."

Propaganda can be distinguished from other forms of discourse either by the cultural, social and historical conditions within which it is produced, or by considering formal aspects of the text. In analysing the kinds of context and the formal structural features of informative texts which support and strengthen one group while they put down and demoralise others, we may find a means of recognising subtle, 'invisible' propaganda. This may allow us to describe and explain propaganda appropriately as a type of discourse. It may also open the possibility of countering the potentially destructive effect of propaganda more successfully than before.

I would like to refer briefly to two studies on the nature of propaganda, one by Balfour (1979)<sup>4</sup> and the other by Jacques Ellul (1973)<sup>4</sup>.

Balfour distinguishes five forms in which propaganda can present itself. His distinctions consider the information structure of the text as follows:

- (i) giving false information which the writer believes to be true,
- (ii) deliberate deception by telling deliberate lies,
- (iii) not stating, but suggesting a false set of propositions,
- (iv) suppression of the truth, i.e. neglecting to mention certain facts, and
- (v) slanting of the news, i.e. manipulating the perspective from which certain information is given.

Within such a characterisation of propaganda, counter-propaganda would attempt to expose the false assumptions underlying such texts. Towards the end of the 1980's oppositional media had gained access to internal and external resources and had accumulated skills which enabled them to create space in which public dialogue about restricted matters could take place. Balfour's pointers are useful in describing how counter-propaganda was effected:

- (i) The 'alternative media' were able to *uncover lies* which were reported either deliberately or innocently due to lack of direct access to particular sources of news. For example, reports were published which drew attention to SA's military involvement in the wars in Angola and Mosambique, or to children being held in detention as if they were adult offenders.
- (ii) *False suggestions were challenged*, such as those that portrayed the majority of black people as being politically disinterested, or the vast numbers of detainees not brought to trial as having actually committed offences;
- (iii) "*Suppressed truth*" was made public. The prohibition on reporters entering the townships made it possible for the state to conceal incidents of police brutality. Similarly, governmental support to vigilante groups and even to Inkatha was kept from public scrutiny. However, information of such occasions was not completely inaccessible. Eventually ways were found to report this, even in defiance of prohibitions.
- (iv) "*Slanted news*" which supported a conservative, government perspective was rewritten from a different, more critical perspective. For example, a new Afrikaans weekly, *Vrye Weekblad*, and a community newspaper such as *Saamstaan* emerged presenting news in Afrikaans which the established Afrikaans media would either not publish at all, or would have represented completely differently.

Ellul's study distinguishes between various kinds of propaganda:

- (i) political and sociological propaganda,
- (ii) propaganda of agitation and integration,
- (iii) vertical and horizontal propaganda, and
- (iv) rational and irrational propaganda.

I shall focus on the second distinction only.

\* **Propaganda of agitation** refers to subversive and oppositional discourse which is aimed at overthrowing an existing order;

\* **Propaganda of integration** refers to discourse which seeks to obtain and perpetuate stable behaviour - the '*status quo*', to produce inertia and conformity.

In forbidding oppositional voices and publishing its own point of view only, the government was circulating propaganda of integration. In responding to the limitations set by the '*status quo*' and in challenging those values that government propaganda propounded, alternative media were circulating propaganda of agitation. Such propaganda can be referred to as 'counter-propaganda'.

There is a popular belief that propagandistic messages are aimed at us by sinister forces within our own society, as if there is a conspiracy to corrupt, overpower, usurp, control resources and so on. Establishing such a belief can itself be a form of propaganda. This is often done by posing a distinction between **factual information** and **propaganda**. The register of the former is then used to present the point of view of the speaker/writer. Information presented in a manner which appeals to the intellect, is termed factual. This is contrasted with a manner of presentation which is addressed to the reader's feelings. Then, in the guise of rationality appeals are made to the prejudices of the audience: an appeal to the emotions can be deceptively intellectual. So, veiled propaganda may be presented as democracy, rationality or sound commonsense. This is often more effective than the transparent propaganda we expect to find in a one-party-democracy or tyranny of some kind.

#### **TEXTUAL INTERVENTION**

'Textual intervention' is a term used by Pope (1995:185-186) to refer to a set of creative-critical procedures which can be used to challenge and change texts. These procedures are suggested to assist readers in recognising the intended meaning and underlying assumptions of the producers of the texts. They are further suggested as a tool for actively generating differences which will enable the reader to introduce his/her own critical preferences. This approach opposes the assumption that a text has a single dominant meaning which the ideal

submissive reader will passively recognise. It encourages a way of interacting with texts which will enable us to understand a story or a history as a representation that might have been otherwise. In fact, not only does this approach encourage the exercise of critical judgements as to the implication and consequences of the text as it is presented - it also assumes that this is what actually happens when people are making sense of texts. So, 'textual intervention' is a critical strategy which draws on reader-response theories such as those put forward by Iser<sup>6</sup>, Jauss<sup>7</sup> and Fish<sup>8</sup>.

The reader's response is taken to be more than an interpretive act of decoding. It is re-coding, re-production and re-creation of a text in an active sense. I find this approach particularly appealing in dealing with counter-propaganda produced under circumstances of severe restriction, because in producing a text dealing with censored matter, it seems that the writer not only assumes, but actually relies on readers' abilities to re-write and transform texts so as to uncover the concealed meanings of the text. These particular kinds of texts are dialogic in that they invite readers to "sport with what is given" (Pope, 1995:189), to remake the text, to resist accepting face-value and to "celebrate the power of transformation".

Active reader participation in the establishing of meaning, can assist recognition of details that a text has marginalised, suppressed or ignored. Such participation can 'make strange' fixed assumptions which the writer does not himself call into question, or prefers readers not to call into question. On the one hand readers will identify what the text did manage to say, what it actually articulated and resolved. On the other hand they will be able to read "the gaps and the silences within and around a text" (Pope,1995:189) so that they are able to identify what the writer would not or could not say. Some theorists take reader engagement to be more than simply a part of the process of reading and interpreting. Roland Barthes (1975:64) for example, sees active interaction as a power and responsibility to be exercised by the reader.

I shall now try to be a bit more specific about the analytic procedures mentioned above. I shall focus on one form of textual intervention which Pope (1995:46ff.) suggests, namely attention to 'subject position'. This will illustrate one way in which readers can be active agents in constructing the meaning of discourse in general, and of counter-propaganda in particular.

Samples of some of the texts which were produced in defiance of government restrictions

between 1986 and 1990, will serve as specific instances of counter-propaganda. The **alternative media** of the time did not meekly accept the imposition of a news embargo. They responded by actively challenging the restrictions in a variety of ways. I shall very briefly indicate a few challenging strategies used in various kinds of texts, and consider how textual intervention may highlight the effect of such strategies. Then I shall indicate how attention to subject-position of a given text, can help to disclose hidden meaning.

1. Immediately after the announcement of the 1986 State of Emergency the **Weekly Mail** was removed from selling points by government officials, allegedly having published restricted material. It became increasingly difficult for editors to determine what would be regarded as "subversive matter". Consequently, to prevent a repetition of such confiscation and to express outrage at being gagged, following issues of various newspapers published reports on restricted topics or events, and then they simply blacked out supposedly offensive words or phrases. (cf. illustration (i) below)
2. Publication of certain information, e.g. on unrest related matters, was disallowed, except if permission from the police or designated senior government officials was obtained. One newspaper then published the names and telephone numbers of all senior officials who were supposedly well informed on the security situation in the country, i.e. the State President, the Minister of Law and Order, the Minister of Defence, and so on. Readers were invited to use the numbers to obtain 'permission to discuss' topics on which the newspaper was not allowed to publish. (cf. illustration (ii) below)
3. A Bureau of Information eventually took over the official responsibility of clearing certain information for publication. Reporters who were denied permission to publish matters on which they had received reports, did notify readers in general terms how their requests had been turned down. This enabled the informed reader to deduce when and where unrest had occurred: most probably there had been incidents such as police involvement in township violence, community protest of some kind, harrassment, intimidation, detention of leaders, etc. (cf. illustration (iii) below)
4. Reference to restricted persons or 'unmentionable' activities was done by rephrasing the story in seemingly innocent words and phrases. For example, after police had interrupted a church service and detained a number of worshippers, it was reported as if unidentified men wearing some kind of uniform had arrived and disrupted the proceedings. Also, to the arrest and detention of a community leader was reported as abduction by people who had disguised themselves. Thus full coverage could be given



to the arrival of 'plain clothes police' in the early hours of the morning, the ruthlessness with which the family had been treated, and so on. In both instances informed readers could deduce very accurately what had actually happened.

5. Incidents which were unrest-related and therefore classified as restricted information, often led to some kind of court action. Publication of the details of the trial then afforded the opportunity to report on the incident. For example, in May 1986 a challenge in court to the right of the police to detain people without giving reasons, succeeded<sup>9</sup>. Not only did this give opportunity to publish the names of particular detainees, it also called into question the relatively common practice of detaining in terms of Section 29 of the Internal Security act. Such comment on the legislation and on police conduct in terms of the legislation would otherwise have been a risk for the publisher.
6. A more direct form of protest was effected in the form of advertisement-style notices which alerted readers to the fact that the news coverage of the publication was not a complete representation of news events. Blank spaces indicated the withholding of restricted visual material. Slogan-style comment was published alongside of reports on controversial policies, decisions or activities. (cf. illustration (iv) below)

An entertaining example of counter-propaganda<sup>10</sup> is found in the publication of a photograph of the then still imprisoned ANC leader, Nelson Mandela. Formally publication of such a picture was forbidden, yet a Bureau of Information publication intended at discrediting the ANC, carried a photograph of the young Mr Mandela. Under the heading "The first legal photo of Nelson Mandela in 22 years" and with clear reference to the Bureau which had been set up to condone publication or not of 'subversive matter', the picture (cf. illustration (v) below) was reproduced in weekly and daily newspapers with wide circulation. The following report accompanied the publication of the photograph:

**"LOUIS NEL'S ANC-KNOCKING BOOKLET INCLUDES THIS MANDELA PICTURE:**

**The first legal photo of Nelson Mandela in 22 years  
(COURTESY OF THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION)**

Everyone knows his name and what he stands for. But almost no-one knows what Nelson Mandela looks like. This is because it has been illegal to photograph him or to reprint an old photograph of him for the 22 years he has been a prisoner of the state. Until this week, that is.

This photograph, right, taken before Mandela was imprisoned for sabotage in 1964, was reproduced this week by the Bureau of Information in their new propaganda booklet, "Talking with the ANC".

It is the first time since 1964 that it has been legal in this country to publish a photograph of South Africa's most famous political prisoner, the leader of the banned African National Congress and by most accounts the most popular leader among blacks.

It is only legal because permission was given by the Department of Prisons. All other pictures, drawings or representations of the man are still illegal.

The controversial Bureau of Information booklet is intended to show South Africans that it is folly to talk of negotiation with the ANC.

\* See "UDF calls for ANC unbanning" page 3"

(*Weekly Mail*, 6-12 June 1986)

'Textual intervention' suggests that one should consider alternative ways of representing the same content, in order to disclose what the pretended focus of a given discourse is as opposed to the actual focus. This procedure will also disclose the writer's attitude to the matter being reported. In the article above, for example, one would consider the writer's decision to use particular words and phrases rather than others which may have carried the same denotation, but not necessarily the same connotation. One would also consider stylistic choices and consider the communicative effect which may have been achieved (or lost) if an alternative style had been used.

Including the phrase "courtesy of the Minister of Information" in the title serves not primarily to inform readers that the Minister had generously given permission to publish the picture. Clearly explicit permission was never obtained; the picture was merely published by a Bureau which the Minister had set up precisely to control the publication of such matter. The placement of this phrase right at the outset, declares the legal basis on which the editor takes the liberty of publishing the particular photograph.

Attention to various referring expressions is also revealing: the opening sentence reverses a general syntactic convention by using pronouns (*his, he*) before disclosing the referent (*Mr Mandela*)<sup>11</sup>. Even in mentioning his name, it is still not stated directly that the photo is of Mr Mandela. The statements made in the first paragraph are (and here I am 'intervening'):

Almost no-one knows what Mr Mandela looks like.

Until this week it has been illegal to print a photograph of him.

Creating an expectation of disclosure of the actual referent by delaying such mention, parallels the expectation of disclosure of whose picture is printed alongside; it suggests an attempt to surprise the reader... who would have guessed... one may have seen the photo and not even have known who it was.

Later in the text Mr Mandela is referred to as "South Africa's most famous political prisoner" and as "the most popular leader among blacks". This is done in reference to a person whom the original publisher of the photograph, the Bureau of Information, did not believe to be either famous or popular. The writer uses an "ANC-knocking" source to put

the leader of the ANC in a positive light.

In all it appears that the whole article of 5 paragraphs is no more than an extensive caption to the photograph: it mentions who the picture represents, what the source of the picture is and how it is possible to publish an otherwise illegal print. And yet much more is communicated.

"Subject position" is one of the interventional procedures which Pope explains in detail. He denotes this concept as "a perceptual location within or orientation towards an event, usually unconsciously and habitually assumed". Each subject position then offers not only a slightly different version of 'the same event'; in fact substantially different events may be represented depending on which subject position the writer chooses. Every addressee of a given text is considered potentially an addresser of the same text. The recipient can analyse and comment on what the writer presents, not only in response to the text, but also in determining the meaning. The position of the writer is not given precedence over the position of the reader.

A text can be presented from any one of three major types of subject position, namely

- (i) the personal subject position, centred on the first person, i.e. the speaking subject,
- (ii) the interpersonal subject position, centred on the second person, i.e. the spoken-to subject,
- (iii) the depersonalised subject position, centred on the third person, i.e. the spoken-about subject)

The texts identified as (i), (ii) and (iii) in the appendix below, illustrate how texts are mostly open to one of these three major positions. In (i) the speaking subject is recognised by the use of "our", "we" and "us". (*Our lawyers tell us we can say almost nothing...*) In (ii) the spoken-to subject is recognised by the use of "you" and by the imperative sentence form. (*Should you intend discussing... phone these numbers...*) In (iii) the spoken-about subject is recognised by the third person reference "The Star" (rather than "we") and by extensive use of the passive form. (*The Star has been refused permission... The reports were received...*) The "Mandela picture"-text above also takes this depersonalised subject position. It is important to recognise that if a text takes one particular subject position, there are always the other two positions to take into account, even if they are secondary and more covert. A text will always bear traces of those subject positions which are not in the foreground.

Textual intervention invites the reader to manipulate the subject position of a given text to assist him/her in determining what the writer has highlighted and what has been marginalised. The dominant subject position which is apparently preferred by the speaker, is plotted against what the actual reader prefers. Textual and contextual considerations are taken into account in helping us to understand our own reaction to a particular text.

In (ii) below, the instruction to readers is introduced by a caption

5. *"The Emergency made simple".*

The writer preferred this form as an introduction to reporting on how extensive the ambit of the latest emergency regulations are, rather than using phrases such as

6. *"We have been informed how the Emergency is to be coped with",*

7. *"We are hereby informing you how the Emergency is to be coped with" or*

8. *"It has become clear how the Emergency is to be coped with".*

By using a format often found in simplified instructions<sup>12</sup>, the writer implies that readers are faced with as big a problem as reporters. The emergency regulations do not affect the newsmedia only. The extreme difficulties one faces if one wants to discuss (not to mention criticise) certain matters of societal interest, apply to readers as well. But then, with a touch of irony and humour, the writer suggests an easy way out. Rather than following the more conventional societal process of circulating and discussing information, i.e. rather than consulting a newspaper and responding to what you find there, you are now encouraged to phone the most senior members of government. The governmental taboo on reporting on, for example, boycotts or treatment of detainees, is ridiculed by the simple instruction as to how public discourse on matters of 'genuine public interest' can be facilitated. In using 9. below the reporter communicated at least 10. as well:

9. *"Should you intend discussing any of the following topics: ...  
simply phone these numbers to ask permission ..."*

10. *We would like our readers to know how absurd the latest emergency regulations in fact are.*

#### CONCLUSION

It appears that propaganda and counter-propaganda are forms of discourse which are prevalent in most societies where opposing ideologies are operative. In finding procedures which will assist readers in determining the covert meanings of texts, we may contribute to a process of emancipation in our community. In recognising that even stringent restrictive measures can barely succeed in prohibiting public discourse of sensitive and controversial matters, we may contribute to establishing a custom of free expression. Research into the

characteristics of various kinds of propagandistic texts may reveal procedures for recognising and countering offensive and oppressive forms of discourse. These I think are useful enough ideals for us to keep at it, even if the process of finding completely sufficient explanations for indirect forms of communication, proves to be less simple and straightforward than the practice of discussing legally disallowed matters.

**NOTES**

1. cf. Fowler (1991:12ff.) as well as Hall (1978:53) and Galtung and Ruge in Cohen and Young (1973:62-73).
2. Pope, Rob. 1995. **Textual Intervention - Critical and creative strategies for literary studies**. London, New York: Routledge.
3. Z.Sisulu, October 1980, Mwasa conference, Cape Town.
4. cf. **Propaganda in War 1939-1945**.
5. cf. **Propaganda: the Formation of Men's Attitudes**.
6. cf. The notion of reading as an ongoing negotiation between textually 'implied' and historically 'actual' readers. Iser, 1978.
7. cf. The notion of horizons of expectation, the interface where the time and space of the text meets the time and space of the reader. Jauss, 1982.
8. cf. The notion of interpretative communities - institutionalised bodies of readers who privilege and legitimise particular readings. Fish, 1980.
9. cf. report in the Weekly Mail, 23 - 29 May 1986.
10. In terms of formerly explained categorisations this would be challenging what Balfour refers to as "suppressed truth". According to Ellul's categories this would be called "propaganda of agitation".
11. Cook (1992:18) refers to such a relation as *cataphoric*, as opposed to an *anaphoric* relation.
12. cf. "English Made Easy", "Xhosa Simplified" or "Cooking Made Simple" as a general format for titles of books on how to acquire particular kinds of skills quickly and easily.

APPENDIX  
ILLUSTRATIONS:  
(i)

FRONT PAGE COMMENT

Our lawyers  
tell us we can  
say almost  
nothing critical  
about the  
Emergency

*But we'll try:*

PIK BOTHA, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, told US television audiences this week that the South African press remained free.

We hope that [redacted]  
[redacted], was listening.

They considered our publication subversive.

○ If it is subversive to speak out against [redacted], we plead guilty.

○ If it is subversive to express concern about [redacted], we plead guilty.

○ If it is subversive to believe that there are better routes to peace than the [redacted], we plead guilty.

○ To PAGE 2

**RESTRICTED** Reports on this page have been classified to comply with emergency regulations

(ii)

*Weekly Mail 12 December 1974*  
**THE EMERGENCY MADE SIMPLE**

Should you intend discussing any of the following topics:

- Security force action
- Boycotts
- The treatment of detainees
- The release of any detainee
- 'People's courts'
- Street committees

Simply phone these numbers to ask for permission:--

PW BOTHA (State President)	(021) 45-1135	BAREND DU PLESSIS (Minister of Finance)	(012) 28-0221
PIK BOTHA (Minister of Foreign Affairs)	(012) 28-6912	DANIS STEYN (Minister of Economic Affairs and Technology)	(012) 286-568
CHRIS HEUNIS (Minister of Constitutional Affairs and Planning)	(021) 45-7235	WILLIE VAN DER MERWE (Minister of Health and Population Development)	(012) 28-4772
MAGNUS MALAN (Minister of Defence)	(012) 26-6718	BUREAU FOR INFORMATION	(012) 21-7297 (012) 21-7529 (012) 21-7296 (012) 21-7528 (012) 21-7520
ADRIAAN VLOK (Minister of Law and Order)	(012) 372-8090	NEIL BARIARD (Head of the National Intelligence Service)	(012) 322-9761
KOBIE COETSEE (Minister of Justice)	(012) 323-0581	PW VAN DER WESTHUIZEN (Secretary of the State Security Council)	(012) 325-4780
STOFFEL BOTHA (Minister of Internal Affairs and Communications)	(012) 28-8081		
GERRIT VILJOEN (Minister of Development Aid and Education)	(012) 28-5177		

Section 3(4)(a)(i) of yesterday's new Emergency Regulations authorises any minister, deputy minister or government official to allow discussion of these forbidden topics. See PAGE 3 for details.



(iii)

*that is 16 June*  
**Reports 1982**  
**censored**  
 The Star has been refused permission to publish reports relating to the situation in the country. The reports were:

- Cape Town
- Elsie's River
- Kempton Park

The reports were received by *The Star* in the usual manner. Despite requests, none of these reports were released for publication at this morning's briefing by the Bureau for Information although they relate to weekend events. *The Star* feels obliged to indicate that the reports are not of such a nature as to cause public alarm. They are however of genuine public interest. Because of today's even more rigorous clampdown on news reporting, readers should be aware that this issue of *The Star* has in effect been censored and does not reflect adequately the situation in South Africa.

(iv)

**RESTRICTED** Reports on these pages have been censored to comply with Emergency regulations

The detained editor of the New Nation, Zwelakhe Sisulu, led the journalist union Wasa at a time when black journalists first began to challenge the sin-plus-sport format of black newspapers. SEFAKO NYAKA reports

ORDINARILY, Zwelakhe Sisulu's arrest last Friday would have been another statistic to add to the long list of Emergency detainees. But he is no ordinary person. He is the editor of New Nation, a young, emerging newspaper owned by the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference. In its six months of existence, New Nation has striven to uphold the principles of fearless journalism. As editor, Sisulu has worked painstakingly with a youthful group of journalists to give readers news that

**RESTRICTED**

Zwelakhe Sisulu ... detained

There was further speculation that the passage through parliament of the new stringent security legislation was being speeded

**STOP LEGRANGE'S LAW**  
**NO TO A PERMANENT EMERGENCY**

(v)



**REFERENCES**

- Barthes, R. 1975. *The Pleasure of the Text*. transl. Richard Miller. Jonathan Cape: London.
- Cohen, S. and Young, J.(eds.). 1973. *The Manufacture of News: Social Problems, Deviance and the Mass Media*. Constable: London.
- Cook, Guy. 1992. *Discourse*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Ellul, J. 1973. *Propaganda: the formation of men's attitudes*. transl. K.Kellen and J.Learner. Vintage Books: New York.
- Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power*. Longman: London.
- Fish, S. 1980. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretative Communities*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass.
- Foulkes, A.P. 1983. *Literature and Propaganda*. Methuen: London, New York.
- Fowler, R. 1991. *Language in the News*. Routledge: London, New York.
- Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T. et al. 1978. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. MacMillan: London.
- Iser, W. 1978. *The Act of Reading*. Johns Hopkins: Baltimore.
- Jauss, H.R. 1982. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. transl. T. Bahti. Univ. of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Pope, Rob. 1995. *Textual Intervention - Critical and creative strategies for literary studies*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Rubin, Bernard. 1977. *Media, Politics and Democracy*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Tomaselli, K. and Louw, P.E. (eds.) 1991. *The Alternative Press in South Africa*. James Curry: London and Anthropos: Bellville, SA.
- Wodak, R. (ed.) 1989. *Language, Power and Ideology*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

**NEWSPAPERS, PERIODICALS**

- The Indicator*, 30 June 1986.  
*New Nation*, 5-17 June 1986.  
*The Star*, 16 June 1986.  
*Weekly Mail*, 23-29 May 1986.  
6-12 June 1986.  
20-26 June 1986.  
4-10 July 1986.  
12-18 December 1986.