

Wreckers of the Fight against Apartheid : II

# Putting the Record Straight

*Sol Dubula*

This is truth, undeniable truth. Yet it might be expedient in certain circumstances to deny truth.

Matthew Nkoana in *The New African*, October 1965.

Have the Africanists anything to offer besides cheap and vulgar abuse of the Congress leaders? Yes, they have lies. Big lies and little lies, lies of a truly breathtaking audacity. They seem to have studied Hitler's dictum that no matter how far-fetched the lie you tell—the bigger, he said, the better—if only you repeat it loud enough and often enough people will begin to accept it for the truth. *Fighting Talk*, August 1958.

WHEN DAN TLOOME, the well known ANC leader, wrote the latter remarks he had before him the June-July 1958 issue of *The Africanist* which purported to put forward the views of the sect which subsequently formed the PAC. The issue in question, like all their subsequent propaganda, was devoted almost entirely to an attack—not on white supremacy, but on the leadership of the African National Congress. These leaders were described in the following terms:

Lackeys of foreign ideologicities [*sic*] . . . discreated [*sic*] . . . purblind. Stooges . . . faithful servants of white domination . . . robots and megaphones. A careerist clique . . . hirelings . . . cranks and touts of white liberals.

It must be remembered that those who were described in the above terms were actually at the time still facing the most serious charges of treason (a capital offence). Today many of them are serving terms of up to life imprisonment on Robben Island. Some have been hanged by the white state. On the other hand those who spat this venom against the people's leaders were doing so from the safety of their arm chairs—having just been expelled from the ANC for scabbing activities in the 1958 General Strike. For this treachery

they earned the accolade from the white press as 'the most responsible native leaders'.

The character and content of *The Africanist* was destined to set the tone for future PAC propaganda techniques against the ANC and its leaders. As time has passed the big lies and little lies and the lies of a truly breathtaking audacity have continued to drip in profusion from the pens of the PAC propagandists. With almost religious ferocity, what remains of the PAC leadership\* is devoting more and more of its resources in frantic, futile and fruitless attempts to discredit and destroy the principal, most militant and most revolutionary opponents of white supremacy.

The ANC has, quite rightly, refused to be drawn into this sort of intellectual street brawl—to which level PAC's shebeen politicians would reduce those issues which are a matter of life and death for our people. For this reason it has, by and large, ignored the river of slander, lies and half truths which those who still retain office in the PAC have published. In the main this approach has much to commend it. However, the volume of misrepresentation has so increased lately that those readers of THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST who have not had access to the recent material, and who in particular may not be familiar with the PAC technique, should be brought up to date.

---

\* Apart from Z. Motopheng and Sobukwe who was sentenced to 3 years imprisonment in 1960 and who is being kept interned on Robben Island, every other top leader of the PAC fled the country years ago. Outside, the dog-fights at the top, the never ending expulsions (usually in the form of a Vorster type edict prefaced by the words 'By virtue of the Presidential powers vested in me . . . ' and signed by Leballo) and the spate of allegation and counter-allegation of the misuse of funds, has almost completely destroyed whatever superficial cohesion there once existed. Amongst those dealt with are:

*Philip Kgosane* (led the Cape Town March in 1960). Expelled.

*Gaur Radebe* (PAC representative in Tanganyika). Arrested by Tanganyikan security police during foreign-inspired mutiny.

*J. D. Nyaose* (leading PAC trade unionist). Expelled. Recently issued circular alleging mismanagement of PAC by Leballo.

*Joe Molefe*. Involved in a knife fight with another top PAC leader (Z. B. Molete). Expelled.

*Nana Mahomo* (London PAC representative for many years). Resigned from PAC and now joint editor with Joe Molefe of the London journal *Crisis and Change*.

*Peter Molotsi* (one-time PAC representative in Dar es Salaam). Expelled.  
*Andrew Tsehlana* (Transvaal PAC leader and its one-time representative in Zambia). Expelled.

In addition 22 rank-and-file critics of the PAC have recently been expelled in Tanzania. This does not include the 13 whose disgust with PAC's policy led them to resign in 1963 and to join the ANC. Some doubt

Also, one hopes that this brief treatment (see also the last issue) will cause those who have allowed themselves to be influenced by PAC propaganda techniques to rethink their position. I refer not to those who form the backbone of the struggle against white supremacy both inside and outside South Africa—these have seen and experienced enough of the political treachery and dishonesty of most of the higher echelons of the PAC to require no reminders whatsoever. I refer, primarily, to people like Douglas Rodgers, the editor of the British publication *Africa and the World* who, with no first-hand knowledge of the events of the past decade in South Africa has not only provided the PAC clique with a monthly platform but has also himself taken sides (see *Africa and the World*, July 1965). I refer, too, to those responsible for the contents of the *Afro-Asian Journalist*—published in Indonesia—who have allowed political hitch-hikers like Lionel Morrison to write and publish ‘facts’ about the South African struggle which he knows to be false.

It would require much more space than this whole question merits for me to attempt to analyse each and every distortion and misstatement which has emanated from the PAC publicists. A few random samples will suffice to convince those whose minds are open to being convinced by truth. Take, for example, the following statement by Mr. Nkoana published in the April 1965 issue of *Africa and the World* and republished in the July-October issue of the *Afro-Asian Journalist*:

I had been brought out of goal by the party who paid the balance of my fine six months ahead of the conclusion of an 18 months’ imprisonment term for the purpose of founding and editing a PAC-supporting journal *Mafube* (translated, *Dawn of Freedom*). The first issue was devoted almost entirely to our strongly critical attitude to the demonstration (general strike) which we considered to be a dangerous reversion to directionless unpurposeful pre-1960 activities. There was to be no second issue of *Mafube*, for the police pounced. *An interesting sideline to this whole affair is that while the organizers of the demonstration who were arrested at the time were sentenced to 12 months’ imprisonment, the editor of a ‘subversive’ journal which was critical of the demonstration was sentenced to 3 years.* [Italics in the original].

The story does not end there. The conviction and sentence imposed by a lower court on Duma Nokwe, Secretary General of the African

also exists as to the current status of Patrick Duncan who, I understand, has recently been removed as PAC’s Algerian representative. It is also not clear whether Vuyisile Make, their Cairo representative for many years, has received the presidential edict. He is certainly no longer their Cairo representative.

National Congress, and 13 others were set aside on appeal to a higher court. My own appeal failed.

In the meanwhile the N.E.C. of the PAC had decided that my services would be more useful outside the country than inside gaol. I jumped bail and left South Africa by an underground route.

Trading on the readers' ignorance of the true facts does not always pay. Mr. Nkoana is better advised to restrict himself to generalized insult and broad invective. It is very unwise for him to allow his imagination to actually enter the field of concrete fact. The above events to which he refers are not so far back in history. They can be tested and verified. And what are the facts?

Nkoana is perfectly well aware that he was not charged and convicted as editor of *Mafube*—or for being 'critical' of the general strike (a polite term for scabbing on it). The issue in his case was quite different. Had the issue been the contents of the one and only issue of *Mafube* appealing to African workers to ignore the call to the general strike, he would have received a compliment and not a sentence from the magistrate. In fact, as reported at the time and never denied by them, PAC agents were accorded police assistance and protection in distributing their scabbing *Mafube* broadsheet. Nkoana's account is extremely misleading, to say the least.

Even more misleading is the statement that in contrast, Nokwe and 13 others—'the organizers of the strike'—were sentenced to only 12 months' imprisonment. He wants the reader to draw the inference 'as an interesting sidelight to the whole affair' that either Nokwe and his 13 co-accused were in collusion with the oppressors' courts ('the story does not end there'. Nokwe won his appeal. Nkoana's failed) or that his own activities (in scabbing on a general strike against white supremacy) were considered more dangerous. The facts are, that Nokwe's sentence of 12 months' imprisonment was *not* a charge of organizing the strike but was based on his association with the conference of African leaders held in Orlando at a time when both the ANC and PAC were banned. Indeed PAC took part in this conference. *Mr. Nkoana should remember that amongst Nokwe's 13 co-accused whose 'sinister' sentence of 12 months was successfully appealed against on a point of law, were included top PAC leaders like Joseph Molefe. He should know, too, that ANC leaders like Mandela and Sisulu who were later actually charged with organizing the strike, were sentenced to 5 years and 6 years respectively.*

If one charitably assumes that Mr. Nkoana's memory failed him on these historical questions of fact, he is obviously totally

incompetent to write on such matters. The only other assumption is that he does remember and he is deliberately lying.

It is in any case too silly for words to attempt to base any sort of argument on the question of which leader got what sentence in which case.\* But if ideological bankruptcy leads you to look for this sort of *non sequitur*, at least base it on truth and not on deliberate concoction.

As he insists on dragging his own history into his polemic, I must also add that Mr. Nkoana is less than frank when he describes the reasons for his fleeing the country. The bail he 'jumped' was not only in respect of a political conviction.

### **THE WOMEN'S STRUGGLES**

Let us examine another example of PAC's polemical technique.

Writing in the March issue of *Africa and the World* the same gentleman uses the same technique. Speaking of the '50s he says:

If it was a decade of decision for men it was a time of triumph for our women. 'I challenge our men to give us their trousers' jibed Lilian Ngoyi, President of the ANC Women's League, who was soon to feature in the marathon treason trial.

'Mr. President,' said Mrs. Hlongwane addressing Sobukwe at the end of the National Heroes' day speech, 'if when the call comes my man fails you, I swear on my honour he will be finished with me. I will not have another woman in the house.' Her man did not fail Sobukwe.

Our women were every bit qualified to speak as they did. For this as I have said was their decade. It was a decade in which 20,000 of them from far-flung parts of the country converged on the citadel of apartheid, Pretoria, to confront the Lion of the North Prime Minister Strydom in his den and tell him 'We shall not carry passes'.

Then after detailing the extent and the heroic character of these demonstrations which took place over a period of three years from 1955 onwards, Nkoana goes on:

By comparison only 8,000 men participated in the defiance of unjust laws campaign *organised by the ANC* in 1952 which lasted about 5 months before it fizzled out.

One hardly knows where to begin disentangling this tissue of misrepresentation of historical facts, of suppression of truth and suggestion of falsity. Undoubtedly the average reader in England (where this journal is published) would gain the following impressions from the above rigmarole:

---

\* e.g. would Mr. Nkoana like me to add 'as an interesting sidelight' that Sobukwe was sentenced to three years and Sisulu to six years or Mandela (at a later stage) to life imprisonment?

That whereas the African women struggled valiantly during the fifties the men did not ('organised political activity had sunk back to pre-1949 levels' adds Nkoana, for good measure).

That in contrast to the defiance campaign the women's anti-pass demonstrations were not organized by the ANC. (The writer just stops short of openly claiming the women's demonstrations as PAC achievements!).

These impressions are directly in conflict with the facts which Mr. Nkoana has either forgotten or deliberately suppresses.

It is no disparagement of the splendid Pretoria demonstration of women, and many other such demonstrations, to point out that they were not really comparable with the 1952 defiance campaign in which the volunteers of all races (many of them, incidentally, women) deliberately flouted apartheid laws knowing the penalty was months of imprisonment. This pointless 'comparison' makes sense only when it is coupled with the artful innuendo that the women's demonstrations were not organized by the African National Congress and its allies.

*Now Mr. Nkoana knows very well that the magnificent resistance to the introduction of passes for women from 1955 onwards was an ANC-led campaign and that it was actively organized by the ANC Women's League supported by the non-racial Federation of South African Women. Why then does he not say so? Is this one of those instances where it may be 'expedient' to deny the undeniable truth?*

As for the petty-minded refusal to recognize the greatness of the 1952 campaign and to belittle it by the use of phrases such as 'only 8,000 participated' (went to jail sounds too impressive, does it not, Mr. Nkoana?) and 'fizzled out', let us hear what some of his colleagues have to say. Events were still too fresh in the minds of people for *The Africanist* (June-July 1958) to refuse to recognize that:

The stakes of the ANC sky-rocketed: a disciplined grim struggle was carried on.

Even as late as January 1964 PAC leader E. L. Ntloedise writing in *Voice of Africa* conceded:

In 1952 a country-wide defiance campaign was organised. This was designed by its organisers to defy all the unjust discriminatory laws. It was a very successful campaign and nearly paralysed the economy of the country.

Make up your minds, gentlemen!

In addition to the defiance campaign of 1952 about which PAC spokesmen differ so sharply in their estimates, the decade of the

fifties saw an unprecedented upsurge of mass struggles of all kinds led by the African National Congress. These were the years of the peasant revolts, the '£1 a day' campaign, the transport boycotts, the fight against 'Bantu' education, the potato boycott, the Congress of the People, followed by the mass Treason Trial and the militant 'Stand by Our Leaders!' demonstrations that accompanied it. Above all they were the years in which, for the first time in our country, the *national general political strike* made its appearance. Time and again the great industrial complexes of the Witwatersrand, the Eastern Cape, Natal and elsewhere were brought to a standstill, as hundreds of thousands of African and other workers answered the Congress call, and stayed at home. They struck for basic political demands, despite lack of recognized trade unions, loss of pay, police intimidation—and despite repeated scabbing appeals by most of the people who now lead PAC.

These heroic years are the very period of which Mr. Nkoana now writes that 'organised political activity had sunk back to pre-1949 levels', and of which (in the course of an article in *The New African*, October 1965) he alleges that the ANC 'expended its energies in futile efforts to stem the tide of African nationalism'. The only example he offers in support of this sweeping dismissal of a decade of heroic struggle, is his claim that the ANC

attempted to stage nation-wide demonstrations at the time of the 'Whites only' election with the avowed aim of influencing the white electorate to remove Verwoerd's Nationalist Party and put in its place the equally reactionary United Party which is only the other side of the coin.

Mr. Nkoana cannot sustain this absurd allegation. If any leader of the ANC or any of the other Congresses had 'avowed' this 'aim' you can be sure that Mr. Nkoana would have produced evidence. The avowed purpose and aim of this demonstration as of others led by the ANC was to utilize the occasion of an exercise by the White minority of its exclusive right to political control, to demonstrate the unconditional demand of the Non-Whites for full democracy. As indicated in the previous article it was precisely in connection with the 1958 General Strike that the forces of the White state were mobilized as never before to deal with the African National Congress and those who responded to the call. The United Party and the so-called Bantu press went into action and called for strong government measures against the ANC. The army and the police force were mobilized. In their campaign of sabotage and opposition to the peoples' struggle the forerunners of PAC joined with the ruling class. It was for their scabbing activities during

this strike that Messrs. Leballo and Madzunya, founders of PAC, were expelled from the African National Congress. One wonders who were 'expending energies in attempts to stem the tide of African nationalism'—the ANC which time and again led the masses in action against White supremacy, or the PAC leaders, whose political careers began and ended in futile attempts to sabotage those actions, as strike-breakers for the White ruling classes.

### **COWARDLY ATTACKS**

The history of the South African freedom struggle will be written and judged in our own country. We are content to leave this task to the future; it is not supporters of the Congress alliance who want to refight old polemics, but the PAC propagandists who, despite their own discreditable role in these events, insist on foisting on an uninformed public abroad a fantasy-laden version of the recent past. But they do not confine themselves to repeating and embellishing old myths. A consideration of their current outpourings shows that fertile imaginations are still at work, distorting and misreporting the present.

Perhaps the most unforgivable of the offences committed by the poison-pen of Matthew Nkoana are his repeated sneers and innuendoes against those of our leaders and heroes who are now, while he sits safely in London, in Vorster's jails, unable to reply. In at least one case, as we shall see, his malice extends even to our martyred dead.

In *Africa and the World* (February 1965) he writes that the two outstanding heroes of the South African people, Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu, have been jailed 'for seeking . . . to create bridges between the races,'—with the jeering implication that they were trying to patch up some sort of 'bridge-building', Race-Relations type of compromise with White supremacy. Now the Rivonia trial received world-wide publicity. Even Mr. Douglas Rodgers who helps spread such unsavoury implications might be expected to be aware that in this trial (and the Umkonto trial which followed it) the African, Indian and White accused (the latter no doubt covered by Nkoana's description: 'Whites first and radicals second') faced the death sentence and were sent to jail for life because the Court had found that they were planning and preparing the military overthrow of the White state.

In the April 1965 issue of *Africa and the World*, Nkoana, with the obliging assistance of Rodgers, essays another smear against Nelson Mandela, impugning his loyalty to the principles and the



organization to which he has dedicated his life. He announces to his readers the sensational (but wholly imaginary)

news from Robben Island . . . that Mandela has ordered the close to 200 Umkonto members jailed on the island to join the PAC when they come out of prison.

On this occasion he adds (an unusual concession for a PAC publicist) that his 'news' is 'not yet satisfactorily confirmed'. Six months later the same smear, in precisely the same terms, was regurgitated by Nkoana in the *Afro-Asian Journalist*, at which time one must presume it was still 'not yet satisfactorily confirmed', but what need has a journalist for confirmation when he can suck his 'news' out of his thumb?

Perhaps the most outrageous example of this mean, spiteful and disrespectful attitude towards our people, their heroes and their freedom struggle, appears in this writer's treatment of the first historic break with 'non-violence'—the Umkonto we Sizwe's sabotage explosions of December 16th, 1961. Criticizing Umkonto's reluctance to initiate bloodshed, Nkoana permits himself to write about the death on that day of the people's hero Petrus Molefe. In almost gloating and sneering terms he describes the incident as follows:

Indeed the only loss of life which can properly be attributed to Umkonto throughout its activities thus far was the accidental blowing up of his own stomach by one of its cadres on the first day of operations December 16th, 1961.

In this sordid manner it is hoped to detract from the fact that the era of preparation for the armed revolutionary overthrow of the White state was ushered in by the ANC and its allies.

## **THE FREEDOM CHARTER**

Perhaps in this most fertile field of misrepresentation, the lie of the most 'truly breath-taking audacity' relates to the way in which the PAC ideologists have distorted the Freedom Charter. The people whom Dan Tloome described in 1958 as the 'windbags, self-seekers and mischief-makers of the liberation struggle' had to find an 'ideological' basis for their splitting activity. As the Trotskyites did in a different field, so the bulk of these PAC 'militants' cover up their fear of real revolutionary activity by high-sounding phrase-mongering. Thus:

With the exception that this policy (Freedom Charter) does not envisage—not expressly—the balkanising of the country on national or racial lines, it is not different from Dr. Verwoerd's plan for the

separate development of the races. It panders to racial bigotry no less than do the men of apartheid. *Africa and the World*, March 1965. The reader will be astonished to learn that the clauses of the Freedom Charter which are quoted in support of this outrageous proposition are the following:

*There shall be equal status in the bodies of the state, in the courts and in the schools for all national groups and races;*  
*All people shall have equal rights to use their own languages, and to develop their own folk culture and customs;*  
*All national groups shall be protected by law against insults to their race and national pride. . . .*

For the sake of completeness let us add the last paragraph of the section of the Freedom Charter which is left out by him ;

*All apartheid laws and practices shall be set aside.*

To suggest that this blueprint for a non-racial South Africa 'is not different from Dr. Verwoerd's' ideology and 'points to racial bigotry' can only be supported by one who has entered with Alice through the looking glass where words mean 'what I say they mean'.

Although it is not always an infallible guide, often the reaction of the enemy to a given political activity is some indication of its revolutionary content. Certainly, the Verwoerd regime saw in the Freedom Charter, and the Congress of the People which adopted it, the most potent threat to White privilege that had yet been made by the liberation movement. The Congress of the People itself was surrounded by over 2,000 armed police and 'under the barrels of sten-guns the draft charter was read and adopted, clause by clause, to the singing of Nkosi Sikelela i'Afrika and other patriotic songs'. (Introduction to *The Freedom Charter*—published by the ANC 1965).

Soon after its adoption the government went into action against the people's leaders for adopting the Charter. 156 of them were arrested and charged with high treason in a trial which was to last four long years. (The racial composition of the accused with the Africans in overwhelming majority was a picture of a future non-racial parliament). The show of unprecedented force including the dramatic use of military aircraft to transport the accused to one centre, the setting up of a special tribunal of three judges (a procedure reserved for trials during wartime and such like emergencies), the shooting down of a mass of demonstrators who in unprecedented numbers arrived at the court room—all this and more was a pointer to the revolutionary impact of the Freedom

Charter. In the words of the ANC pamphlet it was no doubt 'one of the great documents of the African Revolution'.

To attempt to convey the impression that this document panders to racial bigotry and is not different from Verwoerd's apartheid is to abandon the realm of reality. When the clauses to which Nkoana refers talk of equal rights which all national groups shall enjoy, they cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be interpreted to mean that each national group, irrespective of its size, will have the same say in public affairs. From every sentence of its poetic structure the Charter screams the thought that we shall be satisfied with absolutely nothing short of complete democratic rule. It requires no series of complex mental gymnastics to realize at once that what is envisaged is a society which will be governed by, and for the interests of, the majority.

What sort of political reasoning is it which sees in the entrenchment of national language rights, folk culture and custom, equal status in the courts and the schools for all national groups, protection against racial incitement and so on, a sinister plan to introduce apartheid? If this is so then every socialist country and many African states could be condemned in the same way.

The problems in the field of language, culture, etc., which will face the revolutionary regime of the South African people when the destruction of racialism has been achieved is a complex one and cannot be adequately dealt with in the context of the present article. I am confident, however, that just as the multi-group and multi-national states of the Soviet Union and China succeeded, so will we succeed in overcoming the problem of building a unitary state whilst at the same time giving impetus to the flowering of varied custom and culture whose development the ruling class has stifled for centuries. It is only one who is either blind or who does not wish to see who confuses such an approach with the perpetuation of group domination or inequality. Can the propositions which are contained in the Freedom Charter be faulted in relation to historic groups such as the Xhosa and the Basotho people? And what about the Coloured people? Have they got no language and no folk culture? Can anyone who has not got an axe to grind confuse the primitive ethnic philosophy of the White supremacists with the militant revolutionary programme of the Freedom Charter?

Not only does Mr. Nkoana distort the section he quotes by omitting the last paragraph (which would destroy his argument) but he also proceeds to base his interpretation of the section on allegations of 'fact' which do not bear examination.

## THE CONGRESS ALLIANCE

Immediately after the statement he makes about the Charter pandering to apartheid and racial bigotry, he says the following:

To make good their word, adherents of multi-racialism—the signatories to the charter—have created what is called the Congress Alliance operable at top level through the National Consultative Committee (N.C.C.). Each group *sends* two representatives to the N.C.C.; that is, equal representation irrespective of the size of the population group from which each has sprung, or of the following it commands.

Now it should be noted that the whole of this section of Nkoana's article is headed 'The Position Today' (i.e. March 1965) and the use of the present tense would indicate to the reader in England that the N.C.C. is still in operation. Mr. Nkoana must surely be aware that for various reasons, particularly the extreme difficulty of legal and illegal organizations co-operating on an official level in a police state, the N.C.C. ceased to operate as long ago as 1961. Why does he (in March 1965) try to give the impression that it is still functioning?

In any event it is absurd to treat the N.C.C. as if it were some sort of miniature parliament. It was not a 'legislative' body, or even a policy-making body. It was a meeting-ground where representatives of like-minded organizations could discuss and co-ordinate their plans for their common objective: the end of White supremacy, monopoly and privilege and the establishment of a democratic South Africa of 'equals, countrymen and brothers'.

As the name implies, the National Consultative Committee was created purely for the purpose of exchanging views and achieving closer unity in the common struggle for this objective. It was the expression of an alliance of independent organizations; hence it never originated policy, possessed executive powers or issued directions or decisions to the participating bodies. Hence the question of how many delegates were sent by each body to the N.C.C. was entirely irrelevant. In practice there were never any serious differences among the partners in the alliance, and if there had been there would have been no question of resolving them by means of a vote on the N.C.C.

Everyone who took part in the Congress alliance was fully aware of the truly fraternal relations between the organizations which took part in it: a brotherhood of trusted colleagues standing shoulder to shoulder in the fight, a unity tested and sealed in a thousand ordeals. To this day the record of our movement showed and still shows how we have stood together through thick and

thin, and will go on doing so till victory is won. Even the 'Africanist' predecessors who used to shout about alleged 'domination' of the ANC by the Congress of Democrats or by 'the Indians' must have been aware in their lucid moments that such wild charges were baseless, mere cynical demagoguery for the purpose of whipping up chauvinism and prejudice. They failed miserably in their racialist appeal. The African masses, and above all the membership of the African National Congress, demonstrated their political maturity time and again by rejecting the PAC line.

Even more in exile in the outside world, the PAC leaders have found that their crude racialism does not pay, and have decided (to use the appropriate terminology of the admen and the 'public relations' underworld) to change their 'image'. Hence they have produced a few White and Indian supporters (none distinguished by their militancy when in South Africa) and admitted them to PAC membership. They have also struck up some sort of alliance with Mr. Barney Desai's dissident 'Coloured People's Congress' group in exile. This last phenomenon invites some curious speculations. What, one wonders, is the relationship? Unless Mr. Desai has agreed to become Mr. Nkoana's office-boy, surely it must be on the basis of equality. And if so, how does this differ from the much-criticized basis of the former N.C.C.?

But it is as vain to look for consistency and logic in the writings of the PAC leaders as it is to look for political integrity and plain honesty. The quotation from *The New African* which appears at the head of this article is followed by this sentence: 'In the long run however a denial of truth would be deleterious to man's spiritual well-being leading to the development of a stunted personality.' I suppose that in the interests of expediency Mr. Nkoana is prepared to take a chance on it.

*(The theme of this article is referred to in the Editorial Notes of this issue.—Editor, THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST.)*