

PCC/5/4/3/55

P.O.Box 71,
Hilton,
3245,
South Africa.
6th August, 1986.

Mr. David Everatt,
Granary Cottage,
South Leigh Manor,
South Leigh,
Witney,
Oxfordshire,
OX6 6XB, ENGLAND.

Dear David,

I am sorry it has taken me so long to respond to your letter but I have really only been able to get down to reading your paper in the last two days.

First some questions of fact.

Page 1: I would include Jordan Ngubene amongst the leading members working to radicalise the Party.

Page 6 and somewhere else in the paper: Selby Msimang was not the only blackfunder of the Party. There was at least one other black at the Committee meeting which launched it in Cape Town -- Lediga as far as I can remember -- and there were more in the various centres who joined from the beginning.

Pages 10 and 11: I don't think it was ever agreed that the issue of forming a party would not be discussed at the May meeting. That is what we went there to discuss. Rubin's action certainly made it more difficult not to form one, but it might have happened anyway. The question of being preempted by the Union Federal Party was not especially a Natal concern. People like Rubin, who was a senior Torch member, were the ones particularly concerned. Nor do I think it fair to put Marquard in the same category as McInteno and Ballinger. He was much more 'reasonable' in his attitudes than they were.

Page 12: "Multi-racialism became the raison detre of the LP...". This should be non-racialism - one of the terminological quibbles of our times. Multi-racialism was the way the Congress Alliance was organised.

Congress of the People: One should not underplay the fact, because it was a very important one, that the shape and form of the campaign to precede the holding of the COP, had already been decided before the Party was invited to co-sponsor. Apart from the fact that the plan itself seemed to the Party to be impractical (a view born out by the fact that that plan was never followed), it is in the nature of things that it is much easier to get excited about something you have been in from the beginning than it is to feel the same about something presented to you as a fait accompli.

I can't find the exact point at which this appears in your paper now but somewhere somebody says the 'basic objection of the LP to COD was that it was part of the Congress Alliance'. This statement seems to me to have things quite the wrong way round. The LP's relations with the Alliance were coloured by the fact that COD was part of it. The CP, as far as I know, was a loyal Stalinist party at the time it was banned. Stalin was still around and there weren't any other kind of CPs in those days. Many of its white members joined the COD, while others joined other members of the Alliance. There was nothing to suggest that they had renounced their loyalty to

Stalinism when they made the move, and it was this which was the cause of LP concern.

These comments are not for publication but perhaps for discussion when we meet.

Just one matter which is concerning me and that is your reference to the papers at Wits. I am not sure what these are, but the Liberal Party's own papers, which are there on micro-film, are the ones already pledged to Douglas Irvine.

My typing seems to be worse than usual today.

Apologies!