## **Anthony Brink**

**From:** Anthony Brink [arbrink@iafrica.com]

**Sent:** 07 November 2008 12:32 AM

**To:** 'Joe Thloloe'

Cc: 'ferialh@mg.co.za'; 'Shaun de Waal'; 'Nic Dawes'; 'Reedwaan Vally'; Khanyi Mndaweni; 'Peter

Hallward'

Subject: RE: Robert Suresh vs M&G; Anthony Brink vs M&G

Dear Mr Thloloe

Thanks for your quick <u>response</u> to my complaint.

I accept your decision right away.

Because hey I was wrong!

Jesus, wonders never cease!

I've learned from your ruling that three months after STE's Reedwaan Vally told *Die Burger* in November 2007, all extremely concerned, that he was canning the reprint of *Fit to Govern* for the time being pending an investigation and resolution of my revelations in *Lying and Thieving*, and one month after my further exposé in the expanded edition of the book in January that Essop Pahad had secretly censored and directed *Fit to Govern* (aired in the *M&G*, *Sunday Times*, *Die Burger* and *Sunday World*), Vally proceeded to reprint the book nonetheless, knowing full well that

- (i) Roberts's plagiarism (*Die Burger* toted over 40 counts) had been confirmed Myburgh and by *Fit to Govern*'s editor Sanders too after examining both my book and Myburgh's audit;
- (ii) Roberts's purported history of Mbeki's political and intellectual engagement with AIDS was a colossal fraud, built on demonstrable fabrication, falsification and an abuse of sources;
- (iii) Mbeki had himself expressly repudiated Roberts's core claim that he isn't an dissident on AIDS;
- (iv) Roberts's book was packed full of malicious lies about me, some of which I'd refuted with objective evidence, the rest on the probabilities; and,
- (v) Pahad had secretly directed and censored the book, contrary to Roberts's public claims to have written it without interference.

So Vally didn't actually 'consider allegations of plagiarism in a very serious light' as he told

Die Burger, seemingly very sincerely, and that 'if they are true he will feel terribly betrayed by Roberts'. Since when upon investigation my 'allegations of plagiarism' proved to be perfectly true, Vally didn't feel so 'terribly betrayed by Roberts' after all. Or perhaps, although he felt 'terribly betrayed by Roberts' for plagiarizing my work, his 'terribly betrayed' feeling was mollified by the prospect of making more money by peddling a new edition of what Sanders described as 'the most serious case of plagiarism and literary fraud in South African literary history'. Even if he was knowingly party to a fraud on the reading public by doing so, and was perverting public discourse in the process.

I can't breach confidences by being too particular here, but I can reveal that the *Guardian*'s resident consultant plagiarism expert was approached to assess my plagiarism charges, and that she opined that it wasn't just plagiarism that Roberts had committed, it was 'aggravated plagiarism'.

Maybe Vally's lawyers are cleverer than she is when it comes to identifying what plagiarism is. Or perhaps they just pointed out that plagiarism isn't usually illegal and therefore actionable; it's primarily an intellectual offence, so taking a purely commercial view of things Vally was quite entitled to go ahead and reprint all Roberts's thieving from me without fear of interdict or damages proceedings. And that for the new edition, again taking a purely commercial view of things, he didn't even need to insist that Roberts go back and credit me in his footnotes for researching and finding and editing all the quotations that he copied and pasted from my work into his book, likewise my insights, my ideas and my themes copied into his book too, which Roberts actually admitted to *Die Burger* books editor Dr Gerrit Brand during an interview published on 15 June 2007.

Still, you are quite wrong in your opening remark that 'the real fight between Roberts and Brink is about the allegations of plagiarism that Brink has levelled against Roberts'. As I've repeatedly stressed, my principle charge hasn't been Roberts's thieving, it's been his lying, and most importantly his lying about Mbeki – which distressed him so much that he contacted Gevisser and through him refuted it on the record for posterity.

But anyway, one can understand Vally's position in reprinting Roberts's book, even as he was feeling 'terribly betrayed' by him for plagiarizing my work, which he viewed in 'a very serious light'. The struggle is over. It's time for business now. And if like a junk dealer you can turn a few bucks by dealing in junk, even though it's been thoroughly exposed as junk, perhaps because you need to keep your many angry creditors and their lawyers at bay, what the hell. Business is business.

Till next time.

Cheers

## **ANTHONY BRINK**

From: Joe Thloloe [mailto:pressombudsman@ombudsman.org.za]

Sent: 06 November 2008 06:15 PM

To: Ronald Roberts; Anthony Brink; Ferial Haffajee; Shaun de Waal

Cc: Khanyi Mndaweni

Subject: Robert Suresh vs M&G; Anthony Brink vs M&G

Dear All,

Please find attached my decision on these two matters.

Regards,



