

IN DIE HOOGGEREGSHOF VAN SUID-AFRIKA
(TRANSVAALSE PROVINSIALE AFDELING)

I 13 Vol 103 Pg 5097-5144

SAAKNOMMER: CC 482/85

DELMAS

1986-06-06

DIE STAAT teen:

PATRICK MABUYA BALEKA EN 21

ANDER

VOOR:

SY EDELE REGTER VAN DIJKHORST EN

ASSESSORE: MNR. W.F. KRUGEL

PROF. W.A. JOUBERT

NAMENS DIE STAAT:

ADV. P.B. JACOBS

ADV. P. FICK

ADV. W. HANEKOM

NAMENS DIE VERDEDIGING:

ADV. A. CHASKALSO

ADV. G. BIZOS

ADV. K. TIP

ADV. Z.M. YACOOB

ADV. G.J. MARCUS

103

TOLK:

MNR. B.S.N. SKOSANA

KLAGTE:

(SIEN AKTE VAN BESKULDIGING)

PLEIT:

AL DIE BESKULDIGDES: ONSKULDIG

KONTRAKTEURS:

LUBBE OPNAMES

VOLUME 103

(Bladsye 5 097 - 5 144)

COURT RESUMES ON 6 JUNE 1986.

COURT : Mr Bizos, before we start. There are two matters that I want to raise. Firstly, when I gave the ruling about the videos', I did not touch upon video number 30, neither did you explicitly say that you objected to the admissibility of EXHIBIT 30, but I took it that that was part of the general objection. I have not been addressed on EXHIBIT 30 at all and I gave no ruling on EXHIBIT 30. So, so far there is no objection - there is no ruling on any objection in connection with EXHIBIT 30, but if you intend to object to it, I think (10) you should place that on record eventually and address me on it, so that I can decide on its admissibility. Secondly, as far as the transcripts are concerned, may I take it that the transcripts are admitted as being correct, unless you inform me say within a couple of days to which parts you have objection and then attempt with the State to sort that out and if you cannot do that, inform me so that I can listen to the video's.

MR BIZOS : One of the reasons for that possibly is that our Learned Friends asked us whether we would admit that the copy shown - that the video shown to Your Lordship was the un- (20) altered video which was seized by the police and they gave us a copy of that. We are investigating that and that is the reason why and once that is done, we will tell Your Lordship, but in all probability, there will be an admission of fact that it was not interfered with after it was seized at the police station. We are merely checking that situation in order to make that admission.

COURT : I raise it because I thought that it had slipped your mind and it was not formally on record that you object to it.

MR BIZOS : It probably did escape us and we are indebted to Your Lordship for raising it. The transcripts have to a (30)

... / certain

certain extent been checked, because copies of the video's were made available to the accused to see in prison during the adjournment that we had on the previous occasion. I think during the Easter holidays. I would ask Your Lordship for a little bit more than two or three days, because there are attempts to fill in the odds and ends, but subject to minor corrections, Your Lordship and the learned assessors can look at it as a fair record of what is seen on the video's. There may be corrections, that are some words which are obvious mistakes. It may be necessary to hear it more than once, but (10) I do not think that that should prevent Your Lordship from looking at the transcripts and studying them. There will be an eventual agreement between the State and us in relation to it. We do not want Your Lordship to check it for us.

COURT : Not a reviewing?

MR BIZOS : Not a reviewing.

COURT : In any event, I was going to say that if you have a disagreement about a portion of a video, I am prepared to review only that portion. So, you will have to give me a number on the tape. (20)

MR BIZOS : I do not think that will be necessary. Some work has been done and we will not be able to do it in a day or to but we will be able to do it in the near future.

ARTWELL DUMISANI SIJADI, d.s.s. (Through interpreter)

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR BIZOS (continued) : There is just one aspect that I want to take up with you. Do you recall that you told us that when you first approached Pankreshas Nkhonza and put to him the information that he had been to your house to make a threat, he denied it? -- Yes.

Do you recall yesterday when I was asking you questions (30) that he, Pankreshas Nkhonza, told you that this was discussed

at a meeting and that they had been sent? Do you recall that?

-- Yes.

I want to put to you what Pankreshas Nkhonza says of this and tell me whether you agree or disagree. On the first occasion that you confronted him with that, he said that he knows nothing about this? The first time? -- I do not agree with that because what I know is I met him once.

The once that you did meet him, did he deny that he knew anything about it? -- Yes.

Just so that His Lordship gets the full picture, was (10) one of your meetings in the passage of the school? -- Yes.

Were you at the same school? -- Yes.

Sort of school buddies? -- Yes.

And this conversation was a conversation between two school buddies at the school passage? -- Yes.

Do you recall whether this was the first time or the second occasion, it does not matter, but do you recall saying "Now look, do these people that did go to my mother, did they go with the authority of COSAS? Did COSAS sent them?" Did you ask him that? -- I cannot recall asking that. (20)

But you are not prepared to deny that it did not happen? -- I cannot deny that, because it happened a long time ago.

And do you recall that Pankreshas Nkhonza having denied that he knew anything about it, told you that he does not know what people go and caucus among themselves, they may have meetings with themselves, but that he as secretary of COSAS knew nothing about it? -- If he did say that, I cannot recall.

Well, can you deny that that is what he said? -- After such a long time I am not in a position to deny it as I already said that it is a long time ago that this happened. (30)

Do you agree that Mr Pankreshas Nkhonza was the secretary

... / of

of the local branch of COSAS and later became its vice-chairman or vice-president? -- Yes, I agree.

HERONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. FICK : Geen vrae.

HOF : Ek wil net iets met u opklaar. U sal onthou toe die Staatsadvokaat u gevra het oor wat Pankreshas vir u gesê het, het u gesê "Ek het Pankreshas gaan besoek die volgende dag. Ek het hom gekonfronteer met wat Sithunyane meld en wat my ma sê. Hy sê die Woensdag was hy nie by nie. Hy het ook gesê soos hulle by my woning was, hulle kan die huis aan die brand steek." Toe het ek vir jou gevra wat bedoel dit nou. (10)
Beteeken dit dat hulle by magte is om dit te doen of dat hulle dit sal doen. -- Ek onthou die vraag.

Toe het jy vir my gesê dit beteken hulle sal die huis aan die brand steek as ek nie bedank nie. -- Ja.

Is daardie getuienis korrek? -- Ja, dit is korrek, want toe ek die verklaring gemaak het, het ek melding daarvan gemaak en toe die verklaring aan my getoon was, het ek dit weer gesien in my verklaring.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR BIZOS : If this statement - if this was not said in the statement, you would not have remembered (20) it, if you told me this morning?

COURT : I do not know whether he told you that this morning. He told you that yesterday.

MR BIZOS : I am talking about the incident. The details of the incident with Pankreshas. You told me this morning that you did not remember the terms of the conversation

Are you telling His Lordship that you merely said this because it was in your statement which you saw before you came into the witness-box? -- No, that is not what I am saying. What I am saying is this happened long ago and I did not (30) even think that I would be called as a witness to come and

... / relate

relate about what happened that day there. As I have already said in my evidence that I at some stage telephoned the police informing them that I am withdrawing whatever I had said to them about this.

When did you phone the police and say that you are withdrawing what you said? -- That was on the day when the youth club closed on the 19th.

HEROEDERVFRAGING DEUR MNR. FICK : Laat ons dit net duidelik kry. Eerstens, hoe lank na die voorval het u 'n verklaring gemaak? (10)

HOF : Laat ons nou nie weer daaroor gaan nie. Die verklaring was op die Maandag of die Dinsdag gemaak terwyl die dreigement op 27 Maart was wat 'n Woensdag was. Dit is op rekord.

MNR. FICK : Kan u vir my sê, ek weet nie of ek u reg verstaan nie, die antwoorde wat u hier gee nie. Na aanleiding van wat u vanoggend gesê het aan My Geleerde Vriend, kan u nie al die detail onthou van die gesprek wat plaasgevind het nie, maar net sekere goed of wat wil u vir die Hof sê? -- Daar is sekere gedeeltes van hierdie gesprek wat ek onthou. Nie dat ek heeltemal vergeet het van alles nie. (20)

GEEN VERDERE VRAE.

MNR. HANEKOM : U Edele, die volgende getuie is weer 'n getuie van Evander. Mag ek vra dat dieselfde reëling wat u gegee het ten opsigte van in cognito getuie nr. 19 ook hier geld?

HOF : Ek sal eers die hof ontruim en hoor wat die getuie vir my te sê het.

MR BIZOS : To save time, if My Learned Friend has consulted with this witness, we would have no objection to following the same procedure.

COURT : Making it in cognito? (30)

MR BIZOS : Making it in cognito so that we may save some time

... / in

in relation to that.

HOF : In order, mnr. Hanekom?

MNR. HANEKOM : In orde.

COURT : The arrangement is therefore, there are members of the press present, that this witness is giving evidence in cognito. This means that the public is admitted to this court, but no identity of the witness may be published in the press or anything that gives rise to identification.

IN COGNITO GETUIE NR. 20, v.o.e. (Deur tolk)

ONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. HANEKOM : Is u verkies as 'n raadslid(10) van die Gemeenskapsraad van Leandra? -- Ja.

Op 12 Oktober 1984? -- Ja.

Het u die Leandra Action Committee wat in die gebied gefunksioneer het geken?-- Ja.

Wie was die voorsitter van die Action Committee? -- Mr Nkabinde.

Is dit mnr. Abel Nkabinde? -- Ja.

Het u enige vergadering wat deur die Action Committee in die gebied gehou was bygewoon op enige stadium? -- Nee.

Wat was die verhouding tussen u Raad ... (Hof kom tussen-(20) bei)

HOF : Kan ek net duidelikheid kry. Die verkiesing van raadslede het ek gehoor was in 1983, September 1983. Hoe is dit dat u verkies is in Oktober 1984? -- Nee, ons is gelyktydig in daardie tyd gekies.

Mnr. Hanekom, het ek dit fout of u?

MNR. HANEKOM: Ek moet sê volgens die verklaring wat ek van die getuie het, is hy op 12 Oktober 1984 gekies.

HOF : Hoe vergelyk dit met die vorige getuie?

MNR. HANEKOM : Ek sal die getuie moet vra om die op te klaar.(30)

HOF : Ek dink so.

... / MNR. HANEKOM

MNR. HANEKOM : Kan ons net seker maak, is u dieselfde tyd verkies tot die Raad as wat die voorsitter van u Raad, mnr. Moloatsha op die Raad verkies is? -- Ja.

Was dit in die jaar 1983 of in 1984?-- 1983.

HOF : Moet ons dit dan Oktober 1983 maak?

MNR. HANEKOM : Oktober 1983.

HOF : Dan is ons nog 'n maand uit, want die ander man was September 1983.

MNR. HANEKOM : Ek sal dit ook opklaar. Kan u onthou watter maand in 1983 u verkies is tot die Raad? -- Ek kan nie meer (10) so goed onthou of dit Oktober of Septembermaand was nie.

Wat was u Raad, die Gemeenskapsraad, se verhouding teenoor die Leandra Action Committee? -- Voorheen was die verhouding goed gewees tussen ons, maar nadat ons verkies was in die Raad, was die verhouding nie meer so goed gewees nie.

Wat, volgens u oordeel, het gemaak dat die verhouding vertroebel het? -- Dit is omdat hulle gesê het, die bewering was dat ons vir die Blankes gewerk het.

Wie het die bewering gemaak? -- Dit is die Action Committee se mense. (20)

HOF: Het die bewering gekom onmiddellik met julle verkiesing of het daar 'n tyd verloop voordat daardie soort bewerings gemaak is? -- Na 'n kort tydjie wat ons verkies was.

MNR. HANEKOM: Het enige persoon van die Leandra Action Committee dit vir u persoonlik gesê of was dit maar gerugte wat in omloop was in die woongebied? -- Ja, ek sal sê dit het gebeur dat ons dit sommer van die mense in die gemeenskap gehoor het dat daar sulke sprake was, omrede ons nie ooreengestem het in 'n vergadering met hulle nie, waar hulle ons later beskuldig het dat ons met mense verkoop. (30)

Die vergadering wat u van praat, het u dit self bygewoon

... / of

of nie? — Ja, ek het. Eintlik was dit nie 'n massavergadering gewees nie. Dit was net ons en hierdie Action Committee wat bymekaar gekom het.

Wanneer het dit gebeur? — Ek kan nie meer so goed onthou wanneer dit was nie, maar dit was kort na ons verkies was, omtrent 'n maand daarna het ons bymekaar gekom, want hulle het gesê ons moet bymekaar kom en samesprekings voer.

Wie het as woordvoerder vir u Raad opgetree by die byeenkoms? — Ons was almal teenwoordig.

Maar wie het as spreker opgetree? — Skosana is die (10) persoon.

Is dit raadslid Skosana? — Ja.

Watter posisie het hy in die Raad bekleed? — Hy was 'n gewone lid.

Wie het aan die kant van die Action Committee opgetree as spreker? — Makhaya.

En waarom het die samesprekings gegaan? — Dat ons bymekaar moet kom en een ding doen. As ons dit nie doen nie, gaan ons seerkry.

HOF : Met ander woorde, julle moet bymekaar staan? — Ja, (20) ons moet bymekaar staan.

MNR. HANEKOM : Was dit die wens van die Action Committee sowel as die wens van u Raad? — Nee, want hulle het ons genooi.

Laat ons dit net duidelik kry. Wie het gevra dat julle moet saamstaan? — Die oorledene Maysa.

Is hy van die Action Committee of van die Gemeenskapsraad? — Van die Action Committee.

Wat was daarop die Gemeenskapsraad se antwoord? — Ons antwoord daarop was ons werk met wat van die gemeenskap af kom en wat ons moet oordra na die Blankes toe. (30)

Wat was die Action se houding daaromtrent? Het hulle iets

gesê daaroor? -- Hulle het toe gesê hulle kan sien dat hierdie Raad se reëlings of die wet van die Raad is te streng en die mense kla daaroor.

HOF : Ek wil nou net duidelikheid kry. Hulle wou gehad het julle moet bymekaar staan? -- Ja.

In watter opsig? Op watter punt? Oor watter saak? -- Daar was 'n sekere tyd wat dit ter sprake gekom het dat daar sekere mense wat nie toestemming het om in daardie lokasie te woon nie, daar woon. Dit was toe gesê dat hierdie mense moet weggaan. Op dit het ons toe na die Kommissaris toe gegaan (10) en dit met die Kommissaris gaan bespreek. Toe ons teruggekóm het vanaf die Kommissaris het hulle ons toe genooi na hierdie plek waar ons bymekaar moes kom. Dit het gegaan oor die mense wat moes gegaan het, wat gebeur het, waarop ons toe gesê het daar is niemand wat sal weggaan hiervanaf nie. Maar hulle sê toe vir ons maar die mense gaan weg na die tuislande toe. Hulle het toe verder gesê dit is juis die rede hoekom hulle ons geroep het om bymekaar te kom met hulle en die ding reg te stel, want daar is mense wat weggaan tuislande toe en aan die ander kant, agter ons rug, is hulle besig om vir die (20) mense te sê dat ons die persone is wat sê die mense moet tuislande toe gaan. Op die ou einde was dit besluit dat daar niemand sal weggaan nie.

Ek verstaan nou nie mooi nie. U is na die Kommissaris toe of julle is na die Kommissaris toe. -- Ja.

Wat was die uitslag van die besoek aan die Kommissaris? -- Die Kommissaris het gesê niemand sal weggaan nie. Hy, wat die Kommissaris is, sal 'n brief skryf na Pretoria toe en dan sal hy vir ons later laat weet wat die uitslag is.

Wat het die Action Committee nou daarmee te doen? -- (30) Die Action Committee het hulle self daar ingebring in die sin

... / dat

dat hulle geweet het daar is mense wat nie permitte het om daar te woon nie en vir die mense gesê "Dit is die Raad wat sê julle moet weggaan hiervanaf."

Mnr. Hanekom, u moet die getuies of duidelik lei of los, maar dit word net deurmekaarder. Die getuienis was dat daar 'n vergadering byeen geroep is sodat die mense met mekaar kan praat, die Action Committee en die Raad. Die getuienis was dat op die vergadering was dit gesê "Ons moet saam staan." Nou hoe kry u die kloutjie by die oor?

MNR. HANEKOM : Dit is wat ek uit die getuie probeer kry, (10) maar ek kan hom nie lei nie. Ek het ook 'n probleem om dit duidelik vir die Hof oor te dra.

HOF : Wel, dit is die kuns van 'n advokaat om sonder om te lei, 'n getuie te lei.

MNR. HANEKOM : Ek poog om dit te doen.

HOF : Probeer weer, mnr. Hanekom.

MNR. HANEKOM : Toe u die uitslag van die samesprekings met die Kommissaris, tussen die Kommissaris en die Gemeenskapsraad aan die Action Committee oorgedra het, wat was hulle reaksie daarop? -- Die reaksie van die Action Committee was dat (20) dieselfde Kommissaris van wie ons praat, het vir hulle, die Action Committee, gesê dat daardie mense sal weggaan.

Is die samesprekings tussen u Raad en die Action Committee op daardie noot uiteen? Kon julle tot 'n vergelyk kom of nie? -- Ons kon nie ooreenkom nie.

Na daardie samesprekings het u gesê het u nooit weer enige samesprekings met die Action Committee bygewoon nie? -- Ons het nie weer alleen bymekaar gekom nie.

HOF : U bedoel die Action Committee en die Raad? -- Ja.

Het julle wel bymekaar gekom op openbare vergaderings? (30)
-- Ja.

MNR. HANEKOM : Op Sondag, 28 Oktober 1984, gedurende vir voor-middag, het die Gemeenskapsraad 'n openbare vergadering belê in die gemeenskap. Is dit reg? -- Ja.

Is die vergadering gehou by die skool? -- Ja.

Het u die vergadering bygewoon? -- Ja, ek het.

Wat was die doel van die vergadering? -- Die doel van hierdie vergadering was om die gemeenskap te laat weet dat iemand sal moet verhuis na Kwa-Ndebele toe.

Hoe laat het u by die vergaderplek opgedaag, by die skool?
-- Ek was vroeg die môre daar. (10)

Wat het u by die skoolperseel aangetref toe u daar kom?

-- Daar was jongmanne wat daar buite die hek gestaan het.

As u sê jongmanne, kan u hulle in 'n ouderdomsgroep plaas?

-- Tussen 18 en 22.

Het hulle sommer net rondgestaan of was dit 'n groep gewees?

-- Hulle was 'n groep gewees.

Het u enige van die mense in die groep geken? -- Ja, daar is van hulle wat aan my bekend was.

Wie was dit? -- Die res van die mense ken ek nie. Daar is van hulle wat ek van sien geken het. Die enigste persoon(20) wat aan my goed bekend was, was mnr. Nkabinde.

Is dit Abel Nkabinde? -- Ja.

HOF : Maar hy is nie tussen 18 en 22 jaar oud nie? -- Ek sal nie kan sê nie, want ek weet nie, maar hulle was omtrent daar.

MNR. HANEKOM : Wat het die groep gedoen? -- Hulle het die mense gekeer om nie die vergadering by te woon nie.

Hoe het hulle dit gedoen? -- Ek weet nie presies hoe hulle dit gedoen het nie, behalwe dat ek gesien het dat hulle in die mense se ore gefluister het en na die fluistering tussen die persoon wat inkom en hulle, het die persoon teruggedraai. (30)

Was daar plakkate die dag? -- Ja, daar was.

... / Wie

Wie het die plakkate gehou? -- Daardie klompie daar.

Was daar baie plakkate? Kan u min of meer sê hoeveel daar was? -- Ja, daar was heelwat baie. 'n Hele goeie klomp van hulle was teenwoordig daar. Ek sal u sê elkeen van die klomp het sy eie plakkaat gehad, behalwe mnr. Nkabinde. Hy het nie een gehad nie.

Kon u lees wat op enige van die plakkate staan? -- Nee.

Waarom nie? Is daar 'n rede hoekom u dit nie kon lees nie? -- Want ek was binne op die perseel en hulle was buite die hek. (10)

Hoe groot sou u sê was die groep mense met die plakkate? -- Tussen dertig en veertig persone was die groep gewees.

Het u die saal binnegegaan? -- Ja, ek het.

Was daar mense in die saal? -- Daar was so 'n bietjie mense gewees.

Het u toe in die saal gebly totdat die vergadering begin het? -- Ja.

Was die voorsitter van u Raad, mnr. Moloatsha, daar? -- Met sy aankoms daar was ons alreeds daar.

Het daar later meer mense in die saal ingekom voor die (20) vergadering begin het? -- Nee.

Was daar baie leë plekke in die saal of was die saal vol? -- Ja, heel wat baie.

HOF : Meer as die helfte van die plekke leeg? -- Die persone teenwoordig daar was minder as die helfte van die saal self.

MNR. HANEKOM : Hoe het die vergadering begin? Wie het die vergadering geopen? -- Abraham Mlaki het die mense daar verwelkom.

Is dit 'n raadslid? -- Ja. Ons het toe vir eerwaarde Khanye gevra om die vergadering met 'n gebed te open. Na (30) dit het mnr. Skosana oorgeneem.

Dit is die raadslid Skosana? -- Ja.

Wat het hy gedoen? -- Hy het dit aangekondig aan die gehoor dat die vergadering nou gaan begin en die voorsitter gaan oorneem.

Is dit mnr. Moloatsha? -- Ja.

Het mnr. Moloatsha begin om die vergadering toe te spreek? -- Net toe hy praat, het hierdie klomp daar binne gekom.

Watter klomp? -- Die wat by die hek was.

Die mense met die plakgate? -- Ja.

Hoe het hulle die saal ingekom? Een-een of as 'n groep?(10) -- Hulle het mekaar gevolg en gelyktydig binne gekom.

Wat gebeur toe hulle inkom? -- Toe die voorsitter gepraat het, het hulle gesing en 'n geraas veroorsaak.

Het enige persoon van die groep gepraat voor die singery begin? -- Ja.

Wie van die groep? -- Een van hulle.

Het u hom geken of nie? -- Van sien het ek hom geken. Ek weet nie wat sy naam is nie.

Wat het hy gesê? -- Hy het gesê "Ek sien hier is polisie hierso. Wat soek hulle?" (20)

Het mnr. Moloatsha daarop geantwoord? -- Ja.

Wat het hy gesê? -- Hy het gesê hierdie polisie het na die vergadering toe gekom.

Laat ons dit net eers duidelik kry. Was daar polisiemanne binne-in die saal of nie? -- Nee, hulle het daar buite gestaan.

Was daar polisievoertuie buite? -- Hierdie ding van hulle was daar 'n Hippo.

Hoeveel van hierdie voertuie was daar? -- Net een.

Hoeveel polisiemanne was daar? -- Ek het nie getel hoeveel van hulle daar teenwoordig was in die Hippo nie. Ek het een (30) gesien Botha.

Nadat die voorsitter gesê het die polisie woon die vergadering by, wat het toe gebeur? -- Hulle vra nou "Is die polisie ook die gemeenskap?" Toe het hulle begin sing.

Wat het hulle gesing? -- Ek ken nie hierdie liedere van hulle nie.

Kon die voorsitter aangaan met sy toespraak of nie? -- Nee, hy kon nie.

Wat het toe verder gebeur? -- Hy het toe gesê hy het besluit dat ons maar moet sluit, want dit help nie.

Hoe is die vergadering uiteen? Wat het die groep (10) jongmense gedoen? -- Hulle is ook uit.

Is hulle in een groep uit die saal uit of hoe het hulle die saal verlaat? -- Hulle is in een groep daar uit net soos wat hulle daar ingekom het.

Waarheen het u gegaan na die vergadering? -- Ek is toe huis toe.

Voordat u huistoe is, het u gesien wat word van die groep jongmense? -- Hulle het in die westelike rigting gegaan.

As 'n groep? -- Ja.

Het u mnr. Abel Nkabinde op daardie stadium gesien of (20) nie? -- Ja, hulle het saam geloop.

Was hy deel van die groep? -- Ja.

Het u uit die Gemeenskapsraad bedank? -- Ja.

Wanneer het u bedank? -- Dit was in Novembermaand.

Van watter jaar? -- 1985.

Waarom het u bedank? -- Omdat hulle gesê het hulle gaan my brand.

Wie het so vir u gesê? -- Dit is net die kinders, gewone kinders.

HOF : Hoe oud is die kinders? -- So daar by 10, 12 jaar. (30)

MNR. HANEKOM : Is dit 'n storie wat hulle net op een geleentheid

vertel het of het u dit baie gehoor? -- Hulle het dit verskeie kere gesê. Hulle het my huis met diesel besprinkel.

Wanneer het hierdie voorval plaasgevind waarvan u nou praat? -- In 1985.

Voor u bedank het? -- My besittings was al verwyder van die huis af. Daar was nie besittings gewees nie.

Kan u onthou watter maand 1985?

HOE : Was dit voor u bedank het? -- Ja.

MNR. HANEKOM : Kan u onthou in watter maand dit was? -- Ek kan nie meer onthou nie. (10)

Het u die huis ontruim toe die voorval plaasgevind het? Was u reeds uit die huis uit? -- Ja, want hulle het alreeds gesê hulle gaan my brand.

Is dit die rede waarom u uitgetrek het uit die huis? -- Ja.

Hoe het u gesien dat hulle probeer het om die huis te brand? -- Dit was as gevolg van die diesel wat in die huis gesprinkel was, wat ek hierdie afleiding gemaak het.

Het die huis inderdaad gebrand of nie? -- Nee.

... / CROSS-EXAMINATION

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR BIZOS: Were you in any way connected with the Leandra Action Committee before you became a councillor? -- No.

Do you recall that a Mr Abel Kabinde was a candidate for election? -- Yes we were together there as candidates.

Do you recall that his candidacy was declared invalid by the electoral officer? -- No that I do not know.

You do not know about that. Did you have anything to do with the temporary council before you were elected a councillor? -- No. (10)

Were you in any way connected with any informal committee set up by Chief Ampie Mayisa in relation to your community? -- No.

Did you know the late Chief Ampie Mayisa? -- Yes.

Was he a person who exercised some authority over your community? -- Yes.

And was he a person who tried to create unity in your community so that there would be co-operation between his committee, the temporary council and the action committee? -- No that I do not know. (20)

Were you not taking part in your community's affairs at all before you were elected a councillor? -- No.

Was Chief Ampie Mayisa a person who continually called for the unity of the community? -- I would not say, I do not know.

Well when you became a councillor and there was this meeting, you recall that you told us that it was about a month after your election? -- Yes.

Do you know on whose initiative this meeting was called? -- Yes I do. (30)

Whose initiative was it? -- Mayisa.

And/.....

And at the meeting that you were at did the late Chief Ampie Mayisa call for unity of all those who took part in the community affairs of the community? -- Yes I do.

Yes. And did he appeal to all those who had been recently elected to the council to remain united with the others involved in community affairs for the benefit of the community? -- Yes in fact that is what he said although it did not in fact materialise.

Yes. And do you recall that he emphasised that if there was any dividedness in the community it would be the community that would suffer or be injured? -- No he did not say that. (10)

Well did he point to any dangers for the community if there was disunity? -- No he did not.

Well did the Chief Ampie Mayisa consider that everybody who lived in the community, whether they had a stamp from the influx control people or not had a right to live in that community? -- No.

Well do you say you do not know what his view was or do you say that his view as different? -- He was a chief within the community who was deciding on complaints. (20)

Did he say that you should come together and all do the same thing? -- No he did not.

Well you told us in your evidence-in-chief that that is what he said. I do not know what to make of your evidence. -- I never said so.

COURT: He said we should stand together not do together.

MR BIZOS: Oh I see. Did he say that you should stand together? -- Yes he said we must stand together.

Just together just to stand or stand together and do something, or just to stand together? -- I do not know what he meant by that. (30)

Yes./.....

Yes. Well you see, did he say that if you did not all stand together, well did he say "If we do not stand together we will be injured"? Did he say that? -- Yes, oh yes that one he said.

And did you understand by that that if you did not stand together the whole lot of you, that is the community as a whole, would be injured? -- Yes.

Yes. And did the action committee work in close co-operation with the late Chief Ampie Mayisa? -- He was one of them. (10)

Yes. And did he take the initiative in bringing this meeting together that you have spoken of? -- Yes.

And from what happened some one month after, some one month after your election, was it clear that Chief Mayisa, both in his capacity as a chief and as one of them in the action committee was in favour of co-operation with the newly elected council? -- Yes.

And do you recall that Chief Mayisa and the other persons from the committee said that attempts were being made to apply the law in relation to the right to reside in the community(20) too strictly? -- I cannot recall that.

Well, My Lord I did not hear the word, did he use the word "streng"? Is that the word that he used, I did not ...

COURT: Yes I think so.

MR BIZOS: I was not sure. Well do you recall that, whether he said anything that the law of the council was strict, streng? -- Yes.

Well what part of the law of the council was he referring to, what really was the uppermost concern of your community? -- I will not know really which of the council's law was (30) he referring to as being strict.

You/....

You see do you not agree that the most important question of your community was that whereas the authorities said that only those who had certain rights, a small number of the community had the right to remain in the community and that the others must go back to Kwa Ndebele? Do you remember that there was this talk? -- Yes that is so.

Yes. And did Chief Ampie Mayisa say that the council, the newly elected council must insist that it represents the community as a whole and not only those, the smaller number of people that the whites are saying are entitled to be there?(10) -- It may be that I was not present at the time when he said that.

Well irrespective of whether you were present when he said that was that not the most important question in your community? That everybody was talking about? -- You mean the way in, the manner in which you are putting it?

Yes, that everybody was talking about, how all the people in the community, however many thousands they may be going to remain as one community or are we going to have a situation that some people will have to go back to KwaNdebele,(20) or go to KwaNdebele? -- Yes that is so.

Yes. And was there a genuine fear among thousands of people that there were plans afoot to send them away from the community to KwaNdebele? -- Yes.

Was there a call by Chief Ampie Mayisa to the new elected council that under no circumstances must they as councillors agree to any portion of their community being moved to KwaNdebele? -- That is so.

Yes. And if anything Chief Ampie Mayisa actually wanted to, the council as an ally in this non-removal of people to (30) KwaNdebele? -- Yes.

Now/.....

Now were the rumours that there was an imminent removal of a substantial portion of your community such, in relation to the removal, that your council decided to go to the Commissioner in Witbank in order to try and find clarity?

-- Yes. No not to the commissioner in Witbank but to Mr Jonker.

Oh. Was he the local commissioner?

COURT: No he was the Development Board chief.

MR BIZOS: Oh, yes I remember that now, yes. Mr Jonker of the Development Board? -- Yes.

Now did any of you ask for a written undertaking that (10) nobody was going to be moved back to KwaNdebele? -- Yes.

Were you give such a written undertaking? -- Yes we were given that.

Were you given an undertaking? When? -- That undertaking was brought by the Chairman in the form of a letter from the Commissioner's office at Evander.

COURT: Sorry I missed your answer, please repeat the answer? -- That undertaking was brought by the Chairman from the Commissioner's office in Evander in a form of a letter.

MR BIZOS: When was that letter brought? -- I cannot quite (20) recall but the Chairman had it.

No was this in 1984 or 1985, or ... -- I should think it was in 1984.

Well then this must have been very joyful news. Were lots of copies made and given to everybody, pinned up on the boards for everybody to know? To declare the, to read for themselves the joyful news? -- Yes that they are no longer going to KwaNdebele.

Was this letter given out? -- No.

No. Any reason why not, the glad tidings were not (30) made publicly known by copies of the letter, pinning it up on/.....

on the council notice board and that sort of thing? -- He did not give it to everyone, he only produced it at a meeting by showing to us "Here is a letter".

When did the commissioner say that he would have to write to Pretoria in order to find out what the position was, when did that happen? -- I cannot quite recall that, as to when that was.

Was it before or after this letter was produced by your Chairman at a council meeting? -- It was after that.

When did the commissioner say that he would have to (10) write a letter to Pretoria? -- That was on the day when we were at the commissioner's office to discuss that.

Yes but can you give us a month or a year or more or less when this was? -- It was during the year 1984, I cannot remember the month.

Let me see if I understood your answer correctly. Was it during 1984 that the commissioner said that he would write to Pretoria in order to find out what the position was? -- Yes.

So that even the commissioner, if what you tell us is correct, was in doubt in 1984 as to what the position was? (20) -- Yes.

Can you remember whether there were steps in the first half of 1984 to remove a number of families to KwaNdebele? -- We saw that in the newspaper.

Yes. And was, do you recall

COURT: Well was it fact or fiction? -- It was fiction because it was not happening.

MR BIZOS: Well let us have a look whether, do you recall whether in the Rand Daily Mail of 8 June 1984 the political reporter wrote an article which was headed "116 Families (30) in Leandra Limbo"? -- Yes I do.

Yes./.....

Yes. Do you remember, I will show you the article, whether you saw it and whether this circulated in your community? And whether you call it fiction or not whether it was taken seriously at least by some people in your community?

COURT: Those are three questions. Did you see the article?

MR BIZOS: Right. -- I see the document here.

COURT: Did you see it at the time? -- I did not see the actual newspaper in which this article was. I only heard from people saying that there was an article in a paper saying this.

MR BIZOS: Yes. Well did the people tell you that the paper (10) said that 116 people were supposed to be removed from Leandra, 116 households I am sorry? -- Yes.

Now could I ask with His Lordship's leave the interpreter to translate the article for you and ask you whether what is contained therein was transmitted to you? (Interpreter translates article to witness). Was that reported to you? -- Yes it was reported like that to me by those who had seen the paper.

COURT: Everything that is in that article was reported to you? -- Not everything, as it was interpreted to me now here. (20)

MR BIZOS: But the essence of it was reported to you? -- Yes.

I do not know whether Your Lordship will receive it on the basis of the perception of the community?

COURT: Well I have this difficulty Mr Bizos that I cannot refuse to receive it unless it is read into the record because the witness now comments upon something which is not before Court. It is an awkward way of doing it because it is interpreted to the witness, the English is not before Court, the language is not typed, he is giving evidence in and in which it is interpreted. We cannot do it that way, it has to (30) come in or you have to take out of it that which is called

the/.....

the gist of it.

C325 MR BIZOS: Well My Lord I submit that Your Lordship ought to receive it, for the limited purpose that the witness, at this stage for the limited purpose

COURT: Well, very well without creating any precedents I will do it this time. Next time I suggest that you take the part of the article which is material because I am sure that there are portions of that article which were not even talked about, where the reporter will say well I got this from Mr X or Mr Y.

MR BIZOS: Well it is possible, but may I just indicate, I do (10) not want to make, I do not want to extend this too far but the way we understand the State's case, the evidence of the previous witness and the evidence of this witness, that there was no real dispute about the movement of people, that it was artificial dispute which was created by the action committee and in order to rebut that suggestion we want to put this before Your Lordship that it was a real issue in the community.

COURT: Well I think it is better that we read it into the record or that it goes in as an exhibit, but you cannot do it in this way because there are numerous facts in this article (20) which I am sure were not common knowledge, were not talked about and were not discussed in the way it is set out in this article.

MR BIZOS: Yes I am sure that that is so but it is only for the limited purpose, My Lord we do not have to read it into the record with respect, if Your Lordship gives it an exhibit number we will cut it and put in on a large piece of paper and make the sufficient number of copies during the adjournment for Your Lordship to ...

COURT: Yes we can do that. Your numbers are ?

MR BIZOS: AAQ and this will now be 45.

(30)

COURT: AAQ(45).

MR BIZOS:/.....

MR BIZOS: We will do the necessary during the adjournment.

COURT: But this is dated 8 June 1986.

MR BIZOS: 86 My Lord?

COURT: 86.

MR BIZOS: No it is 84 My Lord, it is

COURT: Well it may well be.

MR BIZOS: It is 84 My Lord, because there are others and also one original. That is the Rand Daily Mail.

COURT: This is stated to be the Rand Daily Mail. Where is the whole tearsheet? Well we are coming back to the original(10) difficulty which has not been resolved yet. I have no agreement between the State and defence on copies and on dates or whatever it is.

MR BIZOS: So far everything else has been agreed on, except the two cuttings relating to Sergeant Nandes(?), where we have been put to the proof of the whole sheet which we will do. If My Learned Friends want the whole sheet we will have to go back to the State library or the reference library in order to get one. But if we could put it in as, but My Lord

COURT: You see an actually this you should have put to, (20) well alright

MR BIZOS: To the previous witness? If I had had it, yes.

COURT: Yes very well.

MR BIZOS: Now you see I am going to suggest to you that this was not only a big issue in your own community, but you see that it was the main article, or the leading story in the Johannesburg Star of June 22, 1984 that an official reprieve had been granted to these families. Please have a look at this and tell us whether you saw this or you heard it being discussed? -- I see this newspaper, yes. (30)

COURT: Did you see it at the time? -- No.

Mr Bizos/.....

Mr Bizos in this way there are going to be facts before Court which are not testified on but are slipped in in this way and I do not allow it. You can put to the witness, out of that story every sentence if you want to and ask him to agree or disagree whether that was the perception in the community and then it is on record but we cannot do it in this way. In the previous article we had Mr So and So said this and Mr Nkabinde said that and Mr Van Niekerk said that and so it goes on.

MR BIZOS: My Lord could I just ask this question in order (10) to close this off. You see I am going to suggest to you that your evidence-in-chief that the action committee and its members were saying behind your back that people were going to be removed, and that their assertions in relation to the removal were incorrect is not true. -- In what respect?

Well because there were these 116 families which

-- No.

You still insist that there was no one to be removed?

-- Nobody was to leave.

Do you agree that despite what you say now, despite (20) what you say now that people in your community as a result of talking, as a result of reading newspapers, as a result of the inter-action in the community as a whole, believed that 116 families were to be removed away from your community? -- Yes they definitely believed that because they saw these in the newspapers.

Yes. And far from anything being done behind your back the action committee and other members of your community were shouted from the roof tops? -- Yes because they were told.

COURT: Because they were told what? -- Because they were (30) told by the newspapers that they are going to KwaNdebele.

MR BIZOS:/.....

MR BIZOS: Let us try and split it up. Were there 116 families, or any number of families, which were being told by the authorities during the winter months of 1984 that they had to leave Leandra? -- No I do not know about that.

Well are you suggesting that this whole concern that there was in the newspapers about the removal of this 116 families was a non-existent and artificial happening? -- Yes.

Until the, if my memory serves me correctly because the document is before the interpreter, 22 June when a reprieve is said to have been granted by an official do you know of (10) any official statement, any official statement, denying that there was any attempt to send out 116 families from the community? Do you know, of any public statement by any person in authority? -- No.

COURT: You mean in the fourteen days between the report of the Rand Daily Mail and the report of The Star?

MR BIZOS: Yes, or at any time prior to this, the 22nd.

COURT: Well fourteen days is not a very long period for officials to act.

MR BIZOS: Well My Lord first of all I do not think that (20) issue arose for the first time on the, when the report was made. Anyway throughout those winter months of 1984 you cannot, you did not hear of any official statement or comment on this? -- No.

You did not. Yes well I think that in that respect your evidence is correct. Because there were none you see. -- Yes.

Did your council do anything about these what you call false rumours, did your council do anything about it, did it issue any statement? -- Yes.

COURT: What did you do? -- We went to speak to Mr Jonker (30) in Witbank as a result of the rumours.

Yes/.....

Yes and what else? -- On our return from there we went to the Chief Magistrate.

Yes? -- And then we had some talks with the local administration department.

Yes? -- That let there be nobody who is being removed from there.

But did you inform the community? -- Yes we did.

How? -- We called a meeting.

MR BIZOS: When? -- I do not know when that was but each time we came back from there we would come and report back. (10)

To a public meeting? -- Yes.

Could you give His Lordship some idea when these public meetings were held where these 116 families were given the assurance that they would not have to move, and how much applause there must have been on this assurance? -- Before these problems which arose we used to have mass meetings there.

No.

COURT: Yes now we have got lots of problems. We can have problems burning of houses, we can have problems of 116 families being moved, we can have water problems, electricity problems, there are lots of problems. What problems are you talking of? -- By that I mean prior to the singing in the meeting. (20)

Oh you mean that is the 28th? Of October? -- Yes before that date.

Now counsel would like you to pin it down a bit more certain than before that date. I will take the adjournment now and think about it. That is the date when you reported to the community about the result of your discussions with Mr Jonker and the magistrate. (30)

COURT ADJOURNS FOR TEA. COURT RESUMES.

IN COGNITO WITNESS NO. 20: d.s.s. (Through Interpreter)

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR BIZOS: Have you thought of the matter that His Lordship asked you to think about? -- I have forgotten what the dates were, I cannot recall that.

You see could you please have a look whether you saw this article in The Sowetan dated 24 May 1984 which shows that it was not a couple of days, one day in June, but it had been going on before. Do you see that? Did you see that article with the picture of a portion of your community? -- No.

You did not see that either. Good. Now tell me if it (10) was so clear that nobody was going to be moved out do you know whether your Chairman made any public statement saying no this is not so, they are just, there is just behind the back talk by the action committee, there is no truth about that at all? -- It can be like that yes.

Well if I were to, was there any decision on your council that your Chairman should say to newspaper people that he has not comment to make about these matters? -- No.

Are you able to admit or deny that there were reports in newspapers quoting the words "No comment" by your Chairman? (20) -- No I do not know about that.

You do not know. Are you able to admit or deny that these "No comment" remarks by your Chairman made publicly and published in newspapers created the perception that the community council may be conniving in the removal of the 115 families? -- No.

Are you able to admit or deny that whatever you may have been doing behind the scenes your lack of public dissociation with the scheme to remove people from your community led to lack of popularity in your community? Lack of popularity (30) of the council in your community? -- I do not know.

Do/.....

Do you agree that during September 1984 a substantial portion of your community thought that your office had come to an end? -- Yes we heard about that.

Yes. And were there calls by the action committee, through Mr Nkabinde and others, that the authorities should call for a re-election? -- Yes I heard about that.

And was it clear the Mr Nkabinde and other members of the action committee wanted the elections in the hope of their standing for election and replacing you as councillors? -- No that I do not know. (10)

Do you not know of any calls for a re-election? -- I heard about that one, that there was such a call for re-election.

Where did you hear it from? -- From the community.

Not officially? -- No.

Did you attend the meetings of the council regularly? During 1984? -- Yes.

You did not miss any? -- No.

Did a letter from the action committee to the council not come to your notice? -- I heard about that one.

Oh. Did not that letter call for a re-election? -- It(20) was an old letter.

It was an old letter. And for that reason you did not take any notice of it? -- Yes.

Now would you agree that insofar as there was a break down of communication between the action committee and the council that at one stage the council was no longer prepared to have joint meetings with the action committee? -- Yes.

When did you decide that you would not have anything further to do with the action committee? -- After these things which appeared in the newspapers like this. (30)

Well did these things start appearing in the newspapers in/.....

in about March/April 1984? -- I cannot recall.

And is it correct that the action committee called you to various private and public meetings to which you said that you were not prepared to go? -- I cannot remember.

Was this a formal decision taken by the council not to have any further doings with the action committee or an informal one? -- It was decided at a council meeting.

Yes. Well how long after you had been elected was that decision made? -- It is some time during 1984.

The first half of 1984? -- There were many meetings (10) held, therefore I cannot remember which one.

Many meetings of the council held? -- Yes.

And was a decision that you should not have joint committee meetings and that you should not attend, you as councillor that you should not, let us take it one by one, that you should not take joint committee meetings? -- Do you mean except the very first one which we had with them?

Yes. -- We never met with them again after that meeting.

So there was only one meeting? -- Yes as a committee we met their committee. (20)

And after that, after that meeting was held a decision was taken by the council that the council would not have any more meetings with the action committee? -- Yes.

And was it also decided that councillors should not go to the public meetings, the mass meetings that had been called by the action committee? -- Yes.

And did you and your fellow councillors not attend any of the public meetings of the action committee after this decision was taken on the council? -- I remember of one meeting which I believe was attended by the Chairman of the community(30) council and Councillor Skosana. I was not there. I was not

home/.....

home.

So you only heard that your chairman went to one meeting?

-- Yes.

Do you remember when that was? -- No.

Was it shortly before or shortly after the one committee meeting that you had together? -- It was quite some time after we had a committee meeting with them.

Yes. Do you agree that invitations were sent to the councillors from time to time to attend public meetings of the action committee? -- No. (10)

Do you recall whether any letters which were sent by the action committee were not brought, that it was said that they were not brought to the council meeting by your Chairman? -- No I cannot recall that.

Do you not remember whether, do you remember whether one of your councillors took exception to the fact that your Chairman was not bringing correspondence to your committee meetings, to your council meetings? -- No.

I want to deal with the meeting of the 28th.

COURT: Of October? (20)

MR BIZOS: Of October 1984. The, were the police there whilst the young people were whispering in the ears of those coming towards the meeting place? -- It is before their arrival.

And whilst the police, after the police arrived did the young people continue telling approaching people who came to the meeting? -- Yes you could even see their hands indicating (as demonstrated by the witness) that they must not come in. (The witness demonstrates).

Yes, waving them away? -- Yes.

And did some people respond and some people not respond (30) to this waving away? -- Yes.

And/.....

And did they do anything else other than this waving when the police came? -- No except that they were still holding these things of theirs, and singing.

And you told us that the hall was less than half full. Did the young people who were singing, the young people who were singing, take their seats or not? -- They took seats, yes.

Yes. And did they, were they among the people who were welcomed to the meeting and did they take part in a prayer? -- No at that stage they were still outside.

Oh, does the meeting not start with a prayer? -- Yes (10) it does.

Yes. But, yes. Could you tell us how many there were, more or less, of these young people? -- Between thirty and forty.

What happened to their placards, do you know? -- I saw some being taken by the police from them.

Yes. This was before the meeting started? -- Yes.

COURT: Were they taken forcibly or not? -- No the policeman would just say "Bring here" and then it was handed over.

MR BIZOS: You told His Lordship that this group of people, (20) when the meeting was closed apparently as a result of their singing left the way they had come in? -- Yes, while singing.

Yes. There was no disorder of any sort in the hall other than the singing? -- No.

Nobody forced anybody to go through the windows and nobody jumped through windows? -- Oh no, now I remember that when they saw the police they jumped through the windows.

Do you mean to say that the police came into the meeting? -- No, no. When they saw this thing, that is the thing of the police, what do you call it again? (30)

COURT: The police have got many things. -- The Hippo, this is/.....

is what the children call a Hippo.

MR BIZOS: The police also call it that. So you say, but was this before the meeting started? -- What happened is this, the police were outside there in the vehicle. The thickset one came out of the vehicle with a gun. When he came out they might have thought that he was coming for them, as a result of which one of them jumped through a window.

Oh I see. Because an armed policeman approached the meeting? -- No he did not come into the meeting.

No he got out of the Hippo and he walked towards the (10) door of the hall? -- Towards the gate.

COURT: Did he enter the premises? -- Yes not very far in.

MR BIZOS: Anyway you say there was only one person that jumped out of the vehicle? -- That I saw, yes.

The rest of the group walked out in the ordinary way although the police were visibly there? -- Yes. Can you recall whether you saw Mr Nkabinde inside the meeting or not or whether he was outside? -- He was inside seated amongst them.

I see. Because I am going to put to you that although (20) Mr Nkabinde was there he was only outside and he did not come inside? -- He was inside.

Thank you My Lord.

HERONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. HANEKOM : Toe u Raad in 1984 besluit het om nie meer te skakel met die Action Committee nie, wat was die motivering daarvoor? -- Dit was omdat die Action Committee vir die gemeenskap daar gesê het dat ons is die persone wat sê die mense moet na Kwa-Ndebele toe gaan.

HOF : Weet u waar het die voorsitter gebly? -- Ja.

As 'n mens by die saal staan, in watter rigting het hy (30) gebly? -- In die westelike rigting.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR BIZOS : How far is the chairman's house from the hall? -- It is quite a distance. I am not able to say how many metres.

Is this hall situated - on what part of the township is this hall situated? On the south, east, west, north? -- Coming from our town, then the hall is in the direction on your left.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

MNR. HANEKOM : Die volgende getuie is adjudant-offisier Cornelius Johannes Jenkins.

HOF : En waarom gaan die getuie praat? (10)

MNR. HANEKOM : Oor Tumahole.

MR BIZOS : We were told that here were no other witnesses. The person that really has been given us instructions in relation to Tumahole on that basis left. I am hoping that we would be able to deal with it.

COURT : It may well be that his evidence-in-chief runs into the luncheon adjournment and it is Friday.

CORNELIUS JOHANNES JENKINS, v.o.e.

ONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. HANEKOM : U is 'n adjudant-offisier in die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie verbonde aan die Veiligheidstak(20) en gestasioneer te Sasolburg? -- Dit is reg.

Op Sondag, 15 Julie 1984 gedurende die oggend het u diens gedoen in Tumahole woongebied by Parys? -- Dit is reg.

Ongeveer 09h00 wat het u daar aangetref? -- Ons het 'n optog aangetref wat besig was om deur die strate van Tumahole Swartwoonbuurt te beweeg.

Hoe groot was die optog? -- Die optog was min of meer so vyfhonderd Swartjeugdige gewees. Soos die optog voortbeweeg het, het ander Swartes by die optog aangesluit tot dit ongeveer so duisend persone was. (30)

HOF : Van waar na waar het die optog beweeg? -- Dit was twee jaar terug gewees. Ek weet nie wat die roete was nie.

MNR. HANEKOM : Het van die mense in die optog baniere vertoon? -- Dit is reg.

Kon u lees wat op van die baniere staan? -- Ek het daarin geslaag om net een af te skryf op 'n sigaretdosie wat ek op daardie oomblik by my gehad het.

Het u nou die sigaretdosie voor u in die getuiebanc? -- Ek het dit nou hier voor die Hof.

Wat was die bewoording? -- Die bewoording was "Coun- (10)
cillors are useless, so are the participants."

Is dit al wat u afgeskryf het? -- Dit is al wat ek kon gesien het.

Terwyl die mense geloop het, het hulle stil geloop of het hulle gesing? -- Terwyl die optog voortbeweeg het, het hulle gesing. Dit was in 'n Swarttaal gewees en ek kon nie verstaan wat hulle gesing het nie.

Het die onluste-eenheid van die polisie op die toneel gekom? -- Ja, die reaksie-eenheid van die polisie het toe op die toneel gekom. (20)

HOF : Is daar 'n verskil tussen die onluste-eenheid en die reaksie-eenheid? -- Nee, dit is maar dieselfde.

MNR. HANEKOM : Wat het toe gebeur? -- In die nuwe Swartwoonbuurt gedeelte van Tumahole en Swartwoonbuurt Parys, het die reaksie-eenheid die optog tot stilstand gedwing.

Wat het verder gebeur? -- Adjudant-offisier Venter het hulle toe deur middel van 'n luidspreker meegedeel dat dit 'n onwettige byeenkoms is en dat indien hulle nie binne dertig minute sou uiteen gaan nie, sou hulle gearresteer word.

Wat het toe gebeur? -- Ek wil net sê dat die boodskap (30)
is deur middel van 'n tolk aan die optoggers gestel.

HOF : Met 'n luidspreker? -- Deur middel van 'n luidspreker.

MNR. HANEKOM : Het die skare uiteen gegaan of nie? -- Ja, die skare het ongeveer vyftien minute later vreedsaam uiteen gegaan.

Wat het later dieselfde dag in die woongebied gebeur? -- Nadat hulle daar uitmekaar uit is, het 'n groep by die biersaal weer saamgedrom.

Hoe ver is die biersaal van die punt waar die skare uiteen is? -- Laat ek dit so stel, dit is nie binne sigafstand nie.

Ja? -- Toe die polisie hulle genader het om weer 'n (10) verdere waarskuwing aan hulle te rig, het hulle die polisievoertuie met klippe begin gooi. Die polisie het gebruik gemaak van traangas om hulle uiteen te jaag. Nadat die polisie hulle met traangas uiteen gejaag het, het hulle weer kleiner groepies gevorm en onrus het deur die hele Swartwoudbuurt versprei.

Is daar die dag geboue beskadig? -- Daarna het van hierdie groepe besigheidssentrums met klippe bestook, winkelvensters is stukkend gegooi en daar is ook padversperrings in die strate gepak. Die padversperrings was vullisdromme, groot klippe en brandende motorkarbande. (20)

Is enige geboue aan die brand gestee? -- Daarna het hulle die winkel van Gemeenskapsraadslid Hlalele aan die brand gestee. Hulle het ook raadslid Hlalele se slaghuis se vensters stukkend gegooi en die inhoud geplunder. Gedurende die onrus wat omstreeks tot 16h00 geduur het, is daar onder andere vyf polisievoertuie beskadig as gevolg van klipgooiery, vyf winkels is beskadig en vier lede van die Mag is lig beseer deur klippe.

Het kaptein Vorster later beheer daar oorgeneem? -- Ja, hy het beheer geneem.

Dieselfde dag, die aand, was daar padblokkades deur die (30) polisie by die ingange na die woongebied Tumahole? -- Dit is

korrek.

Ongeveer 20h00 is u na so 'n padblokkade ontbied? -- Dit is korrek.

Wat het u daar aangetref? -- Met my aankoms by die polisie-padblokkade wat onder bevel was van kaptein Moorkroft, het ek 'n rooi Corolla sedan motorvoertuig in die padblokkade gevind. Die voertuig was bestuur deur mnr. Terror Lekota.

HOF : Kan hy het opstaan, asseblief. Is dit beskuldigde nr. 20? -- Dit is reg. Daar was ook 'n passasier by hom gewees. Dit was mnr. Alfred Kganare. (10)

MNR. HANEKOM : Het u geweet wat die persoon Alfred Kganare gedoen het? Wat se werk hy gedoen het? Het u dit vasgestel later? -- Ek het vasgestel later dat hy verbonde was aan die organisasie UDF.

Waarheen? -- Aan die organisasie United Democratic Front.

Kon u bepaal in watter hoedanigheid? -- Hy was die publisiteitssekretaris.

HOF : Praat u nou van mnr. Lekota of van Kganare? -- Mnr. Lekota.

MNR. HANEKOM : En mnr. Kganare? -- Uit die dokumente wat (20) hy by hom gehad het, het ek vasgestel dat hy aan een of ander vakbonde verbonde was, dit was die Commercial Catering and Allied Workers Union of South Africa, maar laat ek dit so stel, ek het hom daardie aand vir die eerste keer gesien. Ek het hom nog nie vantevore gesien nie en ek het nie geweet dat hy aan CCAWUSA verbonde was nie.

HOF : Was die voertuig op pad in of op pad uit? Het julle blokkades opgerig om mense te keer om in te kom of om mense te keer om uit te gaan? -- Dit was - die padblokkade het 'n tweërlei doel gehad. Die oomblik toe ek by die padblokkade(30) aangekom het, kon ek nie sê of hy ingegaan het of uitgekom het

.../ nie

nie.

MNR. HANEKOM : Het u die voertuig deursoek? -- Ja, ek het die voertuig deursoek. Ek het 'n aantal dokumente in die voertuig gevind.

Kon u bepaal watter dokumente aan mnr. Kganare behoort het en watter aan beskuldigde nr. 20 behoort het? -- Ja. Die dokumente van Swartman Kganare het hy vir my gesê dit is sy dokumente.

En ander dokumente in die voertuig? -- Ander dokumente wat in die voertuig gevind is, het aan mnr. Terror Lekota (10) behoort.

Het hy dit erken of ontken? -- Hy het erken dit is sy dokumente.

Het u 'n inventaris opgestel van al die dokumente wat u daar aangetref het van beskuldigde nr. 20? -- Dit is korrek.

Om dit net duidelik te stel, u het met die inventaris daar begin en op 'n later stadium is julle na die polisiestasie waar u die inventaris voltooi het. Is dit korrek? -- Ja, dit is korrek. Ek kan net verduidelik, ek het later hulp ontbied om my te help met die opstel van die inventaris. Die dokumente (20) wat Swartman Kganare by hom gehad het, het vir my ooglopend soos stoporders gelyk en was omtrent honderd in getal. Swartman Kganare het daarop aangedring dat die dokumente afsonderlik op die inventaris gemeld word en toe het ek gesien dit gaan vir my baie lank neem om hierdie inventaris op te stel, toe het ek hulp ontbied, waarna adjudant De Wit van die Veiligheidstak en sersant Gouws van die Veiligheidstak toe na die toneel toe gekom het. Sersant Gouws het toe die inventaris opgestel van mnr. Kganare se dokumente. Adjudant-offisier De Wet het toe vir mnr. Lekota gevra wat het hy in die Swartwoonbuurt gemaak. (30)

HOF : Dit is nou in Tumahole? -- Ja. Mnr. Lekota het toe vir

... / hom

hom gesê dat hy sy vriend Vuzile Dabi opgesoek het.

MNR. HANEKOM : Het u so 'n persoon geken, uself, Vuzile Dabi?
-- So 'n persoon is aan my bekend. Hy is lid van die Tumahole Students Organisation. Adjudant-offisier De Wit het my toe eenkant toe geroep. Hy het toe vir my gesê hy gaan 'n bietjie ondersoek instel na die bewerings van Swartman Lekota dat hy in die Swartwoonbuurt was spesifiek met die doel om sy vriend te gaan opsoek. Adjudant-offisier De Wit is toe daar weg en ek het verder aangegaan met die opstel van die inventaris van die dokumente wat by mnr. Lekota gevind is. Terwyl ek besig⁽¹⁰⁾ was om die dokumente uit te skryf, het mnr. Lekota vir my gevra of ons nie na die polisiestasie toe kan gaan om die dokumente daar te gaan bestudeer nie, want hy wou van die dokumente wat ek op die inventaris geskryf het terug hê. Ek het op daardie stadium sy versoek geweier, aangesien sersant Gouws op daardie stadium nog steeds besig was met die inventaris van mnr. Kganare se dokumente. Omstreeks 22h15 het adjudant-offisier De Wit teruggekom. Hy het my weer eenkant geroep en my meegedeel dat mnr. Dabi nie by die huis was nie. Sersant Gouws was op daardie stadium klaar met die opstel (20) van die inventaris van die dokumente wat by Swartman Kganare gevind is en ek het toe besluit om aan mnr. Lekota se versoek te voldoen. Ek het toe vir mnr. Lekota gesê ons kan nou polisiestasie toe gaan en hy het met sy eie voertuig na die polisiestasie toe gery. Ons het daarna ook in ons voertuie geklim en na die polisiestasie toe gery.

Het u toe by die polisiestasie al die dokumente op inventarisse neergeskryf? -- Ja. Daarna het sersant Gouws die inventaris by my oorgeneem en dit verder opgestel vanaf die dokumente wat by Swartman Lekota gevind is wat nog nie op (30) die inventaris aangebring was nie, want ek het toe in die SB se

kantoor gaan sit en weer die dokumente bestudeer wat ek reeds op die inventaris geplaas het.

HOF : By wie se kantoor? -- In die stasiebevelvoerder se kantoor gaan sit. Nadat sersant Gouws klaar was met die opstel van die inventaris, het adjudant De Wit vir mnr. Lekota na die stasiebevelvoerder se kantoor ontbied en hy het hom uitgevra oor sy bewegings die betrokke aand.

MNR. HANEKOM : Was dit in u teenwoordigheid? -- Ja, dit was in my teenwoordigheid, maar ek het nie baie aandag aan die gesprek geskenk nie. Ek was besig met die dokumente gewees.(10) So, ek kan nie meer onthou hoe die gesprek verloop het nie. Ek het toe tot die beslissing gekom dat dit in elk geval vir my ure sou neem om 'n beslissing te maak oor die dokumente, of ek dit sal moet teruggee of nie en ek het toe besluit om nie die dokumente aan hom terug te gee nie. Daar was ook nie tyd op daardie stadium nie, want die onrus in die Swartwoonbuurt het al ons aandag geverg.

Ek toon nou aan u 'n pakkie dokumente. Is dit van die oorspronklike dokumente waarop u beslag gelê het, nie almal nie, maar sommige van hulle? -- Dit is reg. (20)

Het u voor op die pakkie 'n lys gemaak van die dokumente wat in hierdie pakkie vervat is? -- Dit is reg.

HOF : Dit is nou dokumente wat in besit was van beskuldigde nr. 20? -- Dit is reg.

MNR. HANEKOM : U Edele, net ter verduideliking. Op die eerste bladsy van hierdie lys, begin met A(2) en dan Z(2). Ek sal dit nou-nou opklaar. Ek wil eers na die tweede bladsy verwys, van item 7 af. Die itemnommers wat u gegee het van 1 tot 18, dit is die agtien dokumente waarvan ons nou praat? -- Dit is korrek. (30)

Dan van item 7 af het ek gemerk AAX (1).

HOF : En die ander bewysstuknommers? Is al wat bestaande bewysstukke is?

MNR. HANEKOM : Ja. Ek sal dit nou vir die getuie gee om ook te identifiseer, maar dit is wat reeds in die albums voorkom.

HOF : Wat ingebind is?

MNR. HANEKOM : Dit is reg. Dit is nie die oorspronklikes waarvan daardie afdrukke gemaak is nie, maar dit is soortgelyke dokumente.

HOF : Wel, laat ons maar eers die ding stap-vir-stap neem.

Wat sê u nou vir die getuie? (10)

MNR. HANEKOM : Ek sê vir die getuie van item 7 af het u die dokumente gemerk AAx(1) tot by item 18 wat AAx(12) is? -- Dit is korrek.

Dan die heel regterkantste kolom onder die opskrif "Kwintansienommer", verwys dit na die nommer op die inventaris wat u die aand opgestel het? -- Dit is korrek.

HOF : Moet ons nie na die dokumente eers kyk nie? Gaan u die dokumente inhandig?

MNR. HANEKOM : Ja. Ek het gedink, ek is seker verkeerd, ek probeer, maar ek het gedink dit gaan nie nou ter sprake kom (20) nie, eers miskien later op die stadium van kruisverhoor. Ek het gedink dit sal geweldig tyd in beslag neem ... (Hof kom tussenbei)

HOF : Ja, dit sal, maar ons wil net 'n bietjie kyk na wat die soort dokumente is wat u nou inhandig. Dit is darem twaalf dokumente wat u nou inhandig. Ek het hier 'n AAx(1) en dan net na AAx(1) het ek weer 'n AAx(1). -- Dit was twee pamflette van dieselfde soort.

Maar daar was twee pamflette? -- Ja, daar was twee pamflette. (30)

MNR. HANEKOM : AAx(2) is 'n handgeskrewe dokument. AAx(3) is ... / skynbaar

skynbaar 'n fotostatiese afdruk uit 'n publikasie. Is dit hoe u dit aangetref het? -- Dit is so.

AAX(4) is 'n brief gedateer 7 Oktober 1983 wat gerig is aan "The Secretary, Feasibility Committee, Johannesburg."

HOF : Geskryf deur beskuldigde nr. 20.

MNR. HANEKOM : Beskuldigde nr. 20.

HOF : Dit is blykbaar 'n afskrif. Dit is nie onderteken nie.

MNR. HANEKOM : AAX(5) is 'n brief van die United Democratic Front gedateer 21 November 1983 wat gerig is aan die USA Ambassadeur, Johannesburg. -- Dit is reg. (10)

HOF : Is dit die oorspronklike wat u daar het of is dit 'n kopie wat onderteken is, want dit wil vir my voorkom asof hy onderteken is? -- Hierdie is 'n kopie.

Wat ondergeteken is? -- Wat onderteken is.

MNR. HANEKOM : AAX(6) is 'n brief van die United Democratic Front, Transvaal wat gerig is aan "Dear Friends" met betrekking tot 'n "meeting of UDF general council." Is dit ook 'n fotostatiese afskrif? -- Ja, dit is ook 'n fotostatiese afdruk.

Wat onderteken is deur die sekretaris M. Valli? -- Dit is reg. (20)

Dan AAX(7) is 'n dokument met die titel "Recommendations for UDF publicity." -- Ja, dit is korrek. Hierdie is 'n afskrif wat deur kopieerpapier verkry is. Dit is 'n tikskrif ... (Hof kom tussenbei)

HOF : Deurslag koolafskrif? -- Dit is reg.

MNR. HANEKOM : AAX(8) is weer 'n fotostatiese afdruk skynbaar uit 'n publikasie.

HOF : Is dit by u ook 'n afdruk, nie die oorspronklike nie? -- Ja, dit is ook 'n afdruk.

Maar bo-op myne staan geskryf "South African Labour (30) bulletin". Is dit by u geskryf of is dit by u gekopieer? --

By my is dit in blou balpunte geskryf.

MNR. HANEKOM : AA(9) lyk na 'n persverklaring met die opskrif "Newspapers"? -- Dit is korrek. Dit is ook 'n fotostatiese afdruk.

HOF : Nee, dit is nie 'n persverklaring nie. Dit is 'n opsomming van iets wat in die koerante staan, as 'n mens na die aanhangsels kyk met 'n hele aantal dokumente daarby aangeheg? -- Dit is korrek.

MNR. HANEKOM : AA(10) is 'n enkel dokument met opskrif "Functions and duties of the secretary general and publicity(10) secretary." --Dit lyk ook na 'n afdruk, maar daar is aantekeninge met 'n blou balpunte.

HOF : Die aantekeninge is op die oorspronklike in oorspronklike ink geskryf? -- Dit is korrek.

MNR. HANEKOM : AA(11) is weer 'n handgeskrewe stuk met die opskrif "Oppose the constitution." Is dit by u 'n afdruk of is dit 'n oorspronklik geskrewe stuk? -- Nee, hier is dit 'n oorspronklike geskrif wat met blou balpunte geskryf is.

Dan AA(12) is 'n dokument "Declaration of United Democratic Front". Ons het dit as twee bladsye. Het u dit as een vel (20) wat al kante gedruk is? -- Ja, dit is twee bladsye. Een blaaie met twee bladsye.

Dan gee ek aan u nog 'n pakkie dokumente wat u op die lys gemerk het items 1 tot 6. -- Ek het dit ontvang.

U Edele, van hierdie ses dokumente het ek nie afskrifte gemaak nie, omdat ... (Hof kom tussenbei)

HOF : Net om dit duidelik te maak. U verwys na 'n lys, maar is die lys ook veronderstel om voor die Hof te wees?

MNR. HANEKOM : Ja.

HOF : Nou waarom het die lys dan nie 'n nommer nie? (30)

MNR. HANEKOM : Dan kan ons die lys net AA maak.

... / HOF

HOF : AAX is dan die lys wat as opskrif dra "Bewysstukke" met agtien items daarop.

MNR. HANEKOM : Van hierdie ses dokumente het ek nie afskrifte gemaak nie, omdat ons reeds afskrifte daarvan het.

HOF : U moet dit maar ophandig een vir een sodat ons dit kan identifiseer.

MNR. HANEKOM : Sal u begin met die dokument item 1 wat ons aandui as BEWYSSTUK A(2)? Wat se dokument is dit? -- Hier heel aan die voorkant van die dokument staan "United Democratic Front". Net onder aan staan "Resolutions". Dit lyk ook (10) na 'n fotokopie.

HOF : Is A(2) 'n dokument wat erken is?

MNR. HANEKOM : Hy is erken.

HOF : Hier is geen nota dat hy erken is nie. Hy is nie erken nie. Basies kan 'n mens A(2) gebruik, maar op die kopie is daar notas wat nie op die oorspronklike is wat u aan my nou gee nie. A(2) het dertien besluite en hierdie een het twaalf besluite. Nee, tog dertien, maar die volgorde is verkeerd. Ons kan dit op hierdie manier doen deur eenvoudig hierdie A(2) te neem as kopie en hierdie een in te neem as die (20) oorspronklike en in gedagte te hou dat daar geen aantekeninge op die oorspronklike is nie. Dan hoef u nie afskrifte te maak nie.

MNR. HANEKOM : Die tweede dokument wat ons gemerk het Z(2), wat se dokument is dit? -- Dit is ook 'n fotokopie. Heel bo-aan staan "Preliminary report on the effect of the state of crisis on labour in the East London area."

Uit hoeveel bladsy bestaan die dokument? -- Hy bestaan uit twaalf blaaie.

Die derde dokument? -- Die derde dokument is blykbaar (30) ook 'n fotostatiese afdruk. Op die eerste blad staan "Speech

delivered by Bret Murdol 29 September 1983 at NUSAS ECT
mass meeting students reject the Apartheid constitution."

HOF : Is dit AD(18)? -- Dit is AD(18).

MNR. HANEKOM : Uit hoeveel bladsye bestaan die dokument? --
Hy bestaan uit drie.

HOF : Z(2) is 'n dokument wat erken is.

K326

MNR. HANEKOM : Ja. U Edele, in die afskrif is dit die tweede
bladsy van AD(18) wat gemerk is AD(18)(1).

HOF : Met ander woorde AD(18), die "Draft statement on
consensus Bret Murdol" is nie deel van die dokument wat (10)
hierdie getuie het nie?

MNR. HANEKOM : Nee.

HOF : AD(18) is in elk geval erken, maar is dit dan verder
die hele AD(18) behalwe die eerste bladsy wat die getuie in-
handig?

MNR. HANEKOM : Behalwe die eerste bladsy en die laaste bladsy
ook.

HOF : Die laaste bladsy is dit die bladsy wat "Vigil, vigil,
vigil" ensovoorts bo op het met 'n man met 'n geweer wat mik -
'n prentjie eintlik van die Weermag. (20)

MNR. HANEKOM : Dit is korrek.

HOF : Is hy nie daarby nie?

MNR. HANEKOM : Hy is nie daarby nie. Die vierde dokument
verwys na drie ander dokumente. Dit is C(120), AM(1) en K(2).
-- Op die voorkant van die dokument staan "United Democratic
Front, Transvaal. Program of action for September, October,
November 1983."

Uit hoeveel bladsye bestaan hierdie dokument? -- Hy bestaan
uit drie uit.

Dan item nr. 5, watter dokument is dit? -- AJ(16). (30)

Uit hoeveel bladsye bestaan dit? -- Hy bestaan uit twee
... / bladsye

bladsye en die opskrif is "Joint statement issued by United Democratic Front for SATU, SAAWU, OVGWU, CAVU, CAVUSA, SCWU, JOSTA, SACU, SALTCO, CUSA and Detainees Support Committee." Daar is ook aantekening gemaak met blou balpunte op die dokument.

Dan toon ek nog 'n dokument aan u. Het u hierdie dokument saam met AJ(16) gekry by die beskuldigde se stukke? -- Ja, dit is korrek. Dit is 'n oorspronklike teleks.

Dit is in die vorm van 'n teleks? -- In die vorm van 'n teleks. Dit lyk soos 'n oorspronklike een. (10)

Ek sal vra dat ons hom nommer AJ(16)(2). -- Dit bevat dieselfde inhoud as die vorige dokument wat ek ingehandig het.

Tot so ongeveer drie-kwart van die bladsy? -- Ja.

En dan onder aan die druktelegraaf is 'n stukkie wat onder die opskrif is "Additional statement"? -- Ja. Dit lyk of die dokument wat ek voor dit ingehandig het, opgestel is uit hierdie dokument. Ek sê, dit lyk net so.

Dan die laaste dokument, item 6? -- Dit lyk ook soos 'n fotokopie. Die opskrif is "Statement on the detention of our public secretary (Terror Lekota)" gedateer 2 Oktober 1983. (20)

Dit is AJ(22). -- AJ(22).

Die dokument wat u voor u het, lyk of dit onder aan die verklaring 'n handtekening het, dit lyk na Molefe of is daar geen handtekening op nie? -- Hier is geen handtekening onder aan die dokument nie.

HOF : Ons maak dan 'n nota - kyk 'n bietjie na die datum. Wat is die datum op u dokument daar? -- Hier staan oorspronklik 2 Oktober 1983. Toe is die Oktober doodgetrek en daar is November geskryf.

Wat staan daar? Is dit nou 2 November? -- Ja, die Oktober (30) tober is doodgetrek en dan staan daar November.

... / Dus

Dus ons afskrif is nie dieselfde nie in twee opsigte. Daar is nie 'n handtekening onder nie en waar daar staan October staan daar November op die oorspronklike. Is daar enige ander geskrif op behalwe dit wat getik is? -- Ja, hier staan nog 'n datum 24/10/83.

Waar is dit geskryf? -- Dit is geskryf net langs die datum.

Heel bo-aan? -- Heel bo-aan.

Ja, ons dokument lyk ook nie soos u dokument nie, want ons dokument is op die briefhoof van die UDF, terwyl u (10) dokument sonder briefhoof is. -- Dit is korrek.

MNR. HANEKOM : Net volledigheidshalwe, die ander dokumente wat u die aand op beslag gelê het van beskuldigde nr. 20, wat ons nie nou voor die Hof geplaas het nie, is dit nog in u besit? -- Dit is nog in my besit. Ek kan net verder aangaan daarmee, dat die dokumente was by die stasiebevelvoerder van Parys gewees, want hulle het blykbaar 'n navraag gekry dat die dokumente moet teruggehandig word. Die dokumente is nooit gaan afhaal nie.

HOF : Tot wanneer was dit by die stasiebevelvoerder? -- (20) Dit was ongeveer daar gewees tot 24 Mei 1986.

MNR. HANEKOM : Het u dit toe daar gaan afhaal en van toe af tot nou in u besit gehou? -- Dit is reg. Ek het natuurlik nie persoonlik daar gaan haal nie, maar ek het iemand gestuur om dit vir my daar te gaan haal.

U Edele, ek wil net op rekord plaas dat die ander dokumente wat ons nou nie voor die Hof geplaas het nie, is nie voor die Hof geplaas nie, omdat ons van oordeel is dit is nie relevant nie. Dit is die enigste rede waarom dit nie gedoen is nie. (30)

MNR. BIZOS DEEL HOF MEE DAT HY NIE IN 'N POSISIE IS OM TE
KRUISVRA NIE EN VRA VIR UITSTEL VAN DIE SAAK.

GETUIE STAAN AF.

HOF VERDAAG TOT 9 JUNIE 1986.

DELMAS TREASON TRIAL 1985-1989

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers, The University of the Witwatersrand

Location:- Johannesburg

©2009

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

DOCUMENT DETAILS:

Document ID:- AK2117-I1-13-103

Document Title:- Vol 103 p 5097-5144. Witnesses: Sijadi, IC20, Jenkins