

Why is this flimsy? Other witnesses gave similar evidence. There was no evidence to the contrary and IC8's evidence of other peoples namely the march was not accepted.

10.32.4 AT REASON 4

This is not correctly stated. Defence witness has testified that the order of the speakers were accused numbers 16 then number 1 and number 2.

Hlomuk volume 220 page 11645 lines 15 to 19:

Moselane volume 230 page 12237 lines 9 to 21:

Manthata volume 276 page 15053 lines 9 to 15 and
volume 282 page 15416 lines 11 to 16.

Myeza page 18123 lines 13 to 14

Mbatyazwe volume 331 page 18913 lines 3 to 14 also
volume 332 page 18947 lines 12 to 15.

Mokati page 19370 .

This is wherefore a clear misdirection.

It was also put on behalf of the defence that the order of the speakers was 16, 1 and 2 - pages 1250 and 1252

10.34.5 AT REASONS 5

AZANYU and AZAPO are similar sounding names. AZANYU was not well known. Why is this not a bona fide mistake? The witness said in his evidence - page 19492 - that he did not know the difference between the 2.

10.34.6 AT REASON 6

He only felt hot flushes while he was interpreting for accused number 1 - Msimanga page 19492.

10.34.7 AT REASON 7

The witness said that he thought that the word

"puppet" meant "elusive" - Msimanga page 19498 to page 19499.

10.34.8 AT REASON 8

The witness could have forgotten . Instructions need not have come from him.

10.34.9 AT REASON 9

Why is this not explicable as lapses of memory. The witness remembers a partition to the council presumably in connection with the rent.

10.34.10 AT REASON 10

Why is this a reason to disbelieve the witness? The witness does not know the people who volunteered and did not see the names of the volunteers been taken down - page 19507.

10.34.11 AT REASON 11

The witness explains this in line 19472.

10.34.12 AT REASON 12

Witnesses version and what was put - check.

Partition and see lawyer. Why discrepancy?

See Puttos at page 19593 and thereafter stop.

10.34.13 AT REASON 13

Relevance. Rent general complaint.

10.35 He does not pose the question as to whether the witness would have interpreted the offending words.

Msimanga page

Collection Number: AK2117

Collection Name: Delmas Treason Trial, 1985-1989

PUBLISHER:

Publisher: Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand

Location: Johannesburg

©2016

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.

This document forms part of a collection, held at the Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.