

KXD.MR.HUISAMEN.

Do you know whether they did in fact inform them?— I am sorry, I did never ask him, but we just went to Grahamstown, that is all. We only gave him the instruction and then we left thereafter.

They weren't actually waiting for you because you still had to round them up, right?— No, I wouldn't readily agree to that, because accused no.4 took us to accused no.6's house and then we found the members present.

Did you arrive at accused no.4's house and then he directly took you to accused no.6's house?— Yes.

How long did you remain at accused no.4's house?— I would say for about an hour or a little over an hour.

Was accused no.4 with you all that time?— Yes, he accompanied us to the accused's house.

While you were at accused no.4's house was accused no.4 present?— On our arrival he was not in the house.

When he came there?— Yes, when he came there he took us to accused no.6's house.

And he remained with you until he took you?— Yes.

He didn't at about - any stage inform you to wait for him alone while he went to round up these people?

BY THE COURT. Did no.4 tell you to wait there a while and did he leave to go and round up the other people?— He did. I am sorry.

Where did he leave you?— He left us at his house.

And he did what then?— He came back and took us to no.6's house.

KXD.MR.HUISAMEN.

Would you describe this gathering of you people as a meeting in the true sense of the word or would you describe it as a gathering between you and people from Grahamstown to find out how they feel about the "new plan"?— I would describe/...

Describe it as a meeting between us and the Grahamstown people.

Was this now an A.N.C. meeting or a Youth League meeting, what type of meeting was it, or was it just an investigation by you people by testing the opinion of other people?--- It was for testing the opinion of the members of the Grahamstown branch, both Youth League and mother body.

So this was not the meeting in terms of the constitution of the A.N.C. mother body or a meeting in terms of the constitution of the Youth League body, it was an impromptu meeting, not an impromptu meeting, but a meeting called by you and this was an unofficial meeting really?--- Although sir, you may call it an unofficial meeting, but we regarded it as an official meeting as far as the Youth League is concerned because we instructed our Secretary to write to them, it gives the impression that it was an official meeting.

Was this now an A.N.C. meeting or Youth League meeting?--- There were A.N.C. members amongst the Youth League members.

How many times did you go to Grahamstown?---I only remember twice.

Is it possible that you've been there on more than one occasion?---Yes, that is possible, more than one occasion.

BY THE COURT. Youth League meetings?---Yes, in connection with meetings.

More than twice?--- That I cannot say, more than twice.

MR. HUISMAN.

I am not asking you whether you can say, I just want to know is it possible?

BY THE COURT. He says he went to Grahamstown twice. Now the

the question is: is it possible that you've been there more than twice?--- I don't think it would be possible that I have been there more than twice.

XXD.MR.HUISAMEN.

As President of the Eastern Cape Youth League, you must have known what the state of the Youth League was like in Grahamstown?--- Yes.

Was the Youth League in fact functioning all the time in Grahamstown?--- Not very well, it was not functioning quite well, as the A.N.C.

In fact, in 1954 ...?--- Where?

In Grahamstown?--- But there were members of the Youth League in Grahamstown in 1960.

Who were they?--- Kaba was a Youth League member.

BY THE COURT. Who is that?--- Accused no.2.

No.2 was what?--- A Youth Leaguer.

A leader?--- A member of the Youth League.

XXD.MR.HUISAMEN.

Anybody else you can remember?---I can also remember accused no.5, he was also a Youth Leaguer, a member of the Youth League.

What is his name?--- It is Elias Solomon.

What is no.6's name?--- Vuma Nkozinkula.

No.4?--- Nickel Ejekula.

No.3?--- Jackson Ndinda.

Why do you have such difficulty to remember these names?--- It is because I have only last seen these members, to be with them in 1961, when I was in Grahamstown, and it is quite a long time since then.

If each of these accused denies that they ever attended a meeting of a banned organisation with you, what would you say?--- I would say they are mistaken, because I knew very

well/...

well I attended meetings together with them.

If they deny that they ever attended a meeting with you in 1961?--- I would say they are mistaken because I knew very well I was with them, at that particular meeting.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

BY THE COURT. You say you went to Grahamstown to go and find out about the Youth League? --- Yes.

Why did all the accused come to this meeting?--- Because they were present at that meeting.

Why?--- It is because we have written them a letter telling them that we would like to meet them and discuss the question of the dissolution of the African National Congress Youth League. So they were present at that meeting as members of the Youth League and A.N.C. as well.

RE-EXAMINATION BY STATE PROSECUTOR.

I would like to know why you personally did not agree, or rather did not accept the "new plan"?--- It is because we were highly opposed to the "new plan". It is because our aim was that the African National Congress would fight for the freedom of the African People.

What did the "new plan" envisage?--- The "new plan" I should say was the reverse of that, in other words in a violent way, to attain the freedom of the African people in a violent manner, in a violent way.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

BY THE COURT.

Have you ever had trouble with any of the accused personally, privately, officially or in any way?---Oh no.

Do you bare them any grudge?---No.

Have you got a reason to bare them any grudge?---No, I have no reason.

NO RE-XAD. BY MR. HUISAMEN.

IN TERMS OF SECTION 12 (iv)(c) of Act no.44/1950 STATE PROSECUTOR HANDS IN EXHIBIT C. - CONSTITUTION OF AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS. (With reference specifically to paragraph 2 - Youth League.)

CASE FOR THE STATE.

-----oOo-----

CASE REMANDED TO THE 24th SEPTEMBER, 1964.

MR. HUISAMEN ADDRESSES COURT. (In respect of exhibit C.)

-----oOo-----

DEFENCE.

MR. HUISAMEN CALLS.

STANLEY KABA. Sworn States. Accused no.2.

XD. MR. HUISAMEN.

Do you know the A.N.C. ?--- Yes.

Were you ever a member of the A.N.C. ?--- Yes.

When did you join the A.N.C. ?--- In 1953.

When did you stop being a member of the A.N.C. ?

Did you at any stage stop to be a member of the A.N.C. ?---Yes.

When was that ?--- When the organisation was banned in April, 1960.

Did you ever attend a meeting at Grahamstown in 1961 ?---No, I did not attend a meeting at all.

Did you ever attend - (Court interveance).

BY THE COURT. Or more particularly February, 1961 ?--- During the whole of 1961, I did not attend any meeting.

XD. MR. HUISAMEN.

You heard the evidence the State led against you ?---

Did you ever attend a meeting with the two State witnesses ?---

Yes, I did

When/...

When was that?--- 27th March, 1960.

Was that prior to the banning of the A.N.C. ?---Yes.

Who was present at this meeting?--- Accused no.1,
the State witness Zizi Njikelana, the second State witness
Hewana, Stapleton Ncube, Winnard Mati and Terence Magqabi.

You mentioned accused no.1. Was any of the other
accused there?--- Accused no.4. Accused no.5 and accused
no.6.

JACKSON

BY THE COURT. What about no.3?--- Accused no.3 was not
present.

XD, MR. HUISANEN.

Where was this meeting held?--- It was held in the
house occupied by accused no.6.

After this meeting was there any financial discussions?
--- No.

Did these people that came from Port Elizabeth, were
they in a position to return to Port Elizabeth immediately?
Did they have the necessary means?--- They borrowed money
from us.

How much money?--- R3.

Who gave them the R3?--- I did.

How do you remember that this was the 27th March?
What day of the week was it first?--- It was a Sunday.

How do you remember that it was the 27th day of
March, 1960?--- I remember because the following day, the
28th March, which was a Monday, the "Stay at Home" strike was
scheduled for that day.

In aid of what was this "Stay at Home" strike?--- It
was in connection with the Sharpeville incident.

BY THE COURT. Which organisation arranged it, or who was
responsible for the "Stay at Home" strike?---The African
National Congress.

How long before the 28th was Sharpeville ?--- That was on the previous Monday, the 21st March.

Who informed you about this "Stay at Home" ?--- Vuyisile Mini. He brought the information to us in Grahamstown.

Was that during that week ?--- Yes, during that week.

Did Vuyisile Mini discuss anything else with you when he visited you during that week ?--- Yes.

What did he discuss with you ?--- He explained that the Youth League was to be dissolved. The Youth League of the African National Congress.

Did he say where he got these instructions from ?--- He said that information came from headquarters, the National Executive.

Did he tell you why the Youth League had to be dissolved ?--- Yes.

What did he say ?--- He explained that money involved in the Youth League was being misused.

Were you people prepared to support this instruction or not ?--- Yes.

Why were you prepared to support this ?--- Because the Youth League was no longer in operation in Grahamstown it became defunct in 1954 in that area.

Because you didn't really have a Youth League you were prepared to stand square behind the A.N.C. in its efforts to abolish it ?---That is correct.

When these people from Port Elizabeth came that Sunday, what did they discuss with you ?---The dissolution of the Youth League of the African National Congress was discussed.

What did they have to say ?--- They asked us to support them in connection with the Youth League. They wanted the Youth/...

Youth League to continue.

Did they ask you to do anything specifically about it?--- Yes.

What did they ask you to do?--- They said if we did not believe in this we could send a delegate to headquarters to verify that fact.

Were you people prepared to support these people from Port Elizabeth? --- No.

Why not?--- Because there was no Youth League in operation in Grahamstown.

Shortly after this you were detained under the Emergency Regulations, is that right?--- Correct.

BY THE COURT. Can he remember the date when he was taken into custody?--- Wednesday the 30th March, 1960.

Under the State of Emergency?--- Yes.

How long was he then detained for?--- I was detained for three months.

XP.MR.HUISAMEN.

Did you ever take part in any activity of the A.N.C. after being released?--- Definitely not.

Did you remain a member after the banning?--- No.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

XKB.STATE PROSECUTOR.

Do you know the State witness Zizi?--- Yes, I know him.

Did he hold any office in the African National Congress?--- I don't know what office he held.

Do you know that he was an office-bearer?--- I don't know whether he was an office-bearer or not.

Who was the President of the Youth League of the Eastern Cape Region?--- I had no knowledge because in Grahamstown there was no Youth League in operation.

I want to point out to you that right in the beginning of your evidence you told the Court that you attended a meeting during March, 1960, a meeting of the Youth League of the African National Congress. Do you recall that ?

BY MR. HUISAMEN. I object. He never said he attended a meeting of the Youth League of the African National Congress. He said "I attended a meeting with the following people present".

BY THE COURT. What he actually said was "I attended a meeting with the two State witnesses on the 27th March, 1960. That was prior to the banning of the A.N.C."

K.K.D. STATE PROSECUTOR.

As Your Worship pleases. Were you ever a member of the Youth League of the African National Congress ?--- I was a member of the Youth League of the African National Congress in 1954.

Since 1954 ?--- No, I was not a member of the Youth League after that.

Were you then an ordinary member of the African National Congress ?--- I was an ordinary member yes.

And being an ordinary member of the African National Congress up to 1960, did you come in contact with the State witness Zisi ?---The first time I ever saw the State witness Zisi was Sunday the 27th March, 1960, when he came to Grahamstown.

How did you come into contact with him on that day ?--- Together with accused no.4 all these men from Port Elizabeth came to accused no.6's house where I was living at the time.

So when the State witness told the Court, Zisi and Hewana, when they told the court they arrived there and accused no.4 took them to a certain house where they found you and accused

no.6 ? That is exactly what happened ?---That was the truth.

Who else did you find there ?--- Myself, accused no.5 and no.6 were in the house.

And then you attended a meeting there ?---Yes, a meeting was held.

What meeting was held ?--- These men from Port Elizabeth did not explain what sort of meeting it was.

But certain aspects were discussed and you were present, you listend, I want you to tell the court what meeting was held there ?--- I have been trying to help you to find an answer. Was it a church meeting ?--- These men said that they wanted to contact the members of the Executive of the African National Congress.

My question was, was it a church meeting ?---It was not a church meeting.

It was a meeting of the Youth League of the African National Congress ?--- It was not a Youth League meeting.

It was a meeting of the Executive of the Grahamstown men. Members of the Grahamstown branch of the African National Congress.

So it was a meeting of the Executive Committee of the African National Congress at Grahamstown, and the people from Port Elizabeth joined you in this meeting ?--- Yes.

BY THE COURT.

Executive of what ?--- Of the African National Congress.

XKD.S.P.

What are the names of the members of the Executive at Grahamstown who attended that meeting ?--- Myself, Stanley Kaba, accused no.6, accused no.5, and accused no.4.

About how many persons attended that meeting ?--- Ten of us.

Terence was there ?--- Yes.

At the time of the attendance Terence was the Provincial Secretary of the African National Congress ?--- (Court intervenes.)

BY THE COURT. The question is simply: was Terence the Provincial Secretary of the African National Congress ?--- He was the Secretary.

XXD.S.P.

The witness Hewana told the Court that the people you have mentioned that meeting, he also included accused no.3, and he told the court that there were other persons at the meeting ?--- Accused no.3 was not present at that meeting and there were no other people present.

No other people ?--- Apart from these ten people that I have mentioned there were no others present.

It appears that you and the State witnesses are not talking about the same meeting. (At this stage court adjourns.)

-----oOo-----

COURT RESUMED.

STANLEY KABA. (Still under oath. Contd.)

XXD.S.P. (contd.)

I want you to try to think back. Was there anybody else apart from the persons that you have mentioned that attended that meeting ?--- No.

Did you tell your Attorney about this meeting you attended ?--- Yes, I did.

What was discussed at this meeting ? Who spoke first at this meeting ?--- I did.

What did you say ?--- I said "Gentlemen, there are gentlemen from Port Elizabeth who are here, who have come to visit us". I then said "we will listen to them, hear what they have to say", and I sat down.

So the persons from Port Elizabeth arranged the meeting/...

meeting with you ?--- There was no agreement with us.

BY THE COURT. No arrangement ?---No arrangement. They arrived unexpectedly.

XND.S.P.

What else was said ?--- Winnard Mati advised us in connection with the dissolution of the Youth League of the African National Congress.

Anything else ?--- He requested us to support the people from Port Elizabeth because people from Port Elizabeth opposed the so called dissolution of the Youth League of the African National Congress. I replied saying that in Grahamstown we have no Youth League and I do not accept your request.

Did you mention that to your Attorney, what you had said at the meeting ?--- I did tell my Attorney.

What else was said ?--- (Zube) mentioned the "Stay at Home" strike. Accused no.6 replied saying that we have already heard that from Mini. After that the meeting was closed.

What about the "new plan" ? Was the "new plan" discussed at this meeting ?--- It was not discussed.

You see the dissolution of the Youth League of the African National Congress was in accordance with the "new plan" ?--- We heard nothing about the "new plan", and we knew nothing about it.

What do you mean by "we knew nothing about it" ?--- "We" the executive of Grahamstown of the African National Congress.

You say a "Stay at Home" campaign was discussed at this meeting ?--- Yes.

During May, 1961, during the celebrations of the becoming of a Republic of South Africa, there was a "stay

away" campaign ?---Yes.

Do you remember that ?--- I remember reading about it in the newspapers.

During what tide of the day was the meeting held ?---
At about 3 p.m.

How long did it last ?--- About an hours.

Do you know how the men from Port Elizabeth left Grahamstown ? With what ?--- By motor car.

Whose car ?--- I did not know who the owner was of the car.

Who drove the car ?--- I did not notice.

How did you know they left by motor car ?--- After I loaned them money for petrol they went out and got into a motor car.

When were you arrested in connection with this case against you ?--- 1st September, 1964.

What day of the week ?--- A Tuesday.

Where were you arrested ?--- Zwelitsha Township in the King William's Town district, that is where I am now resident.

How well do you know the State witness Diliza Hewana ?-
I do not know him very well. The first time I met him was during the State of Emergency in 1960.

How well do you know the State witness Zizi ?---
I only know him from meeting him on the 27th March, 1960. That is the only time I came in contact with him.

Only once ?---Yes.

But you do remember very well that he attended that meeting ?--- Yes, he is a very dark complexioned man.

I think you can't blame him for remembering you ?---
I cannot say what his memory is.

You met Hewana in Gaol while in detention during the State of Emergency ?--- Yes.

BY THE COURT.

Was he also detained, Hewana ?--- Yes.

KXD.S.P.

How many days after your arrest during the State of Emergency did you meet him in gaol ?--- I was already in custody when he arrived. I cannot say how long. I cannot remember.

BY THE COURT. How long after the witness' arrest ?--- I was arrested before him. I cannot remember how many days after my arrest, that I met him.

KXD.S.P. You seem to remember dates and days very well. I want you to think, try to remember the date. How many days after your arrest did you see him in gaol ?---I cannot say how many days after my arrest. I was already in custody when I met him.

BY THE COURT. Was he in custody for a long time already or a short time ? More or less ?--- About four weeks after my arrest.

KXD.S.P.

And that was when he was arrested ?--- That was when I first met him.

Do you remember when the State of Emergency was declared ?--- I do not remember the exact date.

Do you perhaps remember the day of the week ?--- I cannot remember.

Do you remember the month ?--- It was towards the end of March or early April, 1960.

Will you please repeat your answer on that question?-- Towards the end of March or early April.

You now agree that the State of Emergency could have been possibly declared during April, 1960, and not March, 1960 ?--- I cannot say for certain. That is an

estimate/...

estimate of mine.

So you are not sure about the date ?--- I am not positive.

You were not arrested before the date when the State of Emergency was declared ?

BY MR. HUISAMEN.

I must object to that question. How must the accused know ?

BY THE COURT. I think the question can be put to him, if he doesn't know he can say so.

XRD.S.P.

Yes. -- I was arrested on the 30th March. I was already in custody when I heard about the State of Emergency. I cannot say for certainty when it was declared.

In your evidence-in-chief you told the court that you were detained during the State of Emergency and arrested on the 30th March, 1960, on a Wednesday ?--- I am positive that I was arrested on the 30th March, 1960.

But you said it was during the State of Emergency, that is the point ?--- All I can say is that I was arrested and after my detention I was told that I was arrested in connection with the State of Emergency. I cannot say what date it was declared.

BY THE COURT. When he was arrested was he charged ?--- No, I was already in custody when I was informed of the charge against me which is under the State of Emergency.

When he was arrested, was he charged ?--- No.

XRD.S.P.

Didn't you try to find out the reason for your arrest immediately after your arrest ? What charge ?--- I did not ask any questions about it.

Why not ? Let's put it this way ? You were sure at that time you were arrested during the course of the State

of Emergency ? Isn't that so ? That is what you told the Court in your evidence-in-chief ?---I said that I was arrested in connection with the State of Emergency.

How long were you detained during the State of Emergency ?---Three months.

It was then that you for the first time found out that you were arrested under the State of Emergency ?---I was already in custody when I found out what I was arrested for.

Under my cross-examination you told the court that you found out about the State of Emergency after your detention and emphasised the word "after" ?

BY MR. HUISAMEN.

I must object to that. This cross-examination is most unfair. "After my detention is after I have been detained", "after I have been arrested", and what's more the accused on several occasions said "I was in custody when they told me". I don't know what my learned friend is going at. I think it is unfair playing with words as such. It is very clear what the witness told the court.

BY THE COURT. The scope of cross-examination is very wide. One may even cross-examine on irrelevant points. Will you put the question again please.

KKD.S.P.

Why did you tell the court that you heard, found out about the State of Emergency after your detention, I emphasise the word "after" ?

COURT TO PROSECUTOR.

After the commencement of detention ?

PROSECUTOR TO COURT.

After detention, that is what he said.

COURT TO PROSECUTOR.

After he was freed again ?

BY STATE PROSECUTOR.

That is what I understood from his answer. He said "after detention".

BY THE COURT. I understood after the commencement of the detention. Well, any rate you can clear it up. -- It was while I was in custody that I was informed of the charge against me.

That he was being detained because there was a State of Emergency?---Yes.

XKD.S.P.

Do you remember the date of your release?---I was released on the 4th July, 1960.

The day of the week?--- I cannot remember the day of the week I do remember the date though.

I take it that you attended a number of meetings of the African National Congress before its banning? --- I attended a number of meetings, yes.

Can you tell the Court when you attended the meeting immediately preceding the meeting on the 27th March, 1960, which you've described?---In Grahamstown we held meetings every fortnight.

I don't think that is an answer to my question. Can you tell the court when you attended the meeting immediately preceding the one you described?--- I cannot remember the date, but I remember the preceding meeting was where Vuyisile Mini was present.

BY THE COURT. How long before the 27th March was that?--- About three or four days.

XKD.S.P.

So you attended a meeting three or four days prior to the 27th March, 1960?-- Yes, that was the meeting where Mini was present.

That/...

That was a remarkable incident wasn't it, you remember that?--- I remember that.

When I first asked you the same question your answer was "we attended meetings every fourteen days", that was your answer to that same question. Why didn't you in the same answer give the answer you've just given?--- I was asked whether I attended a number of meetings. I said "yes". At this meeting where Mini was present was a special meeting.

Do you remember the date of that meeting?--- No.

Although it was a special meeting?--- It was a special meeting called because of Mini's presence.

What was discussed at that meeting addressed by Mini?--- Mini addressed us in connection with the dissolution of the Youth League of the African National Congress and addressed us in connection with the "Stay at Home" strike.

I would like you to tell the court what Mini said about the dissolution of the Youth League of the African National Congress?--- Mini addressed us about the misuse by the Youth League of the African National Congress of the funds and addressed us in connection with the "Stay at Home" strike.

The question is: What did he say about the dissolution of the Youth League?---He said the Youth League is going to be dissolved because of the misuse of the funds.

Who was present at that meeting addressed by Mini?--- Accused no.6, accused no.5 and accused no.4, and myself.

How did you react on this view that the Youth League had to be dissolved?--- I supported this motion because in Grahamstown there was no Youth League in operation.

And the other accused how did they react?---They also supported this motion. Accused no's 4, 5 and 6 supported this motion.

Did any of them, no's 4, 5 or 6 say anything at the

meeting ?--- Accused no.6 was the only one who stood up and supported me.

Did you or any of the persons present there, that is no's 4, 5 and 6, did any of you have an important office in the African National Congress ?--- We were members of the executive. I, myself, was the Secretary.

BY THE COURT. Of what ?--- I was the Secretary of the African National Congress Branch.

At ?---Grahamstown Branch.

And no.4 ?--- He was an ordinary member of the executive.

And no.5 ?--- Also an ordinary member of the executive.

No.6 ?---He was the Treasurer.

And no.3 ?--- He was not present at the meeting. He was not a member of the executive either.

Was he a member or not of the A.N.C. ?--- He was an ordinary member of the African National Congress.

E.D.S.P.

Did your branch, the Grahamstown Branch, have anything to do with the Youth League of the African National Congress ?--- We had nothing to do with the Youth League.

Do you know why it was necessary for Vuyisile Mini to come from Port Elizabeth to discuss the dissolution of the Youth League of the African National Congress with you people at Grahamstown, if you had nothing to do with it ?--- Mini said himself that he was on circuit contacting all the branches in the area.

Which area ?--- He did not say which area, he just said that he was on tour contacting and visiting branches, of the organisation.

In whose house was the meeting held addressed by Vuyisile Mini ?--- It was in the house occupied by accused

no.6.

When was it held ?--- About three or four days before the 27th March, 1960.

Can you give me the date ?--- I cannot remember the date.

Do you remember any of the other meetings of the African National Congress that you attended ?--- I remember the meetings that we held in Grahamstown.

Did you join the African National Congress because you agreed with the aims and objects of the Congress ?--- I joined the organisation during 1953 because I was in favour of its aims and objects at the time.

You add "at the time". What do you mean by that ?--- I joined the African National Congress because I was in favour of its aims and objects. I did not mean at the time.

That is what I didn't understand. That's why I am asking you why did you add the words "at the time" ?--- It is possible that it was a misunderstanding by the Interpreter.

You can speak English and you understand English ?--- I understand English.

And you can speak English ?--- Yes.

You didn't hear that misinterpretation because before you were questioned about it ? About your own words ?--- I have to wait for the Interpreter to give the answer.

BY THE COURT. Did he make use of the words "at the time" or not ? --- No, I did not.

Mr. Interpreter, what do you say about it ? Did he or did he not make use of those words ?--- I am not very clear on that point now. I cannot remember whether he did make use of that word or not.

You interpreted it at the time ?--- Yes, I did.

Did he make use of the words or not ?--- Yes, he did.

BY/...

BY THE ACCUSED.

What I was saying was this. When I joined the African National Congress in 1953 I was interested in its aims and objects.

At that time?---No, not at that time. When I joined the African National Congress in 1953 I was interested in its aims and objects.

In 1953 when you joined? It is the most natural thing. You say so now it means when you joined? At the time in 1953 you agreed with the aims and objects of the African National Congress?--- I agreed.

XND.S.P.

With what aims and objects did you agree?--- Foremost was the fact that the organisation was aiming for the freedom of the Bantu people in this country. That was in a non-violent - to be obtained in a non-violent manner.

Is there anything else you wish to add?--- It would take me possibly a whole day to explain what freedom means. It means so many things.

I am asking you about the aims and objects of the African National Congress? That is the question I want you to answer?--- This aim that I have mentioned, that attracted me to the organisation, these aims and objects.

Were you prepared to fight to see the aims and objects of this organisation evoked?--- Yes. In a non-violent manner.

Do you know whether the African National Congress at any stage dropped these aims and objects?--- Not to my knowledge.

Do you still agree with the aims and objects of the African National Congress?--- I am still in favour of those aims and objects but I cannot further them because of the fact/...

fact that the organisation was now banned.

But you do not agree with violence?--- I do not agree with violence;

You say at this meeting you described, held on the 27th March, 1960, the "Stay at Home" campaign was discussed?--- Yes.

Were you employed at the time?--- Yes.

What was envisaged by this "Stay away Campaign"?--- It was in connection with the Sharpeville incident.

What I mean ...?--- (By the accused in English: "It was a national day of mourning.")

Did you decide to stay away from work?--- It was an agreement by the members of the organisation that we would not go to work on that day.

For how many days did you decide to stay away from work?--- For one day.

Where did you work at the time?--- I was employed by the Rhodes University in the Library.

Was this discussed during the vacation or during the term?--- It was during the term.

Did you obtain the permission of your employer to stay away from work?--- I told them about it.

Did you obtain their permission?--- I did not obtain permission, I just told my employers that that was the position.

Who did you tell?--- The Librarian Dr. van der Riet.

What did he say on that?--- He said nothing.

You knew that it is an offence to stay away from work without the permission of your employer, but you were prepared to do so in the fulfilment of the aims and objects of the African National Congress?--- I told him the reason why I was going to stay away.

The question is: Did you know at the time it was an offence to stay away from work without your employer's permission?--- Not to my knowledge.

Were you prepared to stay away from work?--- Yes, as a member of the African National Congress I was.

And that stay away was planned for which day?--- Monday the 28th March, 1960.

When did you discuss the stay away?--- About three or four days prior to the 27th.

What did you do after this stay away was discussed at this meeting?--- What I am trying to find out is. Did you go around to inform the other Africans around you about your decision at the meeting? To tell them to stay away from work?--- We called a meeting and informed the people in this connection.

How many days after Vuyisile Mini addressed you did you call that meeting?--- Two days afterwards.

Was that an open meeting of the African National Congress?--- It was not an open meeting.

Who attended that meeting? The meeting held two days after the meeting addressed by Vuyisile Mini?--- Accused no.6 was present, no.5, accused no.3.

So only four of you attended that meeting?--- There were other members present.

Who are they?--- I cannot remember their names.

How many?--- Ten people.

On what day of the week was this meeting held?--- I don't remember what day of the week it was, it was the day after Mini had addressed us.

Was this also an important meeting of the African National Congress?--- Yes.

You considered this meeting as an important meeting because you discussed the "Stay at Home" campaign?--- Yes.

And who addressed this meeting ?--- I did.

What did you say at this meeting ? Do you remember ?---

Yes. I addressed the meeting saying that I had received a directive from Port Elizabeth saying that we were not to go to work on Monday.

Anything else ?--- I said that this was in connection with - it was a day of mourning. That was all we told them. I also mentioned that there were to be no incidents of violence.

Do you know that the African National Congress was banned ?--- When ?

I am asking you, Do you know that it was banned ?--- I know that it was banned. During April, 1960.

Do you know that after the banning the African National Congress continued its activities ?--- Not to my knowledge.

Are you sure about that ?--- I read about it in the newspapers. I was then in King William's Town.

Do you know that add - after the banning the African National Congress continued with its activities ? --- Yes, I read about it in the newspapers.

You also learnt that there were quite a number of Africans who were prepared to continue the fight for the so-called freedom ?--- Yes, I read that in the newspapers.

Why didn't you join them in their struggle ?--- I knew that the organisation was banned and that it was unlawful to take part in it.

Why didn't you continue to be a member of the African National Congress after the banning ?--- The organisation had been banned. I had no right to.

Did you ever have any trouble with the State witness Eisi ?--- The witness Eisi at Grahamstown said that we in Grahamstown were of no use to the organisation and he sued threatening/...

threatening language.

Was that when he addressed the meeting during February, 1961 ?--- Yes. No.

You have just said yes. And you didn't say that in Xosa. When the other accused in the dock drew your attention, they made noises, then you denied it ?--- May I repeat it in English. By the accused In English: "It was in 1960, when witness no.1 used threatening language to me".

And Hewana ?--- The witness Hewana did not say anything. BY THE COURT. Was he at that meeting ?---Yes, he was. And while we were in detention together I asked him why he had not paid us our money.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS BY THE STATE PROSECUTOR.

BY THE COURT. He knew Hewana before he was detained ?--- I only knew - came to know Hewana during our detention.

He just said that Hewana was also present at the meeting and the meeting was before the detention ?--- I came to know him personally in detention. He was at the meeting.

And accused no.1, did you know him ?--- The first time I saw him was at this meeting.

Did he know then whether no.1 was a member of the A.N.C. or not ?--- I did not know whether he was a member of the African National Congress or the Youth League of the African National Congress.

This meeting, was it only for members of the A.N.C. Youth organisation or was it open to all ?--- This meeting was for members of the executive of the African National Congress only.

He says no.3 was an ordinary member of the A.N.C. ?--- Yes.

He says this meeting was only for members of the executive of the A.N.C. and/or the Youth League of the

A.N.C. ?— Your Worship are you referring to the meeting that was addressed by Mini or where Hewana was present ?

The meeting where Hewana was ?— The meeting where Hewana was present was for members of the organisation. Of the African National Congress that is.

Does that mean that no.1 is a member of the A.N.C. or doesn't it mean that ?— I don't know what the position was with accused no.1 because he was a man from Fort Elizabeth then.

He says no's 2,3,4,5 and 6 were all members of the A.N.C. ? That includes him ?— We were members of the organisation then.

NO RE-EXAMINATION BY MR. HUISANEE.

CASE FOR THE DEFENCE.

-----oOo-----

STATE PROSECUTOR ADDRESSES COURT.

DEFENCE ADDRESSES COURT.

-----oOo-----

J U D G M E N T .

BY THE COURT.

The accused are charged with contravening section 3(1)(a)(i) of Act no.44 of 1950 in that they became or continued to be office bearers or members of this unlawful organisation, the African National Congress.

It has been proved that this organisation was declared illegal during the whole period covered in the charge.

Mention has been made in the evidence before the court of the Youth League of the African National Congress.

According/.....

According to the evidence it would appear that this Youth League is part of the African National Congress. The intregal portion of the African National Congress one witness described it as auxiliary to the African National Congress. But proclamation no.119 of 1960 which was extended to cover a period from year to year right up to the date mentioned at the end of the charge sheet, not only bans the African National Congress, but also including all branches, sections or committees thereof and all local, regional or subsidiary bodies forming part thereof to be unlawful organisations. It is therefore obvious that as this Youth League was a subsidiary body of the African National Congress that was also banned.

There is evidence before the court that all the accused attended a meeting in Grahamstown during February, 1961; that they were members of the African National Congress or that they were connected with the Youth League of the African National Congress. There is evidence by the State that all the accused were members of the African National Congress at the time. The first witness Zisi Njikelana told the court how he and others went to Grahamstown where a meeting was held, a meeting in the interests of the African National Congress. They went to Grahamstown in the car of accused no.1, and at the house of no.5 all the accused and the party that came from Port Elizabeth attended this meeting. All six the accused were there.

They first of all went to the house of no.4 and after that they went to the house of no.6 where the meeting was held. This meeting was only for members of the African National Congress or the Youth League of the African National Congress. Zisi, the first witness said that only the accused/...

accused and the party from Port Elizabeth were present.

Diliza Hewana, the other State witness, said yes they were all present but he noticed one or two others. Zizi was cross-examined at length but he maintained that this meeting was held in February, 1961, and that was during the period when this organisation was an illegal organisation. His evidence is corroborated and supported by Diliza Hewana. He was also positive that the meeting was held during February, 1961. These two witnesses describe how they first of all went to Cradock, that is accused no.1, the two witnesses and others. From Cradock they went to Grahamstown. They arrived there on the Sunday and the meeting was held that afternoon. Each one of these two witnesses positively identify all the accused as being present.

Evidently the object of this meeting was to discuss the possible dissolution of the Youth League of the African National Congress. The Port Elizabeth party was against such dissolution and the Grahamstown party, that is accused no's 2 to 6 were for the dissolution. There is evidence that these witnesses were detained during the State of Emergency and according to the evidence the State of Emergency commenced some time in April, 1960 and lasted for some time.

Some of these witnesses were detained for up to three months or longer and the evidence for the State is when they came out from detention in connection with the State of Emergency then there was trouble about the dissolution of the Youth League. According to the State witnesses the information that they had about the possible dissolution did not emanate from the headquarters of the mother body, the African National Congress in Johannesburg. There was some speculation of whether it was just talk or not. It would appear that/....

that no definite directive had been received from the headquarters of the African National Congress. That is why this meeting was held and that is why a delegate was sent to Johannesburg to ascertain what the position was. It is true that these two State witnesses, the one said he only saw accused no's 2 - 6 on this one occasion. The other State witness said he saw these accused on perhaps two occasions because he had two meetings in Grahamstown, but apparently no.1 was known to these two witnesses.

At one stage the Defence suggested in cross-examination that the evidence as to identity of the accused was rather slender. It was argued "how could these witnesses remember all six the accused after having seen them only on perhaps one or two isolated occasions more than three years ago?".

The Defence called accused no.2 and according to him this meeting was held but it was held before the banning of the African National Congress on the 8th April, 1960.

No.2 said all these people were present with the exception of no.3. But that no.3 was a member of the African National Congress and had attended a meeting, perhaps the court will refer to it later, immediately before this meeting was held in Grahamstown. The attack on the identity of the accused was eventually discontinued by the Defence and the court is satisfied that there is no question of possible error or mistake as far as the identity of the accused is concerned. When Zizi and Hwasa talk about the six accused then the court is satisfied that they mean and they are positive and able to identify these six accused before the court. In other words the court holds that there is no likelihood of a mistake as to identity.

Accused no.2 gave evidence and he said yes the meeting was held before the banning of the African National Congress.

He said yes all the accused including him, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were members of the African National Congress. According to him, he and no.4, 5, and 6 were members of the executive but no.3 was just an ordinary member.

No.2 said this meeting was held on the 27th March, 1960. If that was so then the meeting would not have been illegal because that was prior to the banning of this organisation, with its subsidiary the Youth League of the African National Congress. This Youth League is provided for in the Constitution of the African National Congress. This Constitution handed in as a document exhibit C. The Youth League or the functions of the Youth League or how it is to be created is described in section 7 sub-section (2) of the Constitution. This document was clearly admissible in terms of the Act and in view of the decision of the State vs. Matsipi, 1962 S.A.L.R.(4) 708.

No.2 gives evidence that he is certain that this meeting was held on the 27th March. He told the court that one Mini had discussed this Youth League with them in Grahamstown. No.2 said that the Youth League in Grahamstown ceased to exist in 1954. If that were so, the court cannot understand why Mini should have discussed this matter with the Grahamstown branch. If that was so there was hardly any necessity for the Port Elizabeth section to go over to Grahamstown to hold a meeting. One of the State witnesses said a Youth League still existed in Grahamstown at the time, but was not doing very well. What was the object of them having a discussion in Grahamstown about the Youth League that didn't exist there? There must have been some interest in the Youth League from some angle or other. Whether it was just perhaps policy in connection with the functioning of the African National Congress or not the court cannot say.

According/...

According to the evidence of the State witnesses then it would appear that arrangements had been made before hand for this meeting to be held in Grahamstown. This meeting was actually held. Yet no.2 comes and says no arrangements had been made whatsoever for the holding of the meeting.

There was much talk about a "new plan". No.2 said the "new plan" was not discussed. "We heard nothing about a "new plan" and we knew nothing about it, that is "we the executive of the Grahamstown branch of the African National Congress". That is also a bit strange because as the executive members one would perhaps have thought they'd know all about the "new plan". All the others seemed to know something about the "new plan".

There is one feature of no.2's evidence which, if that is accepted, then his evidence must be rejected as completely false. No.2 said "the first time I met Hewana was in the State of Emergency in 1960". Zizi he knows from the meeting on the 27th March, 1960. Then he goes on to say "I met Hewana during the State of Emergency. He was detained. I met him in gaol. I was arrested before him. I cannot remember how many days after my arrest I met him in gaol. I met him about four weeks after my arrest". If that is accepted then no.2's evidence that the meeting was held on the 27th March, 1960, is not true because the State of Emergency only commenced in April, 1960. What - if what no.2 says is true then the meeting must have been held after the State of Emergency and that could not possibly have been on the 27th March, 1960.

No.2 himself says "I was released on the 4th July, 1960". No.2 was asked how many meetings were held at Grahamstown. He was also asked *when the last meeting was held* before this meeting on the 27th March, 1960. Then he said

meetings/...

meetings are held once a fortnight and when he was pinned down about a date he said it was, the last meeting before this meeting on the 27th March, 1960, was held three or four days before. Then he goes on to give an explanation which does not make any sense at all. He says that Mini came just immediately before and that after Mini's meeting they held another meeting, an ordinary meeting at which they discussed the "Stay at Home". That can't possibly fit into his explanation of the three or four days. If what he says is true there must have been three meetings almost held within a day of each other.

No.2 was very particular about the way he gave his evidence. For instance in answer to a question he said he was in favour of the aims and objects of the African National Congress at the time he joined. Then he was questioned by what he meant "at the time". He immediately said he never said such a thing. No.2 knows English. He heard what the Interpreter said and the Interpreter advised the court that accused no.2 had used the words "at the time". Afterwards when the accused was asked whether this meeting was held in 1961 he said yes. There was consternation amongst the rest of the accused. No.2 got a fright and said immediately no he made a mistake, not 1961. The Defence has suggested that that was a trick question. I cannot see how it could be suggested that it was a trick question because the words "1961" was used for accused no.2 to hear and accused no.2 showed that he was rather particular about his evidence. He wasn't a witness that gave the court the impression that he just perhaps unwittingly agreed to every suggestion that was put to him. However, in his favour it will be accepted that he perhaps made a mistake when he said "yes, the meeting was/...

was held in 1961".

There are other features of his evidence which do not impress the court at all. In examination-in-chief there was no suggestion whatsoever that there was any possible bias or prejudice by the two State witnesses against accused no.2 or the other accused. Then he comes out in cross-examination with a possible motive why Zizi should incriminate him. He said Zizi said in Grahamstown we were of no use and he used threatening language. If that was so surely he would have advised his representative and in these circumstances the court is of the opinion that this would have been put to him.

Then he goes on further. He says Hewana was at the meeting. He did not say anything. "In detention I asked him why he had not paid our money". That was also not put to Hewana.

Accused was then cross-examined about how - he said he had this meeting and he only met Hewana in detention. Then he gave the very weak explanation by what he understood "knew". He said he only came to "knew" him during detention. But that cannot be reconciled with what he said before. He did not say that he "knew" Hewana during Detention. He gave evidence that "the first time I met Hewana was in the State of Emergency in 1960". The first time he met him not "the first time I came to know him". If he met Hewana during the State of Emergency for the first time how could it be possible that he asked him for money. "Paid him with our money" which they had advanced to no.1 to get back to Port Elizabeth.

Whether the two State witnesses Zizi and Hewana can be regarded as accomplices or not does not make much difference. This court is going to treat their evidence with

the/....

the same caution that a court is required to treat the evidence of an accomplice. And the court there follows the decision of O'Hagan J. in the case of Yasini and Others versus the State P.H.1964(1) B4. It could be argued that these witnesses are not accomplices but the court will treat the evidence as if they were accomplices. The court must then treat their evidence with caution and according to the rules laid down in the decision of Heanana's case - Revs. Heanana 1948(4) 405/6, and also according to rules laid down in the case of the State versus the Avon Bottle Store (Pty.) Ltd. and others, 1963 (2) S.A.389. Then the point to guard against especially is to remember that an accomplice is not merely a witness with a possible motive to tell lies about an innocent accused, but is such a witness peculiarly equipped by reason of his inside knowledge of the crime to convince the unwary that his lies are the truth.

It has been suggested by the Defence that a meeting actually did take place; that Zigi and Hewana were present; but that this meeting took place before the organisation was declared unlawful and that they made use of the facts of that meeting and applied it to an imaginary meeting that is during February, 1961. If that is so then of course there would have been a peculiarly successful or favourable position to try and convince an unwary person that what they say is the truth because then they are applying the facts of the first meeting when it wasn't unlawful to a so-called meeting during a period when the organisation was unlawful. That is a danger that must be guarded against. Of course, if no.2 is not telling the truth he could also make use of this information in the opposite direction. He could for instance apply the facts of this meeting that was held during the time of the banning of the organisation to a so-called meeting/...

meeting before the banning of the organisation. The court finds that there was no bias or prejudice at all on the part of the two State witnesses against the accused. Both witnesses emphatically stated that there had been no trouble between them and the accused and this was not challenged by the Defence. The court is of the opinion that the two instances mentioned by accused no.2 is something that he has taken from his imagination.

The State has argued that the evidence of no.2 corroborated and supported the evidence of the State witnesses and if no.2's evidence is accepted that he only met Hewana during the State of Emergency then the court agrees with the prosecution that no.1 or rather no.2 supported the evidence of the State. The Defence of course replied that the State supports the evidence of the Defence because the State witnesses spoke about the same meeting that no.2 mentioned, the lawful meeting held on the 27th March, 1960, but the State witnesses only at the end altered the date to February, 1961.

It has been said by the Defence that Zizi is a professional witness. The court does not know what that means. Perhaps in favour of the Defence the court should deduce from that that a professional witness is not a trustworthy witness. The only reason advanced by the Defence is that he has already given evidence on six occasions. That in itself does not make him an untrustworthy witness. It may perhaps just have the opposite effect. The State would be very foolish to call a witness that has been discredited time and time again. The court is not really concerned with what the witness said at other trials but this court has no information about what he said and nothing was ever challenged that he said something before and he says something different

now/...

now. This Zizi evidently held a fairly important position in the organisation and it thus would only be reasonable to expect that he knew quite a lot of people, and about meetings and so forth.

But Zizi's evidence does not stand alone. It is supported by Hewana. There is no suggestion that there was collusion between these two witnesses. It is common cause that they were together on this particular occasion and they testified to the same occurrence. There is one little difference in their evidence. For instance, Zizi said there were no other people present at the meeting in Grahamstown. Hewana says yes, he thought there were one or two strangers present. That these witnesses did not invent this story is supported by the evidence for the Defence that a meeting was actually held. They are not making up something that never happened. They had occasion to remember this meeting and they told the court where this meeting actually took place.

Their memory was said to be remarkable but not so remarkable after listening to the evidence of no.2. No.2 only differed from these two witnesses about who attended a meeting. He said no.3 did not attend a meeting. Zizi said no.3 attended the meeting and Hewana said yes no.3 attended a meeting. And it is significant that no.2 said that no.3 attended a meeting immediately before, a meeting where the "Stay at Home" was discussed.

As mentioned before, the evidence of accused no.2 will be rejected as false because of his contradictory statement as to when he met Hewana. In fact, if his first statement as to when he met Hewana is accepted then the State has proved its case to the hilt. If no.2 only met Hewana during the State of Emergency then the meeting *must have been held afterwards* and afterwards would be during the period mentioned in

the/...

the charge sheet and during the period which this organisation was illegal.

The court has not heard from any of the other accused but there is evidence that they all attended this meeting. A prima facie case was made out against them and then as it was mentioned in Rex vs. Difford 1937 A.D. 370:

"It is not a question of throwing an onus on the accused but in these circumstances it would be a conclusion that the court could draw if no explanation were given". "Prima facie evidence means generally that sufficient evidence has in the eyes of the law been produced ...act upon it, or in other words, that the evidence adduced is, in the absence of rebutting evidence sufficient to prove a given fact. It has been held in Rex vs. Soheh 1937 A.D. 211 that where the Crown (that is now the State) has made out a substantially good prima facie case sufficient to call for an answer from the accused, then the fact that he calls no evidence in his defence fortifies the prima facie case to the extent of proving the case against the accused beyond all reasonable doubt, but it must be remembered that no onus is cast on the accused at common law".

But in this case the accused are not in such a favourable position for section 12 of Act no. 44/1950 raises a presumption against them and they have done nothing about rebutting the presumption with the exception of the evidence of no. 2. No. 2's evidence is rejected. So there is no evidence before the court now in favour of any of the accused.

This danger of accepting the evidence of Zasi and Hewana is reduced because they are found to be straight-forward, satisfactory and credible. The danger is also reduced by the fact that the evidence of no. 2 is rejected as false. The danger is also reduced by the evidence of accused no. 2 which actually supports the case for the State, as to when he met Hewana first. The danger is also reduced by the other accused *not giving any explanation.* The danger is reduced because the evidence of the accomplices

does/...

does not stand alone or the so-called accomplice. That is confirmed by the evidence of another so-called accomplice, and that can happen, that is accepted in the courts of this country. Not only that but the evidence of these two so-called accomplices is supported by accused no.2 in a very material respect.

There is evidence before the court that all the accused were members of the African National Congress at the time and it is accepted now that it has been proved that this meeting was held during February, 1961. So we have definite evidence that they were members but their presumption in favour of the State contained in section 12(1) also strengthens the case for the State. "For if it has been proved that he attended a meeting of that organisation, then he shall be presumed until the contrary has been proved to be or to have been a member (or active supporter".)

It is then found that all the accused were members of the African National Congress when they attended this meeting in February, 1961, and all the accused are found GUILTY AS CHARGED.

-----oOo-----

NO PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS IN RESPECT OF ALL THE ACCUSED.

MR. HUISAMEN ADDRESSES THE COURT IN MITIGATION.

-----oOo-----

S E N T E N C E.

BY THE COURT.

All the accused are adult Bantu males. No previous convictions have been proved against them. They will thus be treated as first offenders. According to the law they have committed a serious offence, which carries a minimum penalty/...

penalty of one years' imprisonment and a maximum of ten years' imprisonment. By prescribing such high penalties the Legislature intended the court to take a serious view of these contraventions and it is the duties of the courts to take that view.

The accused now have dependants, small children, perhaps wives, perhaps old parents that they have to look after but they cannot hide behind their responsibilities today. The time to remember the responsibilities is the time when they are tempted to contravene the law. It is never the intention of the courts to punish innocent dependants or people that have nothing to do with the commission of the offence. The court can only deal with the convicted accused and to reach an appropriate sentence is to consider how this sentence will affect him personally.

All the accused were members of this African National Congress. The court has no doubt whatsoever that they knew this was an illegal organisation that had been banned. The duty of every citizen of this country is to obey the laws of the land. For instance they did not succumb to sudden temptation, they must have done what they did with their eyes open and in the full knowledge that they are treading now on very dangerous ground. They consciously intended to do what they did and they must stand the consequences of their actions. It is a bit difficult to ascertain precisely what position each of the accused held in this organisation. From the evidence before the court this organisation seemed to be filled with top officials only. Each one is either a president, or a vice-president or an executive or a treasurer or something like that. In these cases it is perhaps extraordinary to come across an ordinary member. It is said that no.3 was an ordinary member. It is doubtful whether he was. The court is of the opinion

So this organisation was like the army composed entirely of field-m Marshals. The court is of the opinion that no distinction should be made in the sentences imposed upon all of the six accused. They will be treated leniently but let that be a warning to them that if they ever contravene this law again then they will be treated very severely, because this is an unlawful organisation which makes it impossible for anybody in this country to be free.


Each of the accused is sentenced to imprisonment for

EIGHTEEN MONTHS.

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of the original evidence recorded by mechanical means in the case of :

THE STATE VERSUS: 1. Abner Sivundla.
2. Stanley Kaba.
3. Jackson Ndinda.
4. Nickel Njekula.
5. Elias Solomon.
6. Vusa Nkosinkula.

(sgd.) 
Transcriber.

Received on:

Completed on:

-----oOo-----

OORSKRYFSTER SE SERTIFIKAAT.

Ek, die ondergetekende, sertifiseer hiermee dat die voorafgaande 'n ware oorkonde is van die oorspronklike getuienis wat deur middel van 'n meganiese opvangstelsel afgeneem is in die saak van :

DIE STAAT TEEN:

(get.) _____
Oorskryfster.

Ontvang op:

Voltooi op:

-----oOo-----

Collection Number: AD1901

**SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS, Security trials Court
Records 1958-1978**

PUBLISHER:

Publisher: - Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand

Location: - Johannesburg

©2012

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 the collection records 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 is part of a private collection deposited with Historical Papers at The University of the Witwatersrand.