

IN DIE HOOGGEREGSHOF VAN SUID-AFRIKA

(TRANSVAALSE PROVINSIALE AFDELING)

I 1.5 Vol. 36 Pg. 1621 - 1686

SAAKNOMMER: CC 482/85

DELMAS

1986-02-27

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. JACOB:

ADV. P. FICK

ADV. W. HANEKOM

36

NAMENS DIE VERDEDIGING:

ADV. A. CHASKALSON

ADV. G. BIZOS

ADV. K. TIP

ADV. Z.M. YACOOB

ADV. G.J. MARCUS

TOLK:

MNR. B.S.N. SKOSANA

KLAGTE:

(SIEN AKTE VAN BESKULDIGING)

PLEIT:

AL DIE BESKULDIGDES: ONSKULDIG

KONTRAKTEURS:

LUBBE OPNAMES

VOLUME 36

(Bladsye 1621 - 1686)

COURT RESUMES ON 27 FEBRUARY 1986.

LORD ELDORADO RIGHTEOUSNESS McCAMEL: d.s.s. (Through Interpreter)

COURT: Mr Chaskalson could we just place on record which accused is not here?

MR CHASKALSON: Only accused no. 17, Sam Matlole.

COURT: Thank you.

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR CHASKALSON: Father McCamel

I would like to go back to the meeting on 9 October 1983. That was the meeting at which the Vaal Civic Association was established. Now I want to talk to you about accused no. 5, (10) Mr Malindi. Mr Malindi has been on the platform at a number of meetings, he accepts that, particularly commemoration meetings. But he says that at the meeting of 9 October he in fact arrived late at the meeting. He says that when he arrived the hall was full and he in fact did not go up onto the platform at that meeting. Could that be correct? -- I would not remember what time he arrived at this meeting but all I remember is that he was present at this meeting.

I think, he does not deny that he was present. It is just a question as to whether he was on the platform at the meet-(20) ing or not? -- I am not certain about that.

Secondly again at this meeting the accused say that there was red and white banner outside the meeting, outside the church where the meeting was held? A poster, a red and white poster outside the church where the meeting was held? Do you remember that? -- I believe that should be the poster for the invitation for this meeting.

And they say they do not recollect posters inside the hall on that occasion? -- I remember that there were posters from, UDF posters inside the hall. (30

I see. Well I do not think there is much importance about/....

about that Father McCamel, it is just their recollection. But there is something else I want to put to you. You remember that you spoke about Mr Mathete arriving with a group who were singing and entered the hall? -- That is so.

Is it correct that there was meeting in the same hall on 27 November?

COURT: That is later the same year?

MR CHASKALSON: 27 November 1983, the following month? -- That is so.

Now the accused's recollection is that Mathete did (10) arrive at a meeting with a group singing but their recollection is that this was on 27 November and not on 9 October? -- That is possible.

Then I think that you mentioned that there was a man called Mr Phatang who spoke? -- Phatang yes.

Is he the man who owned the sound system? -- I only know this person as a local businessman and the sound system which was used this day in question that I cannot tell whether it belongs to him. Therefore I do not know to whom that belonged.

So you remember a sound system was used at that meeting (20) on 9 October but you do not know who provided it? -- That is so.

Now you also gave evidence about accused no. 3 and accused no. 16 arriving together at a meeting? -- That is so.

Yes, accused no. 3 is the Reverend Moselane, accused no. 16 is Mr Manthata, and the Reverend Moselane you told us that on that occasion the Reverend Moselane was invited to come and speak and did so briefly? -- That is so.

Now Mr Manthata and Reverend Moselane agree that they came together to a meeting, they agree that the Reverend (30) Moselane was invited to speak but they say that that happened at/.....

at the meeting on 27 November and not at the meeting on 9 October. I am sorry I have got it the wrong way around. They say that that happened at the meeting of 9 October and not at the meeting of 27 November. -- If my memory serves me well I remember it to have been on 27 November.

Yes I do not think there is any importance about that, it is just their recollection that it was on the October meeting and not the November meeting and your recollection is different? Now then you also told us about the singing of freedom songs and that you said that these songs were usually sung at (10) meetings? -- That is so.

Now I would just like to go back a little bit in time. We have been talking about events which occurred in 1983. Can you go back to the year 1978, and I think that was an occasion when there was a big funeral in the area of a man called Mr Matsebane? -- Yes I remember.

And I think you were at that funeral? -- Yes.

And as usual freedom songs were sung at that funeral? -- Yes that is so.

And over the years, going back in time for some years (20) before 1978 there had been commemoration meetings in the area to deal with the commemorate the death of Mr Steven Biko, to commemorate the events at Sharpeville, to commemorate the events of 16 June and the like? -- That is so.

And freedom songs had been sung at these meetings? -- That is so.

And freedom songs were sung at student meetings? -- Yes.

COURT: At school meetings? -- Youth meetings.

Not at school? -- No that I do not know that they were sung at school. (30)

MR CHASKALSON: In other words the singing of freedom songs, at/.....

at what you have described as these sort of meetings, have been going on for many years before the Vaal Civic Association was established? -- That is so.

It was something which everybody knew about? -- Yes.

It came as no surprise when they were sung at the VCA meetings? -- No.

And that was why you said that these were the songs which are usually sung at meetings? -- Yes.

You also gave evidence about a mass meeting in February of 1984, I think it was the fifth meeting, the fifth mass (10) meeting?

COURT: Could you just tell us where it was held, that would make it easier.

MR CHASKALSON: Well perhaps I should find out myself.

COURT: Small Farms.

MR CHASKALSON: I am sorry My Lord, I should have known that. Small Farms, the meeting at Small Farms in February 1984? -- Yes.

Did you say that Mr Sam Matlole spoke at that meeting?

COURT: Number? (20)

MR CHASKALSON: He is not in court today, he is accused no. 17.

COURT: No. 17, yes for record purposes we must give the numbers.

MR CHASKALSON: I beg Your Lordship's pardon. -- Yes I did.

Now Mr Matlole was, he was a member of the Zone 7 committee? -- That is so.

And he did attend these meetings and take part in the VCA affairs? -- Yes.

I want to ask you whether you remember a certain Mr (30) Mthombi having spoken at that meeting in February of 1984

at/.....

at Small Farms? -- No I cannot remember that person.

Unfortunately Mr Matlole is in hospital at the moment and I do not think it is a matter of any importance but I, our understanding is that Mr Matlole may have acted as interpreter for Mr Mthombi and not actually to have spoken himself at that meeting. -- I beg your pardon is it Mthombi or Mthombeni?

Modise Mthombeni. I am sorry I had the wrong name.

-- I remember Mr Matlole having made a speech there and I remember well that he is the person who opened that particular meeting. (10)

Well as I say I do not think it is of much importance but I am just mentioning it and unfortunately Mr Matlole is not here today for us to speak to. Now you also mentioned the womens meeting? And you mentioned that the women had affiliated to the, that the womens organisation was going to be known as VOW? -- That is so.

That there had been speakers from FEDSAW.

COURT: A, a speaker.

MR CHASKALSON: A speaker from FEDSAW? -- That is so.

And you also, I think, said that VOW was going to (20) affiliate to the UDF through FEDSAW?

COURT: I understood the witness to say that because VOW as you call it now, it was called Vaal Organisation of Women by the witness, was a supporting organisation of the VCA, it was thereby affiliated to UDF.

MR CHASKALSON: Oh. Our understanding, we may have got it wrong, our understand was that he had said that it was because it was supporting FEDSAW it was going to the UDF.

COURT: Could you just clarify it with the witness.

MR CHASKALSON: Yes. Well perhaps I can put something (30) differently to you, that, what I really wanted to put to you was/.....

was simply this that VOW did affiliate to the UDF? -- My evidence was VOW was going to be an affiliate of UDF through VCA.

Yes. Now I understand that what in fact happened was that VOW affiliated directly to the UDF? -- I will not have any knowledge of that because I was with them at the time of the choosing of the VOW. Otherwise thereafter I was not.

I think I should tell you that I have had a note from one of the accused to the effect that in fact, it is accused no. 9 who says that he, that is Mr Ramagula, that he says that (10) he also recollects Mr Matlole, accused no. 17, both speaking at the Small Farms meeting and interpreting at the Small Farms meeting. Now I think that you told us that you have spoken on more than one occasion about somebody called Edith Lethlake? -- That is so.

How old a person is she? -- I cannot say with certainty what her age is but on estimating I would say she is in the thirties.

Was she a contemporary, of about the same age as Mr Esau Raditsela? -- Even maybe younger than him, I do not (20) know.

And were they good friends? -- From what I know yes.

You also spoke to us about the, or also told us about the production of pamphlets by the VCA? -- Yes.

Now is it correct that the VCA had very little money? -- That is true.

And it in fact operated on a shoe string? -- That is so.

The churches gave the halls free? -- Yes.

The people who held meetings and tried to find, recruit members, gave their services free? -- That is so. (30)

The only expense it had was when it got pamphlets printed?

-- I/.....

-- I have a knowledge about that that UDF was giving assistance pertaining to pamphlets.

COURT: That means, did UDF pay for the pamphlets? -- Yes I do not know of the VCA paying for pamphlets.

MR CHASKALSON: Yes, now I was going to come to that. Is it correct that the UDF arranged for MARS to do the printing?

-- That is so.

And do you know whether there were any other printers or was it only MARS that you know of? -- I know only about the MARS. (10)

Do you know exactly what the arrangements were between the UDF and MARS in relation to the printing accounts? -- No I do not know that.

Do you know that MARS in fact rendered accounts to the Vaal Civic Association? -- No I do not know about that, I have never seen it.

Well I want to put it to you that in fact MARS did render accounts but that we have no knowledge of those accounts ever having been paid. -- Well I understand that.

COURT: Could I just get clarity. Was there at any stage (20) by the committee of the VCA obtained a quotation for printing? Did you ask for quotations? -- I do not know about that and if that happened then it may have happened when I was not there.

We talk now only about those meetings were you attended. Was there any discussion as to what it would cost, what the cost would be of the pamphlets? -- I cannot remember that one.

What was the idea, who would pay for it? -- As far as I know what was happening is that UDF was going to assist about the pamphlets and as I have already said that we had to (30) choose people who were to go to MARS in order to be trained

about/.....



about printing.

MR CHASKALSON: Now Father McCamel you told us yesterday about the loss of your job? -- That is so.

You are a married person? -- Yes.

Do you have children? -- Yes I do.

And you told us that you have a large congregation? -- Yes.

Is it a poor congregation? -- That is so.

And did you depend upon your salary as a school teacher for your, was it a matter of importance to you to get a (10) salary as a school teacher to keep yourself and your family going? -- That is so.

So the loss of your job as a school teacher must have come as a considerable blow to you? -- That is so.

I think that according to the report that you mentioned that no reason was ever given to you for your dismissal? -- That is so.

COURT: Did you enquire? -- Yes I did.

MR CHASKALSON: And no reasons were given? -- No no reasons were given. (20)

And you were dismissed immediately, it was a summary dismissal? -- Yes.

COURT:

Did you take it to court? -- We did have a discussion about this with my attorneys and we ended up leaving it like that.

MR CHASKALSON: In your own mind did you think that your dismissal was the result of having been the Chairman of the Vaal Civic Association? -- That is so.

And I think you told us yesterday that this was one of the main reasons for your dropping out of the affairs of the Vaal Civic Association after February 1984? -- Yes that (30). was one of the reasons.

From/.....

From then onwards you were looking for another job? --  
Yes.

And you did not want the same thing to happen to you again? Is that correct? -- I was looking for another job because it was necessary for me to find another job.

I understand that Father McCamel. In any event after February of 1984 I think you told us you do not really know during that period February 1984 to August 1984 exactly what happened in the VCA? -- Yes because I was not present.

And you do not know what, if anything, was done by the (10) VCA between February of 1984 and the rent protests in about August-September of 1984? -- That is so.

Now if I could just go back again to the time when you were, the time before February of 1984 when you were working as Chairman, when you were carrying out your duties as Chairman of the VCA.

COURT: Could I just get clarity. You were no longer active but you did not resign as Chairman? -- That is so.

But why did you not resign as Chairman? -- The reason is that it is because I notified the committee that I am having (20) some commitments as a result of which then I cannot attend. They understood my problem, which is they accepted it.

MR CHASKALSON: Now in, at the time when you were carrying out your duties as Chairman actively you, there was a campaign which you have referred to as the "Million Signature Campaign"? -- That is so.

Perhaps we should just get quite clear what that campaign is about. Could you please look at EXHIBIT, or could you have put in front of you EXHIBIT AL(34). Do you have that document in front of you now Father McCamel? -- Yes I do. (30)

It is headed "One Million Signature Campaign"? -- Yes.

At/.....

At the top on the left there is the UDF emblem? -- Yes.

And on the right there is a hand holding a pen? -- Yes.

And then there is a statement and below that there is a place for signatures? -- Yes.

The statement is as follows: "We the freedom loving South Africans declare for the whole world to know that we reject apartheid, we support the struggle and unity of our people against the evils of apartheid, we stand for the creation of a non-racial democratic South Africa free of oppression, economic exploitation and racism." Did you (10) agree with all that yourself? -- That is so.

"We say no to the new Constitution because it will further entrench apartheid and White domination, no to the Koornhof laws which will deprive more and more African people of their birthright." Is that the right to vote in the land in which they were born or a right to have a say in the land in which they were born? -- That is so.

Then it goes on to say "Yes to the United Democratic Front, UDF, and give it our full support in its efforts to unite our people in their fight against the Constitution (20) and Koornhof Bills." -- Yes that is so.

Did you agree with all that? -- Yes I did.

And then there is a place for people to put in their name and address and their signature? -- Yes.

Was the intention, as you understood it, to try and collect a million signatures to submit this petition to the government to try to persuade it, well let us deal with it in stages. Was it your intention, was it the intention to try and get as many signatures as possible to this declaration? -- That is so. (3)

And what was, with what intention were those signatures being/.....

being collected? -- To show support which the UDF gets from the people.

Right. Now I would like to take you now forward in time Father McCamel to 1 September when Mr Esau Raditsela ...

COURT: Which year?

MR CHASKALSON: 1 September 1984 when Mr Esau Raditsela visited you at your house. -- Yes.

Now as I understand your evidence this was a Saturday was it? -- That is so.

And there was to be a meeting to be held the following(10) day, on 2 September? -- That is so.

Where was that meeting to be held? -- At the Roman Catholic Church, Small Farms.

And Mr Raditsela wanted you to take part in that meeting? -- That is so.

And you were not keen to do that? -- That is so.

You told us how you had lost your job and certain of the differences which you had had with Mr Raditsela and would it be correct that at that stage you also had the complaint that the meeting had been called without reference to you? -- (20) Yes.

And you were not anxious in those circumstances to go to the meeting? -- That is so.

And you also mentioned to Mr Esau Raditsela that you thought that the march could lead to a confrontation with the police? -- That is so.

And as I understand your evidence his response to that was that the march would be a peaceful march and that no problems would arise? -- That is so.

COURT: Did you believe that then? -- No we did not agree (30) on that.

MR CHASKALSON:/.....

MR CHASKALSON: You thought that there might be some confrontation with the police? -- That is so.

But you did not think that there was any intention on the part of the people taking part in the march that they would not act peacefully? -- At the time when this was discussed between me and Esau what occurred in my mind was in most cases you find people walking peacefully or like for instance when they are attending a funeral, only to find that when they meet with the police the police are the people who are going to provoke the people and therefore a confrontation. (10)

But as far, so your understanding of it was that the risk in the march was that there might come a confrontation arising out of the, the problems might arise out of a confrontation between the police and the marchers? -- That is so.

If the police did not confront the marchers and allowed them to go on then nothing would happen? -- That is so.

Now you also told us that during this discussion you ...

COURT: Are you leaving this subject?

MR CHASKALSON: I am dealing with the subject My Lord. You told us that during this discussion you enquired if you had, (20) of Raditsela if he had asked the Councillors to be at Houtkop? -- That is so.

And he dismissed this with the word "habaashle" (?). -- If they do not go there.

COURT: Then what? -- He had just told me in the discussion that they were notified to be there, that is the Councillors, and if they were not there then "habaashle" is the word.

MR CHASKALSON: Now did you understand that to be an expression of utter contempt for the councillors? -- I would not say a contempt. I may be using the word referred to as contempt (30) in a different context.

Well/.....

Well let me put it differently to you. In English if one would say "let them rot" or "let them go to hell"?

COURT: Yes, what is the question?

MR CHASKALSON: Well would it convey much the same sort of thing? It is difficult in different languages but is that the sort of idea which was being contained, let them go to the nearest hell? -- Yes it corresponds.

Certainly you did not understand him to be saying that councillors were going to be killed that day? -- No.

I want to put it to you Father McCamel that if in fact (10) you had understood that you would have reacted strongly to it? -- Yes that is so.

That you would have tried to talk him out of such action and you would have tried to warn the councillors? -- That is so.

And that when Mr Raditsela left you he left you under the impression that a peaceful march had been planned? -- That is so.

And what actually happened on 3 September came as a shock and surprise to you? -- That is correct. (20)

In fact on the following day you actually went with Mr Raditsela, I think you told us, to visit Bishop Tutu? -- That is so.

And when you were asked then what had been the cause of all the trouble you attributed it to the increase in the rents and the attitude of the councillors and the way they handled the people? -- That is so.

And afterwards you went with Mr Raditsela to visit Mr Frank Chikane to talk about what could be done? -- Yes.

Now of course if you had thought that what had happened (30) that day, the killings and everything had been planned and organised/....

organised you would have had nothing more to do with Mr Raditsela? -- That is so.

And was it clear to you also from your contact with Mr Raditsela that what had happened had also come as a surprise to him? -- Yes.

Now you also mentioned to us that at that conversation with Mr Raditsela at your house on 1 September ....

COURT: I would like to ask you a couple of questions first. At the time of the discussion on this Saturday had there been riots in South Africa or not? The previous month? -- If I (10) remember well there were riots at a place called Thumahole in the Free State.

What sort of riots? -- I do not have all the facts about it but I believe it had to do with the councillors and the rents, although I am not in a position to elaborate on that.

Did the people go on the rampage against the councillors? -- That is so.

And was that because of the rents? -- Yes that is how I remember, that was one of the reasons.

How did these riots start, can you remember? Accord- (20) ing to what you had heard? -- I will not be able to quite remember everything about it as to how it started because what I know is what I read about in the newspapers.

Yes. Were councillors killed or was property damaged? -- I remember damage to property.

Now this sort of information, was this in your mind when you discussed this coming protest march with Esau Raditsela? -- That is so.

But did you mention this to Esau Raditsela? -- I remember even in this court in my evidence I said that I reminded (30) him about the incident in Sharpeville.

Which/.....

Which incident in Sharpeville? -- The incident of Sharpeville where quite a number of people were shot.

This word "habaashle", I hope I have it correct, has it a special connotation as a swear word or a derogatory word or is it merely a word which indicates some action? -- That word can be used in the context as I have already mentioned here in answer to the question by the defence that it could mean "let them go to the nearest hell".

And literally what does it mean? -- Literally it denotes death. (10)

Yes, please translate it exactly? -- If I were to put it literally, translate it into English the translation is, I quote "Let them die".

Yes, thank you.

MR CHASKALSON: Of course the incident at Sharpeville had been where the police shot the protestors? -- That is so.

Damage was not done to property at Sharpeville at all?  
-- Yes.

It was widely seen in this country and around the world as precipitate action by the police? -- That is so. (20)

Who had failed to exercise restraint in circumstances where they should have? -- That is so.

And as a result of that very many people died? -- Yes.

And your fear was that the police might not, might once again show a lack of restraint in their dealings with protestors? -- That is so.

And that is why you mentioned Sharpeville? -- Yes, that is so.

I think on occasion of that meeting you also told us that Mr Raditsela told you that COSAS had organised and would have their people there? -- Yes. (30)

The/.....



The, you also told us that the scholars had been asked not to go to school that day? -- That is so.

Would COSAS have any role to play on that day in persuading scholars not to go to school? -- From what I understood which was being said there is that COSAS, because it is a movement or an organisation having to do with students has already notified the scholars not to go to school.

And they had organised that had they? -- Yes.

And it was expected that having organised that that all the scholars would be there? -- Yes. (10)

Now I would also like now to go forward in time to the visit to you on the afternoon of 3 September 1984, that is the afternoon on which, on the afternoon of the march, let me call it that way. You recollect that occasion on which you told us that accused no. 16 came to visit you, or came to you? -- Yes.

I am not clear where he found you. Was it at your home or at your church? -- The church building and my house are on the same premises.

Now during that morning Sebokeng had erupted? -- That (20) is so.

Had you by then heard that people had been killed? -- All I knew about was what had happened in the immediate vicinity of where I lived and not anything about what had happened further beyond my immediate vicinity.

COURT: Yes but had you heard that people had been killed? -- That is so.

MR CHASKALSON: And had you actually heard the news on the radio that you mentioned or had you not listened to the radio? -- That was before having listened to the radio. (30)

Did you, when accused no. 16, Mr Manthata, came to your home/.....

home had you yet heard the radio reports or did you hear from him that there had been reports on the radio? -- I heard from him that it was announced over the radio.

Was, do you remember that accused no. 16 was with a person called Mr David Masebuko?

COURT: Masebuko?

MR CHASKALSON: Masebuko. -- I did say in my evidence that accused no. 16 came to my place in the company of a stranger whom he introduced to me and I did not know that person.

If I mention the name David Masebuko does that refresh(10) your memory or do you just not remember the name of the person? -- The surname Masebuko rings a bell to me.

Now is it correct that accused no. 16, Mr Manthata, is a social worker employed by the South African Council of Churches? -- That is so.

He is actually a field worker, he is not a qualified social worker he is a field worker? -- That is so.

And did he tell you that he had come out to the Vaal at the request of Bishop Tutu? -- That is so.

And did he tell you that Bishop Tutu had heard about (20) the catastrophe on the radio and wanted information about what had happened? -- Yes.

In fact at that time was there, were you told or were you not told that there was a meeting of the Executive Council of the South African Council of Churches in progress and that the news had been reported to them? -- Not at that time. I did not have any knowledge of that.

Did Mr Manthata indicate to you that Bishop Tutu wanted to know whether he could be of any assistance in helping to meet the consequences of this catastrophe, could he do (30) anything to be of help to the Vaal community? -- That is so.

Accused/....

Accused no. 16 said that when he found you there you looked shocked? -- That is so.

And he too also, he accused no. 16 was also shocked? -- Yes.

You in fact were not able to give him much information other than what you knew of the events in your vicinity? -- That is so.

And did you indicate to him that there would be a need to possibly for support of families of the dead or some assistance for the families of the dead? -- Yes I did. (10)

COURT: But now did you at this stage, when you were in your church, know how many people were dead? -- No.

Now how could you then discuss support and assistance for the families of the dead? -- In my immediate vicinity where I live there were already people who were shot.

Dead? -- Yes.

MR CHASKALSON: Did Mr Manthata also tell you that the, of the radio report which had brought him there? -- I beg your pardon?

Did Mr Manthata also tell you of the fact that he had come out because of the radio, the report on the radio (20) which had been communicated to him? -- That is so.

He himself had not in fact heard the report but he had been told to go out as a result of a report which others had heard? -- Yes.

Then I think on 4 September .....

COURT: Are you going on to a different subject?

MR CHASKALSON: Yes My Lord.

COURT ADJOURNS FOR TEA. COURT RESUMES.

LORD ELDORADO RIGHTEOUSNESS McCAMEL: d.s.s. (Through Interpreter

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR CHASKALSON: Now I would (30) like now to go to the occasion, I think it was 4 September, when/.....

when you were ....

COURT: Nineteen?

MR CHASKALSON: 1984, when you were in the Reverend Frank Chikane's office. -- That is correct.

And then there was, you told us that there was a second meeting with the Reverend Frank Chikane on I think it was 7 September 1984, a few days later? -- Yes.

And do you remember that there were also some discussions concerning yourself and a meeting at your house some time between the first meeting with the Reverend Frank Chikane (10) and the second meeting with Reverend Frank Chikane? -- Yes I do.

Was that when some of the people from the Vaal Civic Association met with you to discuss the events? -- Yes.

And was the purpose of that meeting to see whether or not the, well let us go back a bit. After your dropping out of the affairs of the, no let me leave it, let me put it to you differently. I am sorry Father McCamel I will put it to you this way, that was the talk about at that stage to see whether the Vaal Civic Association could be revived to respond to (20) what had happened in the community?

COURT: Is that now was the discussion at your house with the members of the VCA about the revival of the VCA?

MR CHASKALSON: Yes. Yes about trying to get the VCA to get out into the community to do things in response to what had happened on 3 September? -- That is correct, it was a sort of a restructuring.

And was it correct that at that time you yourself were not keen to resume a high profile as chairman of the Vaal Civic Association? -- Yes at that time because of some mis-(30) understandings which were there I had in fact decided that

I/.....

I am not going to take the portfolio any more.

Right. Now then if I could go back to the first meeting in the Reverend Frank Chikane's office, that was the meeting on the afternoon of 4 September 1983. -- 1984?

1984 I am sorry. It was, I think it was immediately following your discussions at the South African Council of Churches? -- Yes.

And did I understand your evidence to be that it was again a discussion of what had happened on 3 September? -- That is so. (10)

And was the trend of the discussions about the need to keep the community together in the face of this catastrophe? -- Yes.

I think you told us that somebody pointed out the need to express sympathy to the bereaved families? -- That is so.

And I think you said somebody else had spoken about the damage which had been done to property of Indian shopkeepers? -- That is so.

And had, there was a discussion about the need to avoid divisions growing up between the Black community and the Indian shopkeepers as a result of that damage? -- That is so. (20)

And there was a need to go out and talk to the Indian shopkeepers to try and explain that this had not been intended and not to see it as an act of enmity coming from the Black community? -- That is so.

In order to try and establish good relationship to restore, make sure that there was a good relationship between the Black community and the Indian shopkeepers and that there were not racial incidents? -- Yes.

And you said also, I believe, that, you talked about the need for medical assistance to people who had been shot and/..... (30)

and injured? -- That is so.

Had there been shooting by the police on the occasion of the disturbances on 3 September? -- Yes.

And I think you told us that people were afraid to go to hospitals because if they went there they got arrested? -- Yes.

At that time was it common knowledge that lots of people had been arrested and detained by the police? -- That is so.

And did that give rise to the discussion about the need to provide some form of legal assistance to the people (10) affected? -- Yes.

Now then could I then go to the second meeting with the Reverend Frank Chikane. That I think took place, I think the date you gave us was 7 September 1984? -- Yes.

I think present at that meeting were accused no. 6, Mr Petrus Mokoena, accused no. 9 Mr Ephraim Ramagula, accused no. 17 Mr Sam Matlole and accused no. 11 Mr John Mokoena. And I think you also mentioned Mr Esau Raditsela having been present and you said that there were, were there people there from the Transvaal Indian Congress? -- That is so. (20)

Then you mentioned that there had been a disagreement between you and a Mr Sotsu? -- Yes.

And that disagreement concerned the role of the Priests Committee? -- Yes.

Now you had already told us that in that period between 4 September and 7 September there had been a meeting at your house where you had been asked to take over and become active as Chairman or to resume an active role as Chairman of the VCA and you had refused to do so? -- Yes.

And was Mr Sotsu's complaint that they had really got (30) the Vaal Civic Association going and you who had been the Chairman/.....

Chairman were no longer prepared to be active in it and you were going off now on the Priests Committee on your own?

-- His complaint was he could not understand or associate the priests, the part they play in the whole thing.

Yes but what he was saying was that you, instead of being Chairman of the Vaal Civic Association and playing a role through the Vaal Civic Association had chosen to play your role through the priests. In other words his complaint was that you were being active through the Priests Committee and not through the Vaal Civic Association? -- That is so. (10)

COURT: Could I just ask a question on Sotsu. Was this Mr Sotsu one of the persons who started the VCA? -- I came to know about his existence long after the VCA was started.

Now how did he get into it? -- He got into it as a member of Bhoiphotong committee, which is in Vanderbijlpark.

Yes thank you.

MR CHASKALSON: Was his complaint that you had all been in the VCA together and that you were now going off on your own to work through the Priests Committee? -- His complaint, as explained by me, was that there is a certain period during (20) which I was not attending VCA meetings, especially with reference during the time of the organisation for the march and then as a result of what happened because of the march I am now appearing with a group or an organisation of the priests, people who did not show up prior to that.

And accused no. 6 intervened to try to defuse the situation? -- That is so.

And he said that the VCA should try to get its own house in order and that there should be further discussions? -- That is so. (30)

Now I would like to turn to the funeral of the young man/.....

man Sithole which took place in September of 1984. You recollect you gave evidence about that yesterday? -- Yes I do.

Now there were, I understand, a number of speakers at that funeral? -- Yes.

Do you recollect how many people spoke or can you not now recollect how many people spoke? -- No I cannot remember.

But you do know that there were a number of speakers? -- That is so.

And one of the speakers was in fact accused no. 1, Mr Baleka? -- Yes. (10)

He, Mr Baleka does not come from the Vaal Triangle? -- I am not sure of that.

He is not a person who is well known to you is he? -- No.

There was another speaker at that funeral and I do not know whether you remember him, he was a student from Turfloop, called Sepho Sebuse. He is a light complexioned man. Do you recollect a light complexioned man from Turfloop speaking at that funeral? -- No but there is something I would like to tell the Court about this funeral. On my arrival at the church, (20) that is where the service was held, it had already started. It was in the Baptist Church. It was quite apparent that some speakers have already spoken. While being inside there, not long that I had been inside, I was called out by Colonel Viljoen. He was calling me to come and tell me that I must talk to the people gathering in this church not to sing freedom songs but ordinary hymns because otherwise if they continue like this from there on there is going to be some problems. What I am driving at is during the time when I was outside the church building there were speeches which were (30) being made in my absence. That is what I wanted to explain.

Now/.....



Now the accused agree that you in fact came late to the funeral and that it had started without you and that you actually, they also agree that you spoke to Mr Mokoena, who is accused no. 6, and asked him to stop the speech being made by a man which had become, as you put it, you put it emotional. I will accept that. -- Yes.

I am not sure whether those are your words that I put to you but you put it that you felt that he should not go on because it was not appropriate for him to go on in the vein in which he was going on? -- That is so.

COURT: I want to ask something about this funeral. The Colonel clearly disapproved of the way in which this funeral was being conducted? -- That is so.

It seems to me his objection was against the singing of the freedom songs? -- Yes he disagreed with the freedom songs and political speeches.

Now at an ordinary funeral in normal circumstances are freedom songs sung? -- No.

And are political speeches made? -- No.

Now was his complaint justified that this was more a (20) political rally than a funeral? -- Yes.

Now is this often done that funerals become political rallies or was this an exception? -- It is often done, especially when the dead person died in the circumstances where politics are involved.

Now do the bereaved, the family, then organise the funeral and arrange for the political speeches and for the freedom songs to be sung or is this a spontaneous occurrence? -- It is a spontaneous thing My Lord, it is not that it is being arranged by the bereaved family.

And the speeches, does the family not arrange who speaks and who does not speak? -- In most cases when there is a death people will go there to assist in drawing the programme. You will find that ministers of religion would go there and help in drawing the programme. At times if it concerns school (10) children the teachers would go there to assist in that respect and at times if a person was employed that person's co-workers would go there and assist in the making of the programme, or drawing the programme.

But now in a case like this one how does it come about that political speeches are made? Does the family want that? -- In most cases, especially in such funerals, there are youth who will come and assist there. While assisting go to an extent of assisting with the programme. As such then they are being included in the programme. That is how they come (20) to be in the programme. These people are referred to commonly as comrades.

Now are they then members of the family? -- No.

Do they come because they are really concerned with the dead man or do they come because they want to use the funeral for political purposes? -- I will put it in this way. These people go there because they have a feeling that this is concerning them. As I have already explained earlier that with my community, the Black people, the feeling is that what concerns me concerns the next Black man. Under those cir- (30) cumstances then people do go out of their way in helping in that/....

that fashion.

Yes, thank you.

MR CHASKALSON: Did I understand you to say that where the feeling is that the death is the result of political circumstances in this country it is on those occasions that the speeches will take a political turn? -- That is so.

And is the feeling of some of the people that they might, that it is fortuitous that a particular person had died, they might have died equally as that person had died? -- That is so. (10)

Do you know whether this young man, I think his name is Johannes Sithole, do you know whether or not he was a member of COSAS? -- I do not have a good knowledge about that.

Would it also be correct that when a person died the speeches tend to have some relationship to the life of the person and the circumstances in which the person has died? -- That is so.

For instance if a member of the football team has died it is not unusual for players to attend the funeral and to even wear the uniform of the football club and to make (20) speeches on that subject? -- That is so.

And where a person who has been politically active has died it is not unusual at the funeral to talk about his or her political activities? -- That is so.

Is it correct that funerals play a very important part in the community life, that it is taken very seriously by the community? -- That is so.

And the funerals last for a long time? -- Yes depending on the programme.

COURT: So the service, if I may call it the service, in (30) the church itself will that take an hour or will it take five

or/.....

or six hours? -- It depends solely on the programme. It can take an hour or three hours.

Now you told us that the young man had died in unfortunate circumstances. I do not want to know what those circumstances are but were the circumstances of his death such that you would have expected that funeral to deal with political issues? -- That is so.

Now finally I want to put to you what I was going to do a little bit earlier, that is that in fact the person who was interrupted and asked to stop speaking was in fact Sepho (10) Sabuse and not accused no. 1? -- That is possible.

COURT: Not no. 1?

MR CHASKALSON: That is what was put.

COURT: Possible.

MR CHASKALSON: He says that is possible. I have no further questions My Lord.

HERONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. HANEKOM : Net oor die aspek van die gesprek wat u met Esau gehad het op 1 September toe die reëlings vir die vergadering van 2 September en die mars op 3 September getref is. Wat presies was Esau se mededeling aan u aangaande (20) die organisering wat COSAS sou doen by die opmars op 3 September? -- Wat hy aan my oorgedra het was dat COSAS alreeds gereël het dat studente die betrokke dag, met verwysing na die 3de, nie skool toe moet gaan nie.

Was dit die enigste reëling of was daar ook 'n reëling oor hulle aandeel in die opmars die 3de self? -- Wat aan my oorgedra was deur hom was dat dit gereël was dat die kinders nie skool toe gaan die dag nie en as gevolg van die feit dat die ouers ook nie werk toe sou gaan nie, beteken dit dus dat almal teenwoordig moet wees by hierdie marsjering. (30)

Dan die ander aspek, die besoek wat u van beskuldigde

nr. 16 ontvang het op 3 September 1984. Hy het gesê hy is gestuur deur biskop Tutu om te kom verleen wat se hulp verleen kan word aan die beseerdes of die familie ... (Mr Chaskalson intervenes)

MR CHASKALSON : I think the witness's evidence was to see what help he could give. He had subsequent discussions, but I think he said that his mission was in regard to what help the Council of Churches could give in the circumstances.

COURT : Is that not what is put? Dit is tog wat u sê, watter hulp verleen kan word? (10)

MNR. HANEKOM : Dit is wat ek gestel het - aan die beseerdes of die familie en naasbestandes van die slagoffers? -- In die eerste plek was hy daar gewees met die oog daarop om uit te vind "to get first-hand information" oor wat gebeur in die Vaal.

U het getuig van 'n raadslid Liphoko wat in dieselfde straat as u gewoon het? -- Ja, dit is so.

U het gesien dat daar mense op pad was na sy huis toe, die oggend van die 3de? -- Ja.

Het u ook vir beskuldigde nr. 16 ingelig oor wat u (20) waargeneem het gebeur by raadslid Liphoko se huis die dag? -- Soos ek alreeds vroeër in my getuienis gesê het, dat ek het hom ingelig oor wat ek van bewus was, wat plaasgevind het in die onmiddellike omgewing van my woning. Dit sluit in dus dat ek hom ingelig het van die persone wat ek gesien het in die koers van Liphoko se woning gaan.

Het beskuldigde nr. 16 u verder uitgevra oor wat gebeur het by Liphoko, of u enige inligting daarvoor kon gee of nie? -- Daar was nie veel wat ek aan die beskuldigde op daardie stadium kon oorgedra het nie, omrede dat ekself op daardie (30) stadium nog nie by Liphoko se woning was nie.

Op enige stadium na 3 September, waar u teenwoordig was en bespreek is wat se hulp verleen kon word aan die slagoffers of die familie van slagoffers of beseerdes in die Vaal Driehoek is daar by enigeen van daardie geleenthede gepraat oor hulp wat verleen kan word aan die naasbestaandes van raadslede wat vermoor is? -- Nee.

Is die kwessie van die skade wat aangerig is aan die eiendom van raadslede ooit bespreek? -- Nee.

HOF : Waarom nie? -- Destyds het ons te doene gehad met die probleme van die gemeenskap. Op daardie stadium was die (10) naasbestaandes van die raadslede aan die ander kant gewees, dit wil sê was nie deel van die gemeenskap aan wie ons hulp moes verleen het nie. Dit beteken dus dat daar ander persone was wat in hulle belange opgetree het.

MNR. HANEKOM : Wat bedoel u daarmee deur te sê die raadslede was aan die ander kant? -- Ek dink dit was duidelik gewees in my getuienis toe ek gesê het dat hierdie probleme wat bestaan het, het bestaan as gevolg van die raadslede en die veroorsaak van dood was ook daarby ingesluit, want het hulle, die raadslede, na die gemeenskap geluister, wat die gemeen-(20) skap se klagtes was met betrekking tot sekere gevalle, sou hierdie probleme wat later ontstaan het, nie daar gewees het nie. Dit sou vir my baie moeilik gewees het om na die gemeente te gaan en geld vanaf hulle in te vorder en na dit, die geld gaan oorhandig aan die naasbestaandes van die oorledenes.

HOF : Was julle houding dan dat die raadslede hulle verdiende loën gekry het? -- Nee, ons het hulle ook jammer gekry oor hierdie wat plaasgevind het.

MNR. HANEKOM : Die ander aspek is, die vergadering wat u sê by u huis gehou was tussen die twee besoeke aan eerwaarde (30) Frank Chikane se kantoor. U het gesê dit was lede van die VCA

wat daar met u samesprekings gevoer het? -- Ja, dit is so.

Wie was almal teenwoordig by hierdie samespreking? -- Ek sal nie almal kan onthou nie, maar ek onthou dat mnr. Bavumile Vilakazi teenwoordig was.

HOF : Laat hy opstaan. Beskuldigde nr. 10. -- En van die lede van Vanderbijlpark afkomstig en nog van die lede wat in Sebokeng woonagtig was, maar ek kan nie presies onthou wie almal teenwoordig was, hulle name nie.

MNR. HANEKOM : Behalwe dat u nie kan onthou wie almal was nie, het u of kan u name van ander lede gee wat u wel kan (10) onthou? -- Ek het die een getel wat ek onthou. Ek het die een getel wat ek nou net genoem het. Ek praat nie "with certainty" nie. As my geheue my nie in die steek laat nie, was een van hulle Sotsu, Mbongo van Vanderbijlpark. Dit is al mense wat ek kan onthou.

HOF : U het gepraat van 'n herstrukturering, "restructuring", van die VCA wat by die geleentheid bespreek is, in watter opsig moes dit herstruktureer word? Moes daar 'n nuwe komitee kom of moes daar 'n ander organisasie kom met ander takke of iets van die aard? -- Ons het gepraat van dieselfde organisasie (20) wat bestaan het vroeër, dat dit herorganiseer moet word, maar dat ons nog iets by sal nodig kry weens die feit dat daar alreeds moeilikhede was om sekere dinge mee te kan handel, met die gevolg dat dit toe ook bespreek was in die sin "co-opting of other members" om 'n aanvulling te maak vir ander lede.

MNR. HANEKOM : Dan het u getuig dat u daar te kenne gegee het u wil nie weer 'n hoër posisie in die organisasie beklee nie as gevolg van sekere "misunderstandings". -- Dit was my gevoel gewees, ja.

Wat se misverstande verwys u na? -- Byvoorbeeld, die (30) moeilikheid wat ek na verwys het van die argument wat bestaan

het in die kantoor van eerwaarde Frank Chikane te Braamfontein. Dit was na aanleiding daarvan dat ek besluit het dat dit nie die enigste rede is waaroor ek beskuldig word nie. Miskien is daar 'n gevoel tussen hierdie mense dat hulle nou iemand anders wil kies. Hulle het nog nie al hulle redes aan my genoem vir hulle ontevredenheid nie, met die gevolg wou ek nie gehad het dat ek hulle vordering in die wiele ry of in hulle pad staan nie.

U sê hulle het nie al die redes vir hulle ontevredenheid aan u genoem nie. Watter het hulle wel genoem? (10)

HOF : Wil u nou weer hoor oor die kwessie dat hy op die priesterskomitee was?

MNR. HANEKOM : Nee, die getuie het getuig dat afgesien hiervan was daar ook ander redes. Hulle het nie al die redes genoem nie.

HOF : Nee, hy het gesê het hulle nog ander redes, wat hulle nie almal genoem het nie.

MNR. HANEKOM : Ek sal dan die vraag anders formuleer. Het hulle ander redes aan u verstrekk behalwe die van u rol op die komitee van predikante? -- Nee, ek het gesê dit was my gevoel (20) dat hierdie mense nie alles gesê het nie, daar is iets wat hulle teruggehou het as rede.

Het u hulle uitgevra daarna? -- Nee, want ons het nie verder voortgegaan met daardie gesprek nie, want ons was daar gewees om sekere dinge reg te maak.

Net een aspek wat hierdie vergadering nog betref. U getuie was dat hierdie argument wat tussen u en mnr. Sotsu ontstaan het oor u rol by die ander vereniging, was by die tweede ontmoeting met eerwaarde Chikane, op 7 September? -- Dit was bespreek gewees by die eerste aangeleentheid wat ons (30) daar was en toe ons nou die tweede keer daar was, dit was toe



op daardie stadium wat mnr. Sotsu sy sterk gevoelens daar uitgespreek het wat dit dan sterker gemaak het, dat dit bespreek moet word.

Wat die aspek betref nog, terwyl mnr. Sotsu met u in die argument daar betrokke geraak het, wat was Esau Raditsela se houding gewees? -- Hy het Sotsu se beskuldigings beaam.

En beskuldigde nr. 17, Sam Matlole? -- Hy het ook maar iets te sê gehad, al het hy nie veel gehad om te sê nie.

HOF : Was hy krities op u of het hy u ondersteun? -- Hy was krities teen my. (10)

MNR. HANEKOM : U het getuig dat hulle kritiek gemik was op die rol van die predikante se komitee. Watter rol het hulle gespeel, die komitee? -- Na die voorval van 3 September in die Vaal Driehoek, het ek op my eie besluit om met die predikante bymekaar te kom. Dit is al die predikante in die omgewing van die Vaal Driehoek, dat ons kan sien wat se hulp ons kan verleen, indien enige. Die hulp wat ons sou kry van die Suid-Afrikaanse Raad van Kerke sou alleenlik gewees het as daar 'n klompie predikante bymekaar daar gekom het om daardie hulp te kom vra. Die probleem destyds was "the Vaal Triangle(20) Council of Churches was inactive." Dit is juis die rede dat ons nou besluit het om weer bymekaar te kom om dan die SACC te nader om te kan sien wat ons kan doen vir die gemeenskap.

Nou net om hierdie punt duidelik te kry. Was Sotsu en die ander mense wat met u in die argument betrokke was se kritiek gewees op die rol wat hierdie groep predikante gespeel het of was hulle ontevrede met die feit dat u in hierdie komitee gedien het? -- Soos ek alreeds verduidelik het, wat sterk uitgespreek was deur Sotsu was die bestaan van die organisasie van die predikante wat dan doen wat hulle besig was om te (30) doen destyds. Hy wou dit nie gehad het nie.

HCF : Nou waarom nie? -- Soos ek alreeds vroeër gesê het "You, the priest, had not been involved in what resulted to the emerging of the march, but now you are in the forefront."

Maar is wat beskou is - is wat gebeur het na die opmars, dit wil sê die hele ongelukkige gebeure daarna, is dit dan beskou deur die mense as 'n oorwinning? -- Nee, dit is nie so nie.

Dit lyk vir my, asof, wat u vir my vertel, hulle leiersposisie deur die predikante bedreig is, soos dit aan u gestel is? Terwyl wat u vir my sê is, die predikante wou net (10) liefdadigheidshulp verleen? -- Die Hof se vertolking van wat hulle gesê het, is korrek, met betrekking tot die feit dat die gevoelens daar was dat die predikante nou die posisie wil oorneem, dit wil sê hulle wil nou doen wat eintlik moes gedoen gewees het deur hulle, verwysende na Sotsu-hulle, terwyl dit nie die geval was nie, want as ek praat van die gemeenskap, praat ek van die gemeenskap as geheel.

MNR. HANEKOM : Dan laastens die aspek van die begrafnis van Sithole. Weet u wie in daardie spesifieke geval die program opgestel het? -- Nee. (20)

Weet u ook nie wie beskuldigde nr. 6 aangewys het as, wat ek genoem het, seremoniemeester nie? -- Nee.

Ek wil net duidelikheid kry. Watter predikant het die begrafnis eintlik gelei? Was dit u self of een van die ander predikante? -- Ek en nog ander predikante wat teenwoordig was.

Was u self by hierdie begrafnis betrokke by enige reëlings van die program? -- Nee.

Het u ooit die program gesien voor die begrafnis? -- Nee, ek het nie.

Het u ooit 'n program op skrif gekry van die begrafnis?(30)  
-- Daar was geen programme of afskrifte van programme wat

versprei was aan mense wat daar teenwoordig was nie. Die enigste program, indien daar een was, was die een wat die seremoniemeester by hom gehad het vir sy eie gebruik as 'n seremoniemeester.

HOF : Is dit so dat dit nie gebruiklik is om 'n program uit te deel van 'n begrafnis nie? Dit is maar net 'n lysie met die volgorde van die sprekers en die gebeure wat die seremoniemeester hou? --In die meeste gevalle van begrafnisse word daar afskrifte versprei wat gedruk is van 'n program wat opgestel was, aan die mense wat die begrafnis bywoon. Dit (10) gebeur dus partykeer by ander begrafnisse dat daar net 'n lys gehou word deur die seremoniemeester waarna hy verwys tydens die verloop van hierdie begrafnis.

MNR. HANEKOM : Wat is die gebruik waar 'n skriftelike program nie versprei word nie? Word die predikant wat die begrafnis lei ingelig oor die program of nie? -- Dit is nie nodig nie. Die rede is dat in 'n begrafnis wat gehou word daar twee gedeeltes is. Byvoorbeeld daar is hierdie afdeling van die seremoniemeester wat dan die toesprekers beheer en die singery van liedere ook beheer. Op 'n stadium sal dit dan oorgedra word (20) dat die predikant oorneem, wie dan sy eie diens sal begin deur die kerkdiensgedeelte daarvan te doen. Op daardie manier is dit dan nie belangrik vir die predikant om te weet wat sal plaasvind net voor hy aan die woord kom nie, want die seremoniemeester is die persoon in beheer daarvan.

Wat was beskuldigde nr. 6 se reaksie toe u hom versoek om die spreker te stop? -- Hy het dit so aanvaar.

... / ASSESSOR

ASSESSOR (MR KRÜGEL): Mr McCamel just a few matters please. At the last meeting in Reverend Chikane's office, I am sorry I think it was at the first meeting on the 4th, the first meeting in Mr Chikane's office on 4 September, you testified that it was left to accused no. 17 and Edith Lethlake to draft a pamphlet? -- That is so.

And that the preparation and printing of this pamphlet would be left to the UDF? -- That is so.

I believe that the pamphlet that you were referring to is the one which is before the Court as EXHIBIT AN(15)(3). (10) Yes, while the document is being put before you could I just clear up something else please. Eventually, I will leave this, I will come back to this later. You have got the pamphlet now. Would you please look at the translation. My understanding of the original pamphlet is not so good. The pamphlet has got the emblem of the UDF on the front and it then reads that "The Vaal Civic Association calls", then certain statements are made. Firstly "We have no money", that I understand to be an expression of the feeling of the people that they are poor and that they actually have no money. (20) -- Yes.

The second statement reads as follows "Destruction in the Vaal Triangle has been caused by BOERS and the COMMUNITY COUNCILS." Can you give the Court your interpretation of this statement? -- Prior to answering to that question I would like to draw the Court's attention to this pamphlet here. This is not the pamphlet I was talking about which was left over to Matlole and Edity Lethlake. That one, as I already mentioned it, bears my address right at the bottom as P.O. Box 280 Residencia. If you look at this one it does not have (30) that. So therefore it cannot be the one I am talking about.

The/.....

The one I am talking about is the one which is written "Issued by the Evaton Ratepayers Association".

Nevertheless would you agree that this pamphlet, the one in front of you now, seems to have been distributed by the UDF after the happenings of 3 September? -- After the?

The events of 3 September. -- That is so.

And while this may not be the pamphlet that Miss Lethlake and Mr Matlole had been delegated to look after I think it would still be helpful if we had your views on this statement no. 2 in the pamphlet. At least the first statement, the (10) statement in the pamphlet, "Destruction in the Vaal Triangle has been caused by BOERS and COMMUNITY COUNCILS". -- My interpretation of the statement referred to is this trouble was caused by the government and the Councillors.

Do you know who expounded this view prior to the publishing of the pamphlet? -- No.

It continues that if peoples complaints had been, I suppose attended to, people would not have been so aggressive. I think that is plain enough. "We are fighting against rent increases" and I would like your comments about that sen- (20) tence, about that statement read in conjunction with the seventh pamphlet in this volume AN(15).

COURT: AN(15) item 7.

ASSESSOR (MR KRÜGEL): Item no. 7. This pamphlet advertises a meeting on 9 September 1984 at the Small Farms Roman Catholic Church and the meat of it reads as follows: "The organisations console all those people who were injured, those who lost their property and those whose relatives lost their lives during the time when the residents and workers fought against the increases of rent, water, electricity and permits and (30) were deprived of their stands in Evaton."

MR CHASKALSON: I am sorry to interrupt but there has been a slight change in the translation of this. You will remember that it changed from "Association" to "The organisations".

ASSESSOR (MR KRÜGEL): I did read "The organisations."

MR CHASKALSON: Oh, then, I am sorry.

ASSESSOR (MR KRÜGEL): I did read in the changes that ....

MR CHASKALSON: I understand, I am sorry My Lord, I was reading the wrong one and when My Learned Friend Mr Bizos gave the pamphlet to me I thought he told me you were reading the wrong one and I must apologise for that. (10)

ASSESSOR (MR KRÜGEL): Anyway Mr McCamel this seems to imply that the method of fighting against these rent increases, water payments and electricity, permits and so forth, that the method of fighting was the method that manifested itself on 3 September? Or how do you read this pamphlet? -- That is not the way I understand it. What I understand it is that where it stands we are fighting for the rent increases that stands as it is. Now what happened on the 3rd was not that it happened because it was meant to sort of influence or correct the question of rentals. If I remember well I agreed with what (20) was put to me whether it was a spontaneous reaction.

That is quite correct, you did agree with that. But now the fact that the events of the 3rd are portrayed in this pamphlet no. 7 as a time at which workers had fought against increases in rent, "fought", the past tense is used there. -- Could I just have the opportunity of checking the translation?

Yes. -- I differ with the certain word there. In Sotho it reads as follows: (Witness reads the Sotho). That is how it reads. The difference is the translation here brings (30) forward that they fought.

Yes./.....

Yes. Where are we reading now please? What line?

-- "The residents and the workers fought against the increase of rent". What I am trying to bring to the Court's attention is the use of the word "fought". Originally in the Sotho language that word is not appropriate for the word which was used in Sotho.

COURT: What would you use? -- Maybe we can find somebody who can help us and give us an equivalent in English. I do not know, maybe the Interpreter can do that.

Yes well no doubt we will clear up this difficulty (10) later. Which words in Sotho do you say have been incorrectly interpreted? -- Baneng baitseka is one of the statements I differ with when it is being translated as "they fought", or workers fought against.

ASSESSOR (MR KRÜGEL): Yes thank you. So you say that ....  
-- That is all I am complaining about.

... you do not think that the translation is quite correct? -- Yes.

Please also have another look at the pamphlet no. 3.

COURT: It is AN item 3. (20)

ASSESSOR (MR KRÜGEL): Yes, AN(15) item 3. Almost at the bottom, yes right at the bottom we have the following request: "Let us not destroy our peoples properties who has done nothing". And that is followed by "Matla ke arona". "Power is ours" is the translation here. That statement read with a similar statement in pamphlet no. 7, that is AN(15) no. 7, which reads as follows: "The organisations appeal to the community in general to be peaceful and not to destroy other peoples properties". -- Which part of this, where do we find it on this? (30)

Mr McCamel we have referred you firstly to the very  
bottom/.....

bottom of the pamphlet no. 3, have you got that? -- Yes I have got that.

And then also to pamphlet no. 7, almost at the bottom, "The organisations appeal to the community in general to be peaceful and not to destroy other peoples properties." Have you got that? -- We have got that yes.

Well sir could you please give us your view on this statement in pamphlet no. 3 which requests people not to destroy other peoples properties who has done nothing? Can you think why the qualification has been added onto that (10) request? -- I am not in a position to advance any reason as to why this was qualified but what I can say is the two statements differ.

They differ yes. -- The other one is referring to people who had done nothing.

Yes the second statement, the one in the item 7 pamphlet, conveys, well I think you will agree it conveys another feeling to the reader than the one on pamphlet no. 3? -- That is so.

Would you like to interpret the feeling that the (20) pamphlet no. 3 conveyed to the reader on this particular point? -- My interpretation of that statement in pamphlet no. 3 is what I understand that if there are people who has done anything in this context would be anything wrong then let something be done to them and those who have not done anything wrong let there be nothing to be done to them.

Thank you Mr McCamel.

COURT: Any questions arising from those put by the Court?

MR CHASKALSON: Well I am not really qualified on the venacular and I would have to take an instruction. (30)

COURT: Yes, if there is any dispute about that later we will have/.....



have to have expert evidence.

MR CHASKALSON: In any event My Lord, as far as this witness is concerned I think that the interpretation of the, his evidence of the interpretation of the pamphlet would not be something I would have to cross-examine on, it would be something I would have to address argument to Your Lordship on.

COURT: Yes, that is for us to decide.

MR CHASKALSON: One thing I think I should mention and that is, and I do not think I need deal with it other than to place it on record that my instructions are that at that (10) meeting dealing with the restructuring of the Vaal between the two meetings with the Reverend Frank Chikane, my instructions are that accused no. 11 was present at that meeting and not accused no. 10.

COURT: Well I think it is better that it be put to this witness clearly. It is put by counsel that at the meeting, or the discussion in your house where the restructuring of the VCA was discussed accused no. 11 was present, will no. 11 stand up please, and not no. 10. Will no. 10 stand up please. Have you any comment to make? -- I remember pertinently (20) in reply to that question what I said. I said I cannot remember exactly and therefore I even used the words orally "I cannot say that with any certainty", which means I was not quite sure who was there.

Yes, thank you. Enige vrae voortvloeienduit dié wat deur dit Hof gestel is?

MNR HANEKOM: Geen vrae, dankie Edele.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

-----  
MNR. HANEKOM : Mnr. Jacobs sal nou voortgaan. Ek dink die volgende getuie sal mnr. Branders wees. (30)

... / MNR. JACOBS

MNR. JACOBS : Solank ons vir die getuie wag. Laaste toe die getuie in die getuiebank was, het ek te kenne gegee dat ek is klaar met hom. Hy is toe uitgestel vir kruisondervraging. Ek vra verlof dat ek 'n deelgetuie op hierdie stadium met die oog op die wysigings lei, dan gee dit die geheel vir My Geleerde Vriende om die kruisondervraging op te doen.

HOF : Enige beswaar?

MNR. BIZOS : Geen beswaar nie.

MNR. JACOBS VRA VIR 'N VERDAGING TEN EINDE DIE GETUIE BRANDERS IN DIE HANDE TE KRY. (10)

HCF VERDAAG.

HOF HERVAT

K103

ADOLF BRANDERS, v.o.e.

ONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. JACOBS : Mnr. Branders, ek wil met u teruggaan na 21 Februarie 1985. U het vir die Hof in u getuie- nis beskryf hoe dat daar 'n begrafnis was, dat die polisie daar naby opgestel was en dat u observasie gehou het. Ek wil kom by na die begrafnis afgehandel was by die begraafplaas en die mense wegbeweeg het. U het vir die Hof vertel dat u het die voertuie soos hulle wegbeweeg met 'n verkyker dopgehou? — Dit is korrek. (20)

Daar het toe iets gebeur. Kan ons net daar 'n aanknoping kry. Hulle gaan toe nou uit daar by die begraafplaas en u het 'n sekere motor dopgehou? — Dit is korrek.

Wat se motor was dit? — Dit was 'n wit Toyota motorvoertuig gewees.

HOF : 'n Gewone motor? 'n Sedan? — 'n Sedan, ja.

MNR. JACOBS : En u het ook vertel u het hom vir 'n spesiale rede dopgehou? — Ja, ek het hom dopgehou, aangesien ek geweet het dat 'n sekere UDF ondersteuner in die voertuig is.

Wie was dit? — Dennis Bloem, 'n Kleurlingman. Hy is (30) van Kroonstad.

... / U

U hou die motor dop en wat gebeur toe? -- Vorentoe, waar die grondpad wat van die begraafplaas af na die Swartwoonbuurt toe lei, het die voertuie tot stilstand gekom. Ek weet nie presies wat daar gebeur het nie, maar die polisie het traan-rook geskiet daar op die mense. Dit het 'n verkeersophoping veroorsaak en die mense het uit die voertuie gespring en die Swartwoonbuurt ingehardloop. Ek het hierdie wit Toyota motorvoertuig dopgehou en ek het toe gesien dat Dennis Bloem agter uitklim en ook tussen die mense in beweeg ... (Mnr. Jacobs kom tussenbei) (10)

Was daar nog iemand saam met hom? -- Die ander man het by die ander deur agter uitgeklim en agter om die voertuig beweeg en saam met Dennis Bloem gehardloop.

Wie was die ander man? -- Dit was beskuldigde nr. 20, Terror Lekota.

Wat doen hulle toe? -- Terwyl hulle hardloop het van die mense ook klippe begin gooi na die polisie en ek het gemerk dat Terror Lekota ook afbuk en 'n klip optel en gooi na die polisie. Hulle het toe ook in die skare inbeweeg en die mense het in die Swartwoonbuurt ingehardloop. (20)

Het beskuldigde nr. 20 saam met hulle in die woonbuurt ingehardloop? -- Dit is korrek.

Het die wit kar daar agtergebly? -- Hy het agtergebly met die bestuurder nog in die voertuig.

En toe? -- Dit is die laaste keer wat ek hulle toe op die toneel gesien het terwyl ons inbeweeg in die Swartwoonbuurt.

U het toe self ook inbeweeg in die Swartwoonbuurt? -- Ons het ook inbeweeg, ja.

Het u beskuldigde nr. 20 weer daarna gesien? -- Ek het baie lank daarna weer by die polisiestasie gesien toe 'n (30)  
polisieman in uniform hom daar aangebring het.

HOF : Op dieselfde dag? -- Op dieselfde dag, ja.

MNR. JACOBS : Hoe lank daarna was dit? -- Ek is nie heeltemal seker nie. Dit is plus-minus na 'n uur of twee ure. Ek weet nie.

Hoe ver van hom af was u gewees? -- Ek skat so twintig meter omtrent. Die Kleurlingman Dennis Bloem was toe steeds nog by hom gewees.

So, Bloem was saam met hom by die polisiestasie aangebring? -- Dit is korrek, ja.

HOF : Was hulle albei in hegtenis of was hulle nie in hegte-(10) nis nie? -- Ek weet nie. Op daardie stadium was ek besig met iets anders. So, ek weet nie waarvoor hulle daar aangebring was nie.

MNR. JACOBS : Het u enigiets verder van hom gesien of waargeneem of gedoen? -- Glad nie. Ek kon net sien hulle was vuil en moeg gewees. Hulle T-hemde was vol grond gewees.

Het u hom daarna weer gesien?-- Nee.

Weet u uit eie kennis uit wat het met hom gebeur by die polisiestasie nadat hy daar aangebring is? -- Ek het later verneem hulle het hom laat gaan. (20)

Nee, nie wat u verneem het nie, maar weet u uit eie kennis? -- Nee, ek het hom nie weer gesien nie.

KRUISONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. BIZOS : Mnr. Branders, ek wil u na u getuienis verwys wat u verlede keer gegee het. U kan onthou dat u van meer as een begrafnis getuienis gegee het. Van drie, die 18de, die 21ste en die 27ste? -- Dit is korrek.

HOF : Is dit alles Februarie?

MNR. BIZOS : Dit is alles Februarie 1985. U het op bladsy 143 van die oorkonde gesê dat by die begrafnis van die 18de was alles rustig. Dit is die woorde wat u gebruik het. -- (30) By die begrafnis self?

... / Nee

Nee. Ek sal die hele deel uitlees. Luister net "Hulle het toe wegbeweeg van die graf self en by die Swartwoonbuurt ingehardloop." Mnr. Jacobs het dan tussenbei gekom "Maar het nie verdere insidente plaasgevind van klipgooiery of iets van die aard nie? - Nee, op hierdie dag nie. Dit was alles rustig." -- Na die begrafnis.

Na die begrafnis was alles rustig? -- Korrek.

Daar was geen klipgooiery op die 18de nie? -- Na die begrafnis, nee. Nie waarvan ek kennis dra nie.

U is heeltemal seker daarvan?-- Ja, wat ek waargeneem (10) het.

U sê dat daar was wel klipgooiery op die 21ste, dit is die tweede begrafnis, nie waar nie? -- Ja, na die begrafnis.

En dat u beskuldigde nr. 20 daar gesien het? -- Dit is korrek.

Ons kan aanvaar as 'n lid van die veiligheidspolisie dat u nie 'n fout kon gemaak het in verband met die identiteit van beskuldigde nr. 20 nie. Dit was hy wat 'n klip gegooi het op die 21ste? -- Dit is korrek.

En beskuldigde nr. 20, is 'n persoon wat 'n taamlike (20) hoë politieke beeld het veral vir die veiligheidspolisie? -- Dit sal ek nou nie kan sê nie. Ek weet dit nie.

Vir u, in elk geval? -- Nee, ek ken hom glad nie. Ek ken hom net van sien.

Is dit op foto's wat u hom gesien het?-- Dit is korrek.

En u wil vir die Hof sê en die Hof verseker dat u heeltemal seker is dat beskuldigde nr. 20 'n klip of klippe gegooi het na die polisie op die 21ste? -- Dit is korrek.

Daar is nie miskien 'n moontlikheid dat u die 21ste met 'n ander dag verwar nie?-- Nee. (30)

U was tevrede dat op die 21ste beskuldigde nr. 20 'n daad

van openbare geweld gepleeg het, nie waar nie? -- Ja, hy het 'n klip gegooi.

En dit is onder daardie omstandighede wat u seker dadelik 'n verklaring sou gemaak het dat een van die beamptes van UDF skuldig was aan openbare geweld in Kroonstad? -- Nee, ek het nie so 'n verklaring gemaak nie.

Miskien nie, maar u was tevrede van dit wat u gesien het, dat beskuldigde nr. 20 hom skuldig gemaak het ten minste aan daardie oortreding? -- Dit is korrek.

En u het vir ons gesê dat u het hom in die geselskap (10) van u kolonel op die 21ste gesien? -- Dit is korrek.

By die polisiestasie? -- Dit is korrek.

Het u op die 21ste na die kolonel gegaan en vir hom gesê "Kolonel, hierdie man hier vandag op die 21ste het 'n klip opgetel en na ons manne gegooi". Het u dit gedoen? -- Ek het dit later gedoen by die polisiestasie, ja.

Op die 21ste? -- Ja, ons het daarvoor gepraat.

Terwyl beskuldigde nr. 20 daar was op die 21ste? -- Nee, toe hy daar was nie, eers na die tyd wat ek hom toe nie weer gesien het nie. (20)

En het u 'n verklaring gemaak op daardie selfde dag op die 21ste? -- Nee.

Wanneer het u die verklaring gemaak wat deur die Staatsadvokaat gebruik was om u getuienis te lei? -- Dit is moeilik. Ek kan dit nie onthou nie.

Min of meer hoeveel dae, weke of maande daarna? -- Soos ek sê dit is moeilik. Dit is 'n paar weke daarna.

Net 'n paar weke of maande? -- Nee, 'n paar weke skat ek.

Het u beskuldigde nr. 20 net op een keer in die polisiestasie gesien? -- Dit is korrek, net een keer. (30)

As ek dit aan u stel dat u getuienis vals is, omdat

beskuldigde nr. 20 nie op die 21ste te Kroonstad was nie, maar op die 18de toe alles rustig was, wat sal u sê?-- Ek sal dit ontken. Hy was die 21ste daar.

U is heeltemal seker van u getuienis? -- Dit is korrek.

Sal u asseblief lees wat in The Star van 19 Februarie 1985 voorgekom het? -- Moet ek die opskrif ook lees?

Asseblief. Lees wat voor u geplaas is op rekord?--

"Scores injured as funeral disrupted. Scores of moaners were injured and some were arrested yesterday when police interrupted the funeral service of unrest victim Joseph Matches, (10) 17, at the Stilfontein Cemetary near Kroonstad. Police told a group of moaners to disperse and fired rubber bullets and teargas smoke canisters into the crowd. They arrested Mr Terror Lekota, publicity secretary of the United Democratic Front, UDF and Mr Dennis Bloem, a UDF activist. Both men were later released. Mr Lekota was handed a court subpoena and told to appear in the Johannesburg Magistrate's Court on March 4 or submit an affidavit to the court before that date. The house of two policemen ..." (Mnr. Bizos kom tussenbei) (20)

Dit is genoeg, dankie. Ek dink dat die ander deel van die berig nie ter sake is nie.

HOF: Gaan u dit 'n bewysstuk maak?

MNR. BIZOS : Asseblief.

HOF : BEWYSSTUK AAQ(8).

MNR. BIZOS : Of The Star wat op die 19de geskryf het dat mnr. Lekota by die begrafnis was en dat daar geen klipgooiery was nie, is korrek of u getuienis is vals. Die Star het wel geweet voor die 21ste wat op die 21ste sou gebeur het.

MNR. JACOBS : Ek wil net op rekord plaas dat op hierdie stadium weet ons nie - hier is nou 'n datum op, die goed is (30)

nie uitgeklaar met ons voor die tyd nie. Ek weet nie of dit die 19de se Star is of nie. Die hele Star is nie hier met sy datum op nie.

HCF : Ons het hier die ou probleem dat hierdie weer 'n foto-kopie is en u kruisverhoor nou op 'n foto-kopie. Ek aanvaar dat u inligting korrek is dat dit van die 19de Februarie is, maar is dit darem nie moontlik om die oorspronklike te bring dat ons net sien ... (Mnr. Bizos kom tussenbei)

MNR. BIZOS : Ons kan dit bring as dit nodig is, maar ek wil die Hof en die getuie verseker dat dit van die 19de is. (10)  
Daar is nog 'n berig in verband met die gebeurtenis van die 21ste.

HOF : Ek aanvaar u versekering, mnr. Bizos, maar as daar nie 'n ooreenkoms is oor die gebruik van fotokopieë nie, wil ons die oorspronklike hê. U kan intussen op hierdie basis voortgaan.

MNR. BIZOS : U sien, ek wil u vra om te aanvaar dat daardie berig op die 19de in die Star gepubliseer was. As dit so is, is u getuienis vals, is dit nie? — Dit kan moontlik wees dat hulle by die eerste begrafnis ook teenwoordig was, Dennis (20) Bloem en Terror Lekota.

O, ek sien, maar dan sal dit beteken dat hy twee keer gearresteer is en twee keer by die polisiestasie was? — Baie moontlik. Ek sal nie daarvan kennis dra nie.

As ek dit aan u stel dat mnr. Lekota net een keer daar was en dit die 18de was, is u in staat, soos u daar staan, met daardie berig wat voor u geplaas is, om die stelling wat ek namens mnr. Lekota aan u maak te ontken? — Al wat ek kan sê is dat dit die 21ste was toe ek vir Terror Lekota daar gesien het by die tweede begrafnis. (30)

Laat ons in verband met die gebeurtenis op die 18de aan u

... / sekere



sekere vrae stel. Hoe ver was u van die begraafplaas af waar die begrafnis plaasgevind het? -- Dit was plus-minus 150 na 200 meter gewees.

HOF : Dit is nou die eerste begrafnis wat u van praat? Die 18de?

MNR. BIZOS : Ja, die 18de. Let me make it quite clear that the accused's evidence and ennumerable other witnesses' evidence will be that accused no. 20 was there only on the 18th.

Met u verkyker seker? -- Ja, ek het 'n verkyker gehad.

En u het as gevolg van foto's wat u van beskuldigde (10) nr. 20 vantevore gesien het hom goed geken, nie waar nie? -- Dit is korrek, ja.

As hy wel 'n toespraak op die 18de gemaak het, as hy wel 'n toespraak by die begrafnis op die 18de gemaak het, sou dit onmoontlik gewees het vir u om hom nie te sien nie? -- Dit sou moeilik gewees het. Miskien sou ek hom gesien het, maar die mense het die graf toe gestaan en ek het niemand herken daar nie.

En as hy saam met die genoemde UDF ondersteuner was, wat u op die 21ste dopgehou het, en daar gekom het op die 18de, (20) sou u hom gesien het of nie? -- Moontlik, maar ek het hom nie gesien nie.

U het hom nie gesien nie? -- Dit is reg.

As hy een van die laaste persone daar was wat grond in die graf gegooi het, sou u hom gesien het of nie? -- Ek het hom nie gesien nie.

As hy op die 18de gearresteer was min of meer op die tyd-stip waarvan u melding gemaak het, dat dit op die 21ste sou gebeur het, sou dit toevallig gewees het dat hy twee keer by dieselfde plek gearresteer was min of meer dieselfde tyd en (30) deur dieselfde kolonel ondervra was? -- Dit is moontlik. Ek

sal nie stry nie. Ek het hom nie gesien nie.

U sien, ek wil aan u stel dat Kroonstad is mnr. Lekota se dorp. Is dit nie?— Ek verstaan so.

Hy is daar welbekend. Nie as 'n UDF persoon nie, maar omdat dit sy dorp is, as die mense van Kroonstad nie beswaar maak teen die woord dorp nie. Dit is 'n bietjie groter as 'n dorp, maar hy beskou dit as sy dorp. Is dit nie so nie? — Wel, hulle ken hom seker daar.

Ja, hy is welbekend daar. — Moontlik.

En hy is welbekend deur die mense daar en hy is wel- (10)  
bekend deur die polisie, nie waar nie? — Ek sou nie sê hy is bekend deur die polisie nie. Ek weet nie wie ken hom nog nie. Ek het hom al gesien.

Dra u kennis van die feit dat sy moeder nog daar woon?  
— Ek verstaan so, ja.

En as sekretaris van UDF het hy met 'n UDF motor nie dikwels Kroonstad toe gekom om sy moeder te sien nie? — Ek dra nie daarvan kennis nie.

HOF : Weet u hoe lyk 'n UDF motor? — Ek het nog nie so iets gesien nie. (20)

MNR. BIZOS : Maar is die veiligheidspolisie nie bewus van die UDF voertuie nie? — Hoe lyk 'n UDF voertuig?

Wat die veiligheidspolisie weet wat aan die UDF behoort. Dit is nie aan u gestel daar is spesiale UDF motors nie.

HOF : U het gepraat van 'n UDF motor. Toe dag ek dit is iets soos 'n BMW of iets van die aard.

MNR. BIZOS : Nee. Dra die veiligheidspolisie nie kennis van watter voertuie aan die UDF behoort nie? — Nee.

In elk geval, beskuldigde nr. 20 sal vir Sy Edele sê dat hy geen klip gegooi het of gevat nie, hy was net daar op (30)  
die 18de en u getuienis in daardie verband heeltemal inkorrekt

is? -- Ek het hom gesien klip gooi.

Wanneer is u vir die heel eerste keer gevra om oor die gebeurtenis te praat? -- Soos ek reeds gesê het, ek is nie seker daarvoor nie.

Het u enige beswaar as mnr. Jacobs die datum van u verklaring aan die Hof gee? -- Nee, waarom sou ek?

MNR. JACOBS : 30 Mei 1985.

MNR. BIZOS : 30 Mei 1985. Dit is 'n paar dae voor die klagstaat teen die beskuldigdes ingedien is. Wie het na u toe gekom om vir u te vra om getuienis te gee of 'n verklaring (10) te maak in verband met een van die sekretarisse van die UDF 'n paar dae voor die klagstaat ingedien is? -- Dit was kaptein Venter of majoor Venter. Ek is nie seker nie.

Was dit die heel eerste keer wat u 'n verklaring gemaak het in verband met die gebeurtenis? -- Dit is korrek.

U het geen verklaring of notas gemaak kort na die gebeurtenis nie? -- In 'n ander verband, maar nie in verband met Terror Lekota nie.

In enige verslag wat u gedoen het of moontlik gedoen het na die gebeurtenis was daar geen melding van Terror Lekota (20) se naam nie? -- Ek praat nou onder korreksie. Mnr. Dennis Bloem was aangekla onder die veiligheidswet en daar kom Terror Lekota se naam ook voor dat hy in Kroonstad was.

Het u getuienis in daardie saak gegee? -- Nee.

Is mnr. Bloem aangekla? -- Hy is aangekla en die PG het geweier om te vervolg.

Wat was die klagte teen mnr. Bloem? -- Subversie.

Wat het u in daardie verklaring in verband met daardie saak in verband met Terror Lekota gesê? -- Ek kan nie onthou nie.

(30)

Toe u u verklaring gemaak het op 30 Mei 1985, was mnr. Bloem

op vrye voet of was hy in hegtenis? -- Ek dink hy was in hegtenis.

Was h aangehoudene volgens die bepalings van artikel 29 van die Veiligheidswet? -- Dit is korrek.

Hy is vrygelaat en hy is nooit aangekla nie? -- Dit is korrek.

Het die kaptein wat na u gekom het in Mei 1985 en gevra het vir h verklaring, vir mnr. Bloem ondervra? -- Nee, ek weet nie.

Waar was mnr. Bloem aangehou? -- Op Kroonstad self.

Wie was in bevel van sy saak? -- Kaptein Heystek. (10)

Is hy een van die ondersoekbeamptes in die saak sover u weet? -- Nee.

Hoe het dit gekom dat u aan kaptein Venter vir die heel eerste keer melding gemaak het daarvan dat u belangrike getuie-nis teen mnr. Terror Lekota het? -- Ons het gepraat oor die Kroonstad onluste en Dennis Bloem. Hy het gevra wie het ek nog daar gesien wat ek ken van die UDF en toe het ek gemeld Terror Lekota.

So, dit was heeltemal toevallig? -- Dit is korrek.

So, dit was heeltemal toevallig dat kaptein Venter op (20) 30 Mei Kroonstad toe gekom het en u h gesprek met hom gevoer het en dit was heeltemal toevallig dat u van Terror Lekota gepraat het? -- Hy was op Kroonstad gewees om verklarings van ander persone af te neem en dit is hoekom hy by ons kantore was.

Het kaptein Kruger nie Kroonstad toe gekom om verklarings te neem nie? -- Dit is korrek.

Was u in die ondervraging van mnr. Bloem betrokke? -- h Paar keer, ja.

Weet u daarvan dat majoor Kruger mnr. Bloem ondervra (30)

Wie was die verantwoordelike offisier in verband met die aanhouding en ondervraging van mnr. Bloem? -- Kaptein Heystek.

Sou, soos dinge nou by Kroonstad gedoen is, kaptein Kruger die reg gehad het om mnr. Bloem te ondervra in die afwesigheid van òf kaptein Heystek òf een van die mede-offisiere van kaptein Heystek? -- Ja, ek skat so. Hy kon toestemming by die landdros of ons afdelingsbevelvoerder gekry het in Welkom.

Weet u van enige poging om mnr. Bloem te oorreed om getuienis teen mnr. Lekota te kom gee? -- Nee. (10)

Ek wil aan u stel dat volgens 'n verklaring wat mnr. Bloem aan ons gemaak het, kaptein Kruger daar by Kroonstad - en ek het geen getuienis dat u teenwoordig was nie, maar dit is in Kroonstad gedoen dat kaptein Kruger probeer het om mnr. Bloem te oorreed om getuienis teen mnr. Lekota te gee. Dra u enige kennis van daardie feit? -- Nee, ek was nie die dag teenwoordig nie.

Ek wil dit verder aan u stel sodat die regte persone miskien hiernatoe kan kom dat Bloem gesê het hy het geen getuienis om teen mnr. Lekota te gee nie en hy is deur kaptein Kruger gesê dat hy, Kruger, sou 'n verklaring uitskryf en hy moet dit net teken? -- Ek dra nie kennis daarvan nie. (20)

En ek wil aan u stel dat u getuienis wat onwaar is teen mnr. Lekota, is in soortgelyke omstandighede ook onwaar? -- Nee, ek verwerp dit.

As u vir die heel eerste keer aan die einde van Mei 1985 gevra is in verband met die gebeurtenis, hoe kan u seker wees dat u mnr. Lekota nie daar op die 18de gesien het nie en nie op die 21ste nie? -- Ek onthou goed dit was die 21ste.

Wie was die oorledene wat begrawe was op die 18de? -- (30)  
Dit was Matches gewees.

Hoeveel mense was daar by sy begrafnis gewees? -- Dit is moeilik. Dit is plus-minus twee- na drie- na vierduisend mense.

Wie was die oorledene wat op die 21ste begrawe was? -- Ek is nie heeltemal seker oor sy naam nie.

Hoeveel mense was daar op die 21ste? -- Plus-minus dieselfde aantal mense.

Wie was die oorledene wat op die 27ste begrawe was? -- Dit was 'n sekere Swartseun met die van Wolf.

En hoeveel mense was daar? -- Plus-minus weer dieselfde(10) aantal.

Toe beskuldigde nr. 20 by die polisiestasie was - ek stel dit aan u dit was op die 18de, u sê dit was op die 21ste - waar het u hom gesien? -- In die polisiestasie in die agterplaas.

Was hy alleen? -- Hy was saam met Kleurlingman Dennis Bloem.

Was daar enige motor van die beskuldigde en/of Bloem? -- Nee, ek het geen motor gesien nie.

Waarom is hulle oorspronklik gearresteer of aangehou? (20) -- Ek dra nie kennis nie.

En as ek aan u stel dat hulle gearresteer was omdat hulle UDF T-hemde gedra het, wat sal u sê? -- Ek sal nie weet nie.

Maar sê vir ons, op die 18de, hoeveel mense is in hegtenis geneem? -- Nee, ek kan nie onthou nie.

Kan u onthou of enige persoon behalwe beskuldigde nr. 20 en mnr. Dennis Bloem in hegtenis geneem was of nie? Dit is op die 18de? -- Daar was mense gearresteer, ja.

Hoeveel? -- Ek weet nie.

Vir wat? -- Ek dra nie kennis nie. Openbare geweld, (30) seker.

Dra u nie kennis van die feit dat amper elke persoon wat 'n geel UDF T-hemp gedra het aangehou is nie? -- Nee, ek kan nie so iets onthou nie.

U kan nie so iets onthou nie? Hoeveel veiligheidsmanne was daar by die begrafnis van die 18de? -- Dit is moeilik. Ek kan nie sê nie. Van ons tak was daar vier gewees.

Was daar enige senior lid behalwe uself? -- By die eerste begrafnis?

Van die 18de? -- Dit is korrek, daar was.

Wie was dit? -- Adjudant Jacobs. (10)

Was hy naby u? -- Ja, hy was by my gewees.

Het hy ook waargeneem wat u waargeneem het? -- Ja, net sonder 'n verkyker.

So, die beste persoon om te kon gesien het wie daar was, was uself? -- Ek skat so, want dit is beter met 'n verkyker.

Kan u onthou of enige persoon ernstig beseer was op die 21ste? -- Nee. Ek weet daar was mense tydens die onluste beseer, maar ek kan nie onthou watter begrafnis presies nie.

Kan u onthou of enige persoon op die 21ste doodgeskiet is of nie? -- Ek praat onder korreksie, maar ek dink daar (20) was een doodgeskiet, ja.

Wie was dit? -- Dit was Wolf gewees.

Was dit 'n volwasse persoon of 'n kind? -- Dit was 'n seun gewees, 'n jeugdige.

Hoe oud sou u sê was hy? -- Dit is moeilik. Ek weet nie. Hy was nog skoolgaande gewees.

Waar was die begrafnis van die 18de? -- By die begraafplaas in die Swartwoonbuurt.

Watter deel van die Swartwoonbuurt? -- Begraafplaas is geleë buite die Swartwoongebied Constantia. (30)

In watter deel van die Swartwoonbuurt het die begrafnis

begin? -- Die eerste begrafnis?

Ons praat van die 18de? -- Die 18de, dit is die eerste begrafnis. Dit was in die ou Swartwoonbuurt gewees.

Hoe ver is dit van die polisiestasie af? -- Ek sal weer moet skat. Dit is plus-minus twee-, driehonderd meter.

Is dit al? -- Dit is reg.

Kan u onthou of op daardie geleentheid, ons praat nou net van die 18de, die eerste begrafnis, u mnr. Bloem daar gesien het of nie? -- Nee, ek kan nie nou onthou nie.

Kan u onthou wie die predikant was wat die oorledene (10) begrawe het? -- Nee.

Kan u sê wie 'n toespraak daar gemaak het? -- Nee.

Kan u sê hoeveel mense daar toesprake gemaak het? -- Nee.

Kan u sê op watter soort voertuig die kis van die oorledene vervoer was? -- Dit was 'n lykswa, 'n stasiewa.

Was daar jong mense daar op? -- Nie bo-op die voertuig nie.

Was daar deur die landdros 'n verbod om die kis te dra?  
-- Ja, ek dink so.

HOF : Dit beteken dan buite? -- Buite ja, anders as in die voertuig. (20)

MNR. BIZOS : Was dit nie 'n bakkie nie? -- Nee.

Is u seker? -- Ja, ek is seker.

HCF : Met 'n bakkie, bedoel u 'n oop bakkie, nie 'n toe bakkie nie.

MNR. BIZOS : 'n Oop bakkie en die jong mense het daarop gestaan. Kan u dit nie onthou nie? -- Nee, dit was definitief 'n lykswa gewees.

Ek wil dit aan u stel dat u heeltemal verwar is, omdat dit wel 'n bakkie was en mense het op die bakkie gestaan en die kis op die bakkie gedra? -- Ek stem nie saam nie. Dit (30) was definitief binne-in die lykswa gewees.



Daar was wel 'n lykswa, maar dit was die jong mense se manier om die verbod van die landdros te vermy? -- Die kis was binne-in die lykswa gewees en daar was baie bakkies met Swartmense op.

U kan nie miskien sê of die kis so gedra is, soos wat ek dit aan u stel nie? -- Hy was binne-in die lykswa.

Hoeveel lede van die polisie was besig om die begrafnis van die 18de dop te hou? -- Baie.

Hoeveel min of meer? -- Ek sal nie kan sê nie. Dit was baie gewees. As 'n mens 'n skatting moes maak, skat ek honderd, (10) maar ek weet nie presies die getal nie.

Is die oorledene se huis sigbaar van die polisiestasie af? -- Dit is korrek.

In watter deel van die sogenaamde lokasie was die oorledene se huis? -- In die ou Swartwoonbuurt.

Wat is die naam? -- Hy staan bekend as ou Swartwoonbuurt.

Nie as Marabastad nie? -- Moontlik, ja. Ek weet nie.

Is Marabastad sigbaar van die polisiestasie af? -- Dit is korrek.

Van bo af of van straatvlak af? -- Nee, ek glo 'n mens (20) moet 'n bietjie hoër klim, sê maar op 'n muur of op 'n voertuig voor 'n mens dit kan sien.

Is eerwaarde Mosia aan u bekend? -- Nee.

Is eerwaarde Mamabola aan u bekend? -- Nee.

As ek aan u stel dat die twee eerwaardes by die begraafplaas toesprake gemaak het en daarna beskuldigde nr. 20, is u in staat om dit te erken of te ontken? -- Dat hulle toesprake gemaak het?

Ja? -- Ek het hulle nie herken nie. Ek ken hulle nie.

Maar is u in staat om dit te ontken of te erken dat (30) beskuldigde nr. 20 'n toespraak daar gemaak het? -- Ek kan nie 'n

antwoord daarop gee nie, want ek het hom nie daar gesien nie.

Maar wat sou u besig gewees het om te doen met die verkyker as u nie die mense wat toesprake gemaak het waargeneem het nie? -- Ek het wel met die verkyker soontoe gekyk. Ek kon nie juis sien dat mense toesprake hou nie.

Sou dit moontlik gewees het om beskuldigde nr. 20 nie te sien nie as hy vir ten minste tien minute gepraat het by die begrafnis?

HOF : Hoe sê was hy geklee? Was hy opsigtelik geklee?

MNR. BIZOS : Met 'n UDF hemp? -- Ek het geen mense gesien (10) toesprake maak daar nie. So, ek het hom ook nie gesien nie.

Het u nie spesiale opdrag gehad om vir UDF T-hemde dop te hou nie? -- Ek het nie opdragte in daardie verband gehad nie.

Maar u self het geweet om spesiale aandag aan UDF mense te gee? -- Dit is korrek.

En die feit dat een van die sekretarisse van die UDF daar 'n toespraak gemaak het, sou belangrike inligting vir die veiligheidspolisie gewees het, nie waar nie? -- Ja, moontlik. Dit hang af wat hulle gesê het. (20)

En dit was een van die redes hoekom u die verkyker saamgeneem het? -- Dit is korrek, om die mense dop te hou.

Kan u onthou dat daar 'n banier was? -- By watter begrafnis was dit?

Ons praat nog van die 18de? -- Ja, daar was 'n banier.

Wat was die banier? -- Dit was 'n laken of 'n stuk lap.

En wat was daarop geskryf? -- "We are not fighting to bury our hero. Yes to SRC's."

Beskuldigde nr. 20 sal sê dat dit was moeilik om te verstaan wat dit wel bedoel het, maar die woorde was "We are (30) not fighting to bury our dead. Yes to SRC's." Is dit moontlik

dat dit daar op geskryf was? -- Nee, dit is wat ek gesien het op die lap staan.

Kan u onthou of mnr. Bloem daar gepraat het of nie? -- Nee.

Wat is mnr. Bloem se eerste naam? -- Dennis.

Is hy 'n welbekende sakeman daar in Kroonstad? -- In Bruinpark, ja.

Sal u saamstem dat mense het begin wegloop toe hulle besef het dat die tyd nou om was? -- Ek stem saam, sekere mense het begin loop. ( 0)

Baie van hulle. Die meeste van die mense het wegbeweeg? -- Dit is korrek. Ek het hulle nie getel nie.

Kan u onthou nadat die meeste mense weggestap het of daar 'n klein groep mense was wat agtergebly het om die grond in die graf te gooi? -- Ja, daar was heelwat gewees.

Hoe groot was daardie groep gewees? -- Ek sal weer eens 'n skatting moet maak, honderd na tweehonderd mense.

En was dit duidelik dat die groot groep mense besig was om weg te gaan? -- Ja.

As ek aan u stel dat daardie groep wat agtergebly het (20 'n baie kleiner groep as tweehonderd was, sal u in staat wees om dit te ontken of te erken? -- Ja, ek erken dit. Dit was minder as die groep wat wegbeweeg het. So het dit vir my gelyk. HOF: Die wat wegbeweeg het moes seker tweeduisend of meer gewees het? -- Dit is reg.

Wat die advokaat nou aan u stel is, dat dit minder as tweehonderd was? -- Ja, dit is moontlik. Wat by die graf agtergebly het?

Ja, wat by die graf agtergebly het? -- Ja.

MNR. BIZOS : Dit was 'n klein groep mense? -- Ja. (30)

Maar u was nie van plan om van die begraafplaas af weg te

beweeg voor almal weggegaan het nie? -- Dit is korrek.

En as ek aan u stel dat beskuldigde nr. 20, mnr. Lekota een van daardie klein groep mense was wat besig was om die grond in te gooi, is u in staat om dit te erken of te ontken? -- Ek kan nie sê nie. Ek het hom nie gesien nie.

Was daar enige persone in daardie klein groepie mense wat UDF hende gedra het? -- Dit is korrek.

Hoeveel van hulle? -- Ek weet nie, 'n hele paar.

Een, twee, drie, vyf, hoeveel? -- Meer as tien.

En u het spesiale aandag gegee aan mense wat UDF hende(10) gedra het? -- Dit is korrek, ja.

En as beskuldigde nr. 20 daar was, hoe kon u hom gemis het? -- Ek wil dit net meld dat die persone wat om die graf agtergebly het, op die ander grafte wat toegegooi was ook gestaan het. So, hulle was nie egalig gewees langs die graf nie.

Was u nie gefinteresseerd wie die klein groepie was wat verantwoordelik was vir die begrafnis van die oorledene nie? -- Ja, 'n mens wil graag weet. Ek glo dit was seker familieledes ook. (20)

Ja, maar wat van die mense met die UDF hende? Was u nie gefinteresseerd om 'n beskrywing van daardie persone te kry en miskien deur die verkyker hulle te probeer identifiseer nie? -- Ja, ek het probeer, maar ek ken hulle nie.

As die Star berig korrek is, en ek wil dit aan u stel dat dit so is ... (Hof kom tussenbei)

HCF : Dit is nou AAQ(8)?

MNR. BIZOS : Ja. As dit nou korrek is en beskuldigde nr. 20 se getuienis sal so wees, kan u verduidelik waarom u nie beskuldigde nr. 20 daar op die 18de gesien het nie, maar (30) dat u hom wel uitgeken het op die 21ste? -- Ek het hom nie

gesien by die eerste begrafnis nie. Dit was by die tweede begrafnis, aangesien ek vir Dennis Bloem in hierdie voertuig sien klim het deur my verkyker. Op daardie stadium het ek nie geweet dat Terror Lekota by hom is nie.

En dit was na hierdie klein groepie mense by die begraafplaas wat die polisie traangas gegooi het op die 18de, nie waar nie? -- Dit is korrek.

Wie se bevel was dit om die klein groepie mense met traangas aan te val? -- Kolonel Bester.

Die groot deel van die skare was alreeds weg van die (10) begraafplaas toe die traangas gebruik is? -- Dit was nog binne-in die begraafplaas, net nie by die graf self nie.

En die klein groepie was besig om die graf op te vul toe die traangas gebruik was? -- Moontlik.

U was daar met 'n verkyker. Is dit so of nie? -- Ek kon nie sien of hulle die kis toegooi nie.

Wat was die klein groepie mense besig om te doen? -- Hulle het om die graf gestaan.

Was hulle nie besig om dit op te vul nie? -- Ek het nie gesien dat hulle grond opgooi nie. (20)

Ek wil dit aan u stel dat daar ongeveer twintig tot dertig persone daar was by die graf en een van daardie persone beskuldigde nr. 20 was? -- Ek het hom nie gesien nie.

HOF : Maar daar is nou twee stellings wat die advokaat aan u maak. Die tweede een het u beantwoord. Die eerste een is dat daar net twintig tot dertig persone by die graf was? -- Nee, daar was meer mense gewees as dit.

MNR. BIZOS : Hoeveel meer sou u sê? -- Soos ek gesê het, honderd na tweehonderd.

Het die mense wat daar by die graf was weggehardloop? (30)  
-- Toe op hulle geskiet is?

Met die traangas, ja? -- Dit is korrek.

Kan u erken of ontken dat beskuldigde nr. 20 deur een van die "canisters" op die been getref is? -- Ek dra nie kennis daarvan nie.

Kan u onthou dat h ou man daar by die graf geval het? -- Nee.

Kan u onthou of daar enige motor naby die graf was of nie? -- Nee, ek kan nie onthou nie.

Sou dit nie deel van u werk gewees het om registrasienommers van voertuie te neem met u verkyker nie? -- Ons het (10) dit gedoen.

Wel, kan u sê of u die registrasienommer van enige voertuig op die 18de geneem het of nie? -- Ek dink ons het, ja.

Het u vasgestel aan wie die voertuie wat daar by die begraafplaas was behoort het? -- As ons nommers afneem, dan stel ons gewoonlik vas. Ons het.

Kan u onthou of h motor wat aan die UDF behoort daar was of nie? -- Ek kan nie onthou nie.

Het u daar gebly totdat die laaste mense van die graf af weggegaan het? -- Dit is korrek. Ons het saam met hulle(20) uitbeweeg in die Swartwoonbuurt in.

Was die laaste mense wat daar weg is, per motor weg? -- Hulle het gehardloop.

Ek wil dit aan u stel dat beskuldigde nr. 20 een van die laaste persone daar was en hy het met h motor wegbeweeg, saam met vyf ander mense? -- Ek het hom nie gesien nie.

Alhoewel u daar tot die einde was? -- Dit is korrek, ja.

Het u na die oorledene se huis gegaan na die begrafnis? -- Nee.

Het u enige motors wat van die begraafplaas af weggery (30) het gevolg? -- Nee.

Kan u onthou of die mense wat die begrafnisbygewoon het in die algemeen volwassenes was of nie? -- Daar was baie volwassenes gewees.

Was daar polisievoertuie Hippo's wat daar in die omgewing van die oorledene se huis was? -- Nee.

Weet u nie wie mnr. Dennis Bloem en beskuldigde nr. 20 aangehou het nie? -- Nee.

As ek dit aan u stel dat 'n polisieman gesê het "Hier is twee ander met UDF hemde" en dat hulle aangehou was, is u in staat om dit te erken of te ontken? -- Ek onthou dit nie. (10)  
Dit was nie by die eerste begrafnis nie.

En toe hulle by die polisiestasie gekom het, het kolonel Koen aan beskuldigde nr. 20, mnr. Lekota, 'n subpoena oorhandig om getuienis in verband met 'n saak van ene Johannes Ngalo te gee by Parys? -- Dit was die tweede begrafnis gewees en dit was nie kolonel Koen gewees nie, dit was majoor Voigt, die speurder, wat dit aan hom oorhandig het.

Nie kolonel Koen nie? -- Nee.

Maar in elk geval, u was daar toe dit gedoen is? -- Nie dat ek gesien het toe hy dit gegee het nie. Ek het gehoor (20) hy het dit vir hom gegee.

U was daar? -- Dit is korrek.

En dit was 'n subpoena? -- Ek dink so, of 'n verklaring wat hy moes onderteken het.

Of hy moet 'n verklaring maak of hy moet 'n subpoena aanvaar om voor die landdros te verskyn? -- Dit is reg.

En dit was in verband met 'n persoon wat in hegtenis dood is in Parys? -- Dit is korrek.

Kan u onthou vir hoe lank hy daar gehou is, of op die 18de of die 21ste? -- Nee, ek kan nie onthou nie. (30)

Sal u in staat wees om te erken of te ontken dat dit vir 'n

paar uur was? -- Ek dra geen kennis hoe lank nie.

Op die 18de sal u saamstem dat dit 'n vreedsame gebeurtenis was, behalwe vir die traangas wat deur die polisie gebruik was om die klein groepie mense uitmekaar te jaag? -- Ja, en behalwe dat normale mense nie so na 'n graf toe beweeg soos wat hulle gedoen het nie.

Maar daar was geen klipgooiery nie? -- Nee, nie waarvan ek weet nie.

Geen ander geweld van enige aard nie? -- Nee.

Behalwe die traangas wat gebruik was? -- Nee. (10)

Hoeveel mense sal u sê het UDF hende gedra? -- Dit is moeilik om te sê. Ek het hulle nie getel nie. Dit was 'n hele paar gewees.

Op die 18de? -- Dit is korrek.

Hoeveel? -- Ek sal skat meer as twintig.

HOF : Is dit nou in die hele groep van duisende of in die klein groepie van tot tweehonderd wat oorgebly het?

MNR. BIZOS : Van duisende, van die hele skare? -- Ek skat twintig.

Dra u enige kennis van enige geaffilieerde organisasie (20) van die UDF in Kroonstad voor 11 Februarie 1985? -- Nee.

So, die twintig of so persone wat UDF hende gedra het op die 18de was of besoekers of mense van Kroonstad wat miskien 'n UDF hemp van hier of daar gekoop het? -- Ja, dit is moontlik.

Weet u of enige ander organisasie wat ook van T-hemde gebruik gemaak het in Kroonstad gewees het? -- Ek het net T-hemde gesien van ander organisasies. Ek weet nie of daar organisasies wel is nie.

Maar u as 'n veiligheidspolisiebeampte dra geen kennis van enige ander organisasie soos AZASUM of COSAS of enige ander (30) organisasie? -- Daar is wel nou sulke organisasies.



Ons praat nou van voor die 11de Februarie 1985?-- Nee.

Of voor 27 Februarie 1985? -- Nee.

Daar was geen sulke organisasies nie? -- Nee.

Wat het volgens u beskuldigde nr. 20 op die 21ste gedra?  
-- 'n UDF T-hemp.

Wanneer het u hom vir die heel eerste keer gesien soos u  
sê op die 21ste?-- Toe hy uit die voertuig geklim het.

Net voor hy die klip opgetel het? -- Dit is korrek.

Hoe ver was u weg? -- Ek sal weer moet skat. Ek was 'n  
hele paar voertuie agter hulle gewees, omtrent vyftig na (10)  
sestig meter toe.

Was die voertuig stilstaande of het hy gery? -- Hy het  
stil gestaan.

En wat was tussen u en die persoon wat u sê beskuldigde  
nr. 20 was?-- Daar was voertuie tussen ons gewees.

Hoeveel voertuie? -- Ek kan nie onthou nie.

Is u ernstig as u sê dat mnr. Lekota, die sekretaris van  
die UDF, gebuk het om een klip op te tel en dit na die polisie  
te gooi? -- Ek is doodseker.

Hoeveel polisiebeamptes was daar in die omgewing? -- (20)  
Ek sal weer eens moet raai. Ek sal skat vyftig na sestig.

In die nabyheid van die plek waar beskuldigde nr. 20 'n  
klip opgetel het en dit na die polisie gegooi het? -- Daar was  
heelwat polisiemanne.

Hoeveel mense was daar in die onmiddellike omgewing van  
beskuldigde nr. 20? -- Dit is ook moeilik om te sê, dertig,  
na veertig, navyftig.

So, ons het ten minste twee polisiemanne vir elke oproerige  
persoon wat daar was? -- Ek sal nie kan sê nie.

Was die polisie gewapen? -- Dit is korrek. (30)

Wat doen die polisie gewoonlik as mense hulle met klippe

gooi? -- Hulle skiet traangas op hulle.

Het iemand daar geskiet buite die huis van die oorledene op die 21ste? -- Nie waarvan ek kennis dra nie.

HOF : Waar is ons nou? Ek het gedink ons is besig met die ry karre wat wegry en wat stilhou. Gaan ons nou weg daarvanaf?

MNR. BIZOS : Jammer. Was daar enige skietery op die plek waar beskuldigde nr. 20 die klip opgetel het? -- Ja, daar was 'n skietery.

Na die dertig persone? -- Soos ek gesê het dit was 'n grondpad wat van die begraafplaas af na die Swartwoonbuurt (10) toe beweeg en die voertuie het tot stilstand gekom en die mense het uit die voertuie gehardloop. Daar was ook mense wat agter die huise skuiling gehad het wat ook klippe na die voertuie gegooi het.

Al die dertig persone was onbekende persone, nie waar nie? -- Dit is reg, ja.

Behalwe beskuldigde nr. 20? -- En Dennis Bloem.

Is enige persoon doodgeskiet op daardie dag? -- Nie by daardie toneel self nie.

Is enige persoon beseer by daardie toneel? -- Nie waarvan(2) ek kennis dra nie.

Hoeveel polisiebeamptes het geskiet in die rigting van mnr. Bloem en mnr. Lekota? -- Dit sal ek nie kan beantwoord nie.

Min of meer? -- Ek het nie getel wie almal daar geskiet het nie. Ek weet glad nie.

Hoeveel van hulle het rewolwers of gewere in hulle rigting gemik?

HOF : Net 'n oomblik. Ons het nou gepraat van 'n skietery van traangas en nou praat u van 'n skietery met rewolwers of gewere ook. Waarvan praat u? Wat se soort skietery praat u van? (30)

MNR. BIZOS : Miskien kan ons dit net opklaar. Waarmee

het die polisie geskiet op die 21ste toe beskuldigde nr. 20 en mnr. Bloem hulle met klippe gegooi het? -- Met stoppergewere wat traangaspatrone bevat het.

O, nie met koeëls nie? -- Nee.

Beskou u openbare geweld teen die polisie in die vorm van klipgooiery 'n ernstige misdaad? -- Ek skat so, ja.

Is daar 'n dossier ooit deur u geopen teen mnr. Bloem wat wel aan u bekend is en mnr. Lekota wat ook welbekend aan u is? -- Nee, ek werk nie met openbare geweld nie.

Waarmee werk?-- Ek is 'n veiligheidspolisieman. Ek is (10) nie 'n gewone polisieman nie.

As persone die polisie met klippe gooi in u teenwoordigheid ... -- Dan tree ek op.

Is klipgooiery teen die polisie nie deel - raak dit nie die veiligheid van die Staat nie? -- Ja, dit raak die veiligheid van die Staat.

En waarom het u nie onmiddellik u kollegas daar gevra om hulle te arresteer nie? -- Dit is die uniformafdeling se taak daardie. Ek gaan nie vir hulle sê wat hulle moet doen nie. Dit is hulle taak daardie. (20)

Maar dit is mos nie 'n kind wat 'n klip opgetel het nie. Dit is die sekretaris van die UDF wat die aandag van die veiligheidspolisie trek, nie waar nie? -- Dit is korrek.

Waarom het u hom nie aangekla nie, as u getuienis waar is? -- Miskien het iemand anders hom aangekla waarvan ek nie weet nie. Ek het hom nie self aangekla nie.

GETUIE STAAN AF.

HOF VERDAAG TOT 28 FEBRUARIE 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-I1-5-36**

*Document Title:*- **Vol 36 p 1621-1686. Witnesses: MacCamel, Branders**