

VOL. - 270
IN DIE HOOGGEREGSHOF VAN SUID-AFRIKA ^{13168 to}

(TRANSVAALSE PROVINSIALE AFDELING) ¹³²⁰⁹

I 2.13 Vol 248 p 13168-13209

SAAKNOMMER: CC 482/85

DELMAS

PRETORIA

1987-08-03

DIE STAAT teen:

PATRICK MABUYA BALEKA EN 21

ANDER

VOOR:

SY EDELE REGTER VAN DIJKHORST EN

ASSESSOR : MNR. W.F. KRUGEL

NAMENS DIE STAAT:

ADV. P.B. JACOBS

ADV. P. FICK

ADV. W. HANEKOM

248

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

ISMAIL AYOB & ASSOCIATES

COPY

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

VOLUME 248

(Bladsye 13 168 - 13 209)

COURT RESUMES.

POPO SIMON MOLEFE, still under oath

FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MR CHASKALSON : Mr Molefe, you told us that in December 1982 you had been elected to the Committee of Ten in Soweto? -- That is so.

COURT : What position did you hold? -- I did not have a special position. I was simply assisting Reverend Sebidi in his Department of Education.

MR CHASKALSON : Were you still a member of AZAPO when that happened? -- I was no longer a member. (10)

When had you ceased to be a member of AZAPO? -- I ceased to be a member of AZAPO at I think the beginning of 1981, early 1981.

Was there any reason which led you away from AZAPO? -- There is, yes.

What was it? Why did you stop being a member of AZAPO? -- Well, over a period of time I had been involved in a number of discussions, political discussions with a broad range of people. I had been doing a bit of reading myself on a number of issues. That coupled with the differences that we had (20) on how best to address the problems facing us within AZAPO and the role, in particular the role of the White people in the struggle, combined, those factors combined to influence my decision to leave AZAPO. To be a bit specific on these issues, one may say, I think I should say that already around 1980 when we discussed the need for partici - a broad front, comprising of various organisations in Soweto, problems aroused there in respect of those organisations which were non-racial in character and had White members, like the FOSATU and other organisations with a non-racial outlook like (30)

the/...

the Federation of South African Women and so on. The position of AZAPO at that stage was that as far as they were concerned whilst they accepted the fact that White people had a role to play in advancing the process of change, they did not see that happening by way of inclusion of White people in their own organisation or by way of participating in any joint program with those organisations which had White members and as far as I was concerned at that stage, that was a serious problem in respect of building the broadest possible unity, because it meant that those organisations which (10) believed that they could accommodate White members in their own ranks would not be able to co-operate with AZAPO and as a result of that it was not able to expand rapidly and to win the support of those organisations. There had also of course been discussions much earlier on which influenced me as a person that whilst I personally had held the view that there cannot be participation in a single organisation of White people, that in fact that attitude was wrong. That we had to convince the White people that if we are building the future and the future that is non-racial in character, (20) that process, that goal must manifest itself in the course of the struggle for that future. I personally got convinced in the march of time that it was necessary to begin to co-operate with people embracing non-racial principles. So, that in a sense really there was already that difference between myself and certain members of the organisation and it was for that reason that I finally decided in 1981 that I should leave the organisation.

If I could take you back to the - beyond 1982 to the beginning of 1983. You have told us that the proposals (30)

for/...

for the tri-cameral parliament were already known in 1982, that the Koornhof bills were already known in 1982. We also know, I think, that the Labour Party which had previously been a political organisation amongst the Coloured community participated in the tri-cameral or decided to participate in the tri-cameral parliament. Were you aware that that decision by the Labour Party had been taken? -- I was aware of that decision.

Do you know when it was? Could you give His Lordship either the date or an approximate date? -- It was at the beginning of the year in January. If my recollection is (10) correct I think it was on 4 January.

Is that 1983 we are talking of? -- 1983.

Was there publicity containing the fact that this decision had been taken? -- That is so and that it provoked a lot of reaction and reflecting tremendous anger from various quarters in the Black community.

Why was that anger provoked? -- I think really there are two different levels at which one can say the one could identify the source of that anger, at two different levels. (20) The first one is that the proposals for the new constitution were explicitly excluding the African people. The second one - may be still on the first one. They were excluding the African people. Also generally what they were offering was really seen as merely a token vote, not something that could effect meaningful change, but the second reason, the most crucial one that made people angry and I too felt as strongly as many people felt about this was the fact that Reverend Hendrikse and his party had been very, very vociferous in the past in terms of their position in respect of (30)

participation/...

Labour Party decision

participation in structures that did not have the powers to bring about meaningful change. My recollection is that in fact earlier on they had said that they themselves were opposed to the constitutional proposals. But it was also particular important because Reverend Hendrikse himself had been a victim of the South African security legislation during the period 1981. He had been detained with a number of other people who were detained at that stage for there outspokenness against the policies of apartheid. To me it was a very disturbing experience to learn that now the same (10) man who has suffered under the very security legislations that have led to so much suffering to many people, a person who had spoken openly and very vociferously against the new constitution, was now telling the Coloured communities to go into that structure. It was particular this reason that made a lot of people angry.

Had there been any unity between Black and Coloured and Indian or African and Coloured and Indian persons prior to the new constitution or the new plans for the constitution having been announced? -- Yes, my recollection is that (20) prior to the constitutional proposals, there had been in existence what was known as the South African Black Alliance, SABA. I am not certain but I seem to think that that organisation was formed around 1978 or so. The Labour Party was a member of that alliance, so was Inkatha and the movement under the leadership under Mr Mabuza, Innos Mabuza. I think it is called Inyanza Movement. They had come together in a position to the policies of apartheid. Now, people like Jim Buthelezi in particular was particularly angry that the Labour Party was now helping the government to (30)

a constitution that was excluding the Black people, the African people. A constitution that was excluding Inkatha a member of a Black alliance to which the Labour Party was affiliated.

We know from the documents which had been produced in this court that there was a meeting of the Anti-South African Indian council held in January 1983? -- That is so.

Did you attend that meeting? -- I did not attend it.

We know from documents which had been produced that Dr Allan Boesak made a speech on that occasion. Were you (10) or did you get to know about the fact that Dr Allan Boesak had spoken at the Anti-SAIC conference? -- That is so.

Can you tell us how you got to know of it? -- At the first instance I read about it in the newspapers. Secondly I came into contact with people who were present at that meeting and they spoke to me about what happened.

Did you learn of the call that had been made by Dr Boesak at that conference? -- Yes, I did.

How did you understand what Dr Boesak had called for at the conference? -- Well, when that call came I found (20) it to be a very attractive idea and I understood it to be a call similar to the one I myself had made in 1981. It was also a call similar to the one I read about in the pamphlet sent to me which later came out to be a pamphlet by Dr Neville Alexander. I found it to be quite in keeping with my own views.

What was the call as you understood it? -- I understood the call to be for the formation of a united democratic front.

Had you heard of any call or any statement made by Dr Allan Boesak earlier that month? -- I had not heard (30) about/...

about that.

How did you - did you personally become involved in any of the planning for the united democratic front? -- At some stage I became involved.

Can you give us the time when you were asked or the time when you became involved? -- Around the month of March, some time during March 1983 I was invited by a group of people that had been discussing the issue of the United Democratic Front to take part in the discussions.

Between January and March had you been aware of any (10) other discussions following Dr Boesak's call? -- I was aware that there were discussions taking place in other parts of the country, in particular the Western Cape and Natal.

And you yourself in your own political circles in which you moved, was the fact that the call had been made by Dr Boesak known? -- Yes, it was known and it was welcomed by a lot of people.

Was it a subject matter of discussion? -- That is so. It was a subject of debate at various levels.

Prior to March 1983 when you got invited to join the (20) group? -- That is so.

Do I understand you then to say that between January and March in the circles in which you were involved, that there was debate and discussion concerning Dr Boesak's call for a united front? -- That is so. Albeit not of a very structured nature at that stage.

The allegation made by the State in this case is that the United Democratic Front was set up as a result of a call made by Mr Oliver Tambo during January 1983. Were you aware of any call made by Mr Oliver Tambo? -- I was not aware (30)

of/...

of any call of that nature.

As far as you were aware, did you read anything in the newspapers to suggest that such a call had been made? -- No, I did not.

Did you hear at all of such a call having been made at that time? -- I did not. I believe we are dealing with Mr Thambo, whether it was reported as Mr Thambo's call?

Yes. -- Yes.

Did you hear of any call having been made by the ANC to set up a front at that time? -- I did not know of such a (10) call.

You mentioned that you were asked to join a group which were discussing seriously the proposals made by Dr Boesak. There is an exhibit in this case, EXHIBIT C49 which is a resolution taken at the Anti-SAIC conference in January 1983. You told us that you were not at that conference, but I would like you to look at EXHIBIT C49. It is a document headed "Statement by the commission on the feasibility of the united front against the constitutional reform proposals." Did you at any time see that document prior to this case getting on (20) the way? -- Yes, I did.

In what circumstances did you see that document? -- When I was invited to take part in the discussion on the issue of the United Democratic Front by the small group of people I have referred to, this document was handed to me and I was informed - a similar document I must say - that it was the resolution adopted at the meeting of the South African - Anti-South African Indian Council. You were saying what the circumstances were in which you had seen that document. -- That is so.

(30)

Could/...

Could you just tell us how you came to see it? -- I had been invited to a discussion by a small group of people who had been present at the Anti-South African Indian Council conference and they themselves had accepted the resolution and were very eager to consult on the issue with a view to finally establishing a united front in the Transvaal. So, they asked me to participate and they wanted me to be conversant with what was discussed at that conference, the basis upon which this united democratic front would be formed. It was really in those circumstances that I got this (10) document.

What was your reaction to what is contained in this document? -- I found this document expressing the experiences of the Black people, the oppressed people in this country. I found everything in here reasonable and I did not find anything wrong about it and I associated myself with the views expressed in here.

I understand you then to say that you agreed to be part of this initiative in about March 1983? -- That is correct.

At that time, were you in employment? -- I was employed. (20)

Where were you working? -- I was working for Kodak South Africa. It is a film company which is connected to the United States. It is multi national really. I was working at the processing laboratories of that company.

Was that a full time job? -- That is so.

Were you able to participate actively in the discussions which took place after March 1983? -- No, my participation was very limited.

Were you able to attend any formal discussions after (30)
you/...

you had agreed? I am talking now about the period between March and say through to may or June? -- I attended a few of those discussions.

Were you being kept informed of what was happening or did you have to pick it up each time that you went to another discussion? -- I was kept informed.

COURT : Who were the participants in the group? -- Some members of the group had been elected into some kind of a steered consultative committee whose task was to go around talking to individuals, prominent personalities and indivi-(10) duals from organisations to assess the attitude towards the idea of the united front, but when I met them, I did not meet them as the entire committee. Some of the members were part of that committee. Each one of them was going around to getting a group of people together and discussing the issue with them. Should I mention the names?

Yes. -- I recall that amongst those really who were there was Mohammed Vali, Eric Molobi, Reverend Chikane, Amos Msondo and others.

Does this document not originate from the Indian congress (20) or do I have it wrong? The Anti-SAIC group, was an Indian group, was it not? -- It was, but it had Coloureds and Africans also.

But the members you are mentioning are not Indians, only a few of them? -- Mohammed Vali is an Indian. One other person who was part of that was Ismail Momoneat. There was Prema Naidoo. Later on of course at different times other people like Dr Yassat, Dr Saloojee became part of the discussions.

MR CEASKALSON : Were the persons engaged in that initiative purely of Indian background or was it broader than that? --(30)

The/...

The people attending that conference were from all communities. It was a non-racial gathering, Africans, Coloureds, Indians and White people were part of that conference. The resolution reflects the views of those people. That broad grouping of people.

Dr Boesak is not of Indian origin, is he? -- Yes, as I understand it also, Tozamile Gweka was also one of the speakers there. I was not there myself. I am really recalling what I had read in the papers and what I had heard, but I must also indicate that even that Anti-South African (10) Indian Committee had Africans there, because Samson Ndou was a member of that committee and incidentally he is also a member of the Transvaal Indian congress. So was Dr Ismail Mohammed. Dr Ismail Mohammed is not of Indian origin. He is a Coloured.

Did you see the - you told us that you participated in the discussions and that you were kept informed on the occasions that you were not able to attend meetings. Did you see the occasion of a new constitution as a really special importance as far as the country was concerned? -- Yes, I (20) did.

I think you told us quite a lot about your views, but if you could just very briefly summarise why you thought it as being so important at this time? -- At that stage the nation was facing a crucial issue of constitutional proposals. Those of us who had read about the constitutional proposals and how that new constitution was intended to operate, believed that it was going to have very serious implications for our society. These implications have manifest themselves amongst others in divisions. It was dividing the oppressed people (30)

as/...

as a starting point. The Indian, Coloureds and African people had always been struggling together to persuade the government to end apartheid. This new constitution was now saying that we are accepting the Coloured and Indian communities as part of the White government structure in this country, but the Black African people are not to be part of that. We really saw the new constitution having the implication, the likelihood, not even the likelihood, laying the basis for a situation in which Africans would be a alienated completely from other communities. It was also dividing those communi-(10) ties themselves because it was clear from the outset that the new constitution was not welcomed by organisations, individuals who mattered in those communities as well as organisations. It was clear therefore that the Indian communities were going to be divided also, but it was further deepening the racial polarisation that was already existing in the country. It meant that the Black people were simply being told that you will remain there and you will never become part of this new constitution. This is how immediately we saw this new constitution. (20)

What was your attitude at the time to what would meet the needs of the future of the country? -- I believed at the time and I believed this is the view of many of the Black people that I have spoken to that the only constitution that could meet the needs of all the people of this country and create the kind of conditions that would give an end to the polarisation and hostilities which exist in the country, was a constitution based on universal franchise. A constitution in which all the people of the country will participate as equals in which all the people of the country will have (30)

a vote and elect a single government that does not discriminate against the people upon the basis of colour ethnicity or race.

You have mentioned the new proposals as being devisive in the sense that there were important people within the Indian and Coloured communities who fell into disagreement over the proposals. I want to ask you whether you saw the alternative which was being proposed as far as the African community was concerned, the new Koornhof legislation, did it have within it any elements of devisiveness as far as the African community was concerned? -- That was so. (10)

Could you explain to His Lordship what you saw at the time as being the elements of devisiveness as far as the African community was concerned? -- At the time when the government was presenting the tri-cameral formation as the basis for constitutional proposals for Whites, Coloureds and Indians, it had simultaneously presented to the African people the Black Local Authorities as a structure through which their interests could be expressed, their interests could be articulated and I remember very well that by 1982 a number of cabinet ministers, the Prime Minister included (20) had made it very clear that they intended that the Black Local Authorities must be linked to the homeland policy. I remember also very well at a later stage the foreign minister of this country asked the question as to what he says about the Black people and he said "Look, we do not regard the Black people as an issue, the question of the Black people as an issue at this stage, because they are already having a vote in the homelands. We are merely providing for the urban Blacks." To me therefore, this new constitution I saw it presented as a substitute for meaningful vote in a (30) country/...

country of our birth. It was further perpetuating that denial of our right to participate in the decisions - decision making structures in this country. It was pushing us into the peripheries and away from the centres of power and for that reason I found it just unacceptable to me and that was the view of the majority of the Black people.

In regard to the right of work and other rights of movement, was there going to be any difference between people coming from urban areas and people coming from rural areas? -- The new constitution came at the time when there were (10) these other bills which were presented for the Africans. The orderly movement and settlement of Black persons bill also had as its aim to divide the African people into rural and urban Africans. It set out very clearly that those who are qualifying already or who in terms of the test, the criteria as would be said by the orderly movement and settlement of Black persons bill would qualify for permanent urban residence. That those would then be given a vote in the BLA and there would be another category of people who would be regarded as commuters. These are people who are migrant (20) workers who come from rural areas, who had up until that time been allowed to qualify in terms of Section 10(1)(b) of I think the Black Urban Areas Act of 1945. At least after worked consistently for one employer for a period of ten years, those people were allowed to qualify to live in the urban areas in terms of that section. Those who had lived legally in the urban areas in terms of that section for a continuous period of 15 years even if they had been at school or worked for different employers, they would qualify in terms of that section to live in the urban areas, to have houses, (30) to/...

to own houses in the urban areas. Effectively therefore the orderly movement and settlement of Black persons bill by suggesting that people must be divided into commuters and permanent urban residents and using as a criteria to determine that, the question of employment and approved accommodation, it was intensifying the whole system of influx control and making the conditions for the Africans even - very, very difficult as it was dividing them into those who live in rural areas and those who live in urban areas. It meant those who were in the urban areas who had relatives (10) living in rural areas would be cut completely from those relatives, because one of the provisions of that law - I am not putting myself forth here as an expert in this. I am just talking on the basis of the little that I have understood of that act. That bill, sorry. What it was suggesting was that any person who spends the night in the urban area must carry a special permit for that and if found in a house, even it is my uncle found in my house, I will be fined for allowing him to sleep in my house. So, really this act was turning the urban Black people into policemen to implement the (20) policies of the government of influx control. Thereby it was really going to create antagonism between the rural African people and the urban Black people and this was unacceptable to us.

You have explained why you felt it important that there should be a united front against these new proposals and your own participation in the group which was setting up a united front in the Transvaal. Was a united democratic front set up in the Transvaal? -- It was.

Are you able now to recollect the date or approximate (30)

date/...

date when that happened? -- My recollection now after also having been reminded by the minute and various reports that I have been able to get since my arrest, is that it was -- I think we should draw a distinction, the formation of the UDF and the election of the executive to the UDF Transvaal. Those two things took place at different times.

Talk about the formation of the UDF firstly, please and then secondly of the executive. -- That took place in May 1983.

Can you describe just very briefly to His Lordship (10) what the United Democratic Front has formed in May 1983 in the Transvaal? What did it consist of? -- It consisted of different organisations that had different interests. That would have been student organisations, trade unions, political organisations, women's organisations, civic associations, others of course are called residents associations or residents organisations. It was that sort of organisations that set up the UDF and these organisations would be represented by two delegates and there would also be observers of course allowed to be part of that. I may also indicate that at (20) that early stage there had also been as part of the United Democratic Front some media organisations, newspapers or resource organisations, service organisations so to say.

Around what issue were they coming together? What was the front to be formed around? -- The basis upon which this front was formed, the basis upon which these organisations came together, was opposition to the new constitutional proposals and the Koornhof bills. This is the foundation upon which the UDF was formed.

Do you know whether at that time discussions were (30)

taking/...

taking place elsewhere in the country? -- I did know.

As you understood the position at that time, was the only United Democratic Front to be in the Transvaal or were there to be United Democratic Fronts elsewhere in the country? -- I knew that in the Western Cape there were discussions on the matter. There were discussions taking place in Natal. I was personally not involved in those discussions, but from time to time I could get reports from those who were serving in the consultative committee, because on occasions they also went to those regions to discuss with other people there. (10) So, I knew about that and in fact the Natal region of the UDF was formed during the same month as the Transvaal UDF.

Was there any contemplation that these different regions would ever get together? -- I do not know at the beginning if that was planned, but as I understand it, there would obviously have been some way of co-ordinating that, because the new constitution was seen as affecting the people on a national basis. I assume at that stage then that people would have considered how best to speak out in a national voice, but I know for a fact that later on I was involved (20) in the discussion that decided that the UDF must go national. The regions must be brought together.

Perhaps just to conclude the Transvaal before we go on to those discussions about the UDF being brought together on a national basis, you said that there was some - I think you wanted to distinguish between the formation of the front and the appointment of an executive. -- Yes.

Are you able to tell us approximately when the executive was appointed? -- The executive was appointed, my recollection is on 6 August. The Transvaal executive. (30)

Before that, had the - you told us about the discussions that - that you were part of discussions that involved bringing the regions together on a national basis? -- That is so, but perhaps before I deal with that question, may be I should just for purposes of clarity indicate that in the period between May and the time of the elections of the executive committee of the Transvaal UDF, there was a steering committee that was seeing to the affairs of the United Democratic Front.

Were you a member of that steering committee? -- I was not a member. (10)

Did you subsequently become a member of the executive? -- Yes, I became a member of the executive, elected on 6 August.

You told us that you were party to discussions to bring the regions together on a national basis. Did you attend any gatherings at which representatives of the regions from Natal and the Western Cape and the Transvaal came together to discuss this? -- I did.

When would this have been? -- It was at the end of July, the month of July, on 30 and 31 July 1983. (20)

What was the purpose of that gathering? Could you just tell us what was in mind at that stage? -- There were two things which were really going - I think there are two reasons for that. The first is the one I have already alluded to, that the constitution was affecting the people on a national basis. So were the Koornhof bills in the sense that what was happening in Johannesburg, would be happening in Natal, in Durban, in Bloemfontein and so on. They were affecting the Africans as a nation and so on. The view was then that a piecemeal response to a broad issue that affect people (30)

at/...

at a number of these levels nationally, would not be a correct response. It was really therefore - that get together, that meeting sought to find the way of responding to that new constitution in a manner that would be effective enough to be incurred by the government to be listened to by the government. But at yet another level it was crucial to raise that voice because it had already become clear that towards September or so or towards the end of that year the government was going to call a referendum for Whites to decide on the acceptability of the new constitution. So, (10) we considered it crucial for us to do it before that referendum took place and as I recall it again, the new constitution had not yet become an act and we wanted to make our views manifest before the government proceeded to pass South Africa's new constitution act.

You told us that there was a meeting at the end of July I think you said, 30 and 31 July? -- That is so.

Are you able to recollect who besides yourself were present at this meeting? -- My recollection is that from the Transvaal it was myself, it was - my memory tells me that (20) Dr Motlana - no, he was not. I think he was on Saturday. Then there was Dr Saloojee.

Let me interrupt you. Perhaps it is not necessary to have all the names, but can you tell us how big a gathering it was, how many representatives there were from each region? -- I think it was approximately 20 people.

In all or from each region? -- Representing Natal, the Transvaal and the Western Cape.

Is that a total of approximately 20 from the three regions or 20 from each region? -- 20 from the three regions. (30)

That/...

That is the sum total of all people who were present.

We know that there was a national launch of the United Democratic Front or a launch of the United Democratic Front on a national basis on 20 August 1983. Do you know whether that date or are you able to recollect whether that date had yet been fixed or whether it was determined at this meeting? -- That date was determined at this meeting that I have referred to.

That group that got together on this occasion from the three regions, was it given any name? -- It came to be (10) known as the UDF National Interim Committee.

And did it have any particular functions, this National Interim Committee? Was it Interim National Committee, Interim National Executive Committee or Interim Committee? -- I am not certain if the word Executive was there. It might well have been there.

Let us call it the Interim Committee for the moment. What were its functions? What was it to do following that meeting on 30 and 31 July? Did it have any specific functions? -- Its main task was to see to it that on 20 August UDF (20) National is launched or at least that the three regions including other regions that in the course of time might be interested to participate in the whole effort to form a broad front, would come together in Cape Town and debate the issue of National United Democratic Front. That of course would have entailed all the other details relating how to work towards that. As I understood it, it also had as its mandate to go to those parts of the country where there had not been contact between those who had been present at the meeting of the Anti-South African Indian Council, to talk (30)

to/...

to them about this idea and try to persuade them to set the process of forming regional united fronts in their own regions and also to persuade them to attend that national conference in Cape Town.

On this occasion at this meeting on 30 and 31 July, was an Interim Committee in fact appointed? -- Yes, it was.

Were you actually present at the time that the appointments were made? -- I was not present. I later got to know about that.

Where had you been? How come that you were not there (10) at that time? -- Your Lordship will recall that there was a video here presented to this Court showing that there was a meeting that launched the Soweto Youth Congress. I had gone to that meeting at the time.

Why had you gone there? For what purpose? -- I had been invited to read a draft constitution at that meeting.

For how long would you have been away from this meeting, this meeting of the interim group - sorry, let me get this correct. Was this on 30 or 31 July that you went to the SOYCO conference? -- It was on 31. (20)

And for approximately how long would you have been away from the interim group to attend the SOYCO conference? -- Making allowance for travelling I think I would have been away for about three to four hours, because I was using public transport.

When did you arrive at the SOYCO conference? Was that before or after lunch? -- I think it was just before lunch.

And did you get back to the UDF conference later that afternoon? -- Yes, I did.

That is the interim conference. I have called it (30)

the/...

the UDF conference, but it is the interim committee? -- That is right.

And in your absence had an interim committee in fact been appointed to take forward responsibilities for the national launch? -- That is so.

I understood you to say that you were appointed in your absence? -- Yes, I was.

Were you happy to be associated with the ^{new?} due initiative? -- Very much so.

Was there any discussion about how the United Democratic(10) Front on a national basis would be constituted? -- There was that discussion.

What was the thinking at that time? -- The thinking at that time was that it would comprise of regional formations and these regional formations comprising affiliates. I do not know if I am required to deal with the structure of the UDF. I do not quite understand ... (Mr Chaskalson intervenes)

We will deal with that much more - we will deal with that at the time of the launch, when it actually comes into existence, but at that time was there already a thought (20) that it should consist of regional structures who would constitute a united front around regional structures? -- That is correct.

How would the details going to be? Was there any idea of working out details of the structuring, greater details between the end of July and the date fixed for the launch? Was there anything to be done on that issue? -- My recollection is that each one of the regions was given a particular responsibility. It was given certain tasks to work towards that and of course there would be a get together from time to time.(30)

They/...

They would liaise amongst themselves to get reports of how far each had gone in terms of the report and that would be co-ordinated through the interim national committee.

We know that the United Democratic Front, as finally constituted, had a national executive committee? -- That is correct.

Was that discussed at this July meeting or was it something which took place later? The idea of a national executive committee? -- It was discussed on that day.

Was there any discussion about how the posts on the (10) national executive committee should be filled as between the different regions? -- That is so.

Can you just tell His Lordship very briefly what the thinking was then? -- The thinking was that each region would have a number of representatives in the national executive committee. If I recall correctly, it was stated that there would be two persons who would be regarded as vice presidents from regions and there would be another two who are simply regarded as members of the executive representing their own regions. Then there would be two secretaries (20) from the region becoming part of a national executive. These were now the people that each region would send as its own representative to serve in the national executive council. But then there would also be a national secretary as well as national publicity secretary, national treasurer, two national treasurers and a national president. Those would not be regarded as representatives of any region. So, they would simply be elected as office bearers and a consensus was expected to be reached on the names between regions.

At this gathering, was there any discussion about (30)

who/...

who might be the president, who might be a nominee for the president who would be acceptable for all three of the regions? -- There has been some suggestions.

Were the regions able to reach consensus on one president? -- No consensus was reached in that respect.

And ultimately was the solution - we know that there were apparently three presidents of the UDF? -- Yes, that was the position. In fact that was a compromise position, because there could not be an agreement reached on that. On the issue of the president. (10)

The date of 20 August, was that now a fixed date for the launch? -- That is so.

And you yourself were or had been appointed to the interim committee charged with some responsibility as far as this launch was concerned? -- I was.

Were you still in full time employment? -- That is so.

You later gave up full time employment and became a full time official of the United Democratic Front? -- That is correct.

When did you actually give up your full time employ- (20) ment? -- I gave up my full time employment at the end of August 1983.

So, you were still working for Kodak during August 1983? -- That is so.

Were you able to devote some time towards the planning, the advanced planning of the launch? -- It was really difficult because of my work commitments, but a few days before the launch I was given permission by my employers and I had at that stage been asked to become part of what was called the advance planning committee to finalise the details (30)

relating/...

relating to the launch of the UDF.

Did you go down to Cape Town before the 20th? -- That is correct.

What sort of things had to be dealt with from your point of view or plans had to be made? -- The plans related to really a number - there was a number of things that we really had to do there. The first obviously was getting a venue big enough to accommodate the expected numbers of people with the necessary facilities. There was the question of setting up the necessary little committees to ensure that people get accom-(10)modation, they get food when they get there, that there would be a committee that would deal with questions of credentials when people come to the conference, a committee that would deal with the media publicising the wholly band in that area. Really all kinds of logistical issues. That is really what we were really concerned with. That would also include of course the setting out, drafting of the program for the conference and the rally ensuring that when ultimately the conference meets, that there is a common draft declaration of the UDF that would be presented to the conference, that a (20) committee given the responsibility to work out the working principles, has done its work. Our task really was to ensure that all those things took place. At the same time ensuring that the department that had to do with national publicity for the campaign, such as the issuing of national statements, that was taking place. That the number of organisations that were invited - as many organisations as possible were invited to the conference and that also, the whole process of consultations with trade unions that had not been reached out to at that stage, is also taking place because at the time of (30) the/...

the launch there had still been a number of organisations that we had not consulted with. These are some of the things that we had really to deal with.

Did you have anything to do with the handling of the crowd that might be expected? -- Yes. The organisation of marshalls and discussion on how the marshalls would work setting up a legal team of lawyers.

Why did you need lawyers? -- We wanted to ensure that whatever we did was within the law, that whatever we did was lawful and we wanted to get legal advisers and when there (10) was a crisis that needed a legal person, we should have that.

We know that the launch - we know from the documents which had been produced, that the launch took place on 20 August 1983. The papers show a reference to what was referred to as a rally and also to the launch conference itself. Could you tell us first of all what the rally was? Was there any difference between the launch and the rally? Was there just one thing or was there more than one thing? If you would just make that clear to His Lordship? -- Yes, those were to different things. The conference, as the name itself suggests, (20) it is a business that involves serious discussions, involving delegates and observers. It is for a limited number of people. It deals with very crucial matters relating to how the organisation is going to function. I do not know if I have to go into those details at this stage.

COURT : The conference is for the working and the rally is for the shouting? -- Yes, the rally was really for everybody. Every Tom, Dick and Harry could come there. It was for the masses of people. They were two different things. They were not one and the same thing. (30)

MR CHASKALSON : When was the rally held? -- The rally was held on the evening after the conference, on the evening at the end of the conference. My recollection is that it was on Saturday, the 20th. On the same day.

So, the conference in fact took place during the day and then there was a big rally afterwards. Is that what happened? -- That is so.

Just to complete the picture, approximately how many people came to the rally? -- It is a bit difficult for me to say. There were so many thousands of people. What I am(10) saying here is going to be based on the estimates given by people who have experience in that connection. Various newspapers generally estimated the figures between 12,000 and 15,000. In fact, earlier than that the Rand Daily Mail had reported that there were 6,000 people, but the following day or the following edition said that there were 10,000 people. It had also changed later on. But my own estimation is that it would be between 12 and 15,000.

Was it a successful rally? -- It was very successful.

What sort of people were at the rally? From different(20) backgrounds or from the same background? -- What we could say is that that was a rally of the people of South Africa. White people were there, Coloured people were there, Africans, Indians, all of them came together in this massive event. All of them coming from different cultural backgrounds.

What was the atmosphere like at that rally? -- Well, there was a great enthusiasm really at that rally. People were very happy and they felt that this was a very, very historical, an important historical event and all of them participated in the rally with great enthusiasm. (30)

I would like you to look at EXHIBIT A1 please. First of all, can you tell us whether this was a document put out officially by the United Democratic Front itself? -- It is.

I would just to take you through parts of this exhibit. If you could turn to the introduction please. It refers in the introductory sentence to the "United Democratic Front having been launched at a mass rally of over 12,000 people in Mitchell's Plain, Cape Town on August, 29 1983." Is that the rally which you have just described to us? -- That is so. (10)

And then it says "Prior to the rally a conference of 2,000 delegates and observers from more than 500 organisations around South Africa adopted the national declaration which forms the basis for co-operation between organisations in the UDF." Is that the conference which you refer to as having preceded the rally? -- That is so.

The figure of 2,000 delegates, do you know, are you able to tell us whether that is accurate or not? -- I would say that it is accurate in the sense that this would have been drawn on the basis of the lists of people present. (20)

And there is a reference to delegates and observers from more than 500 organisations around South Africa. Again, were lists kept of the organisations that were represented at this conference? -- That is so.

And that figure of 500 organisations, are you able to say whether that is accurate or not? -- I would say it is accurate.

It says that the conference adopted the national declaration with forms the basis for co-operation between organisations in the UDF. I am going to ask you later in much more (30) detail/...

detail about the declaration, but was a declaration adopted at the conference? -- That is so.

Then the next statement says "A call for unity and joint action against the government's new divide and rule plans, was first made by Dr Allan Boesak on January, 23 1983 at a conference of the Anti-South African Indian Council, Anti-SAIC." You told us how you heard about Dr Boesak's call? -- Yes, I did.

At the discussions at which you took place in the Transvaal and at the meeting at which you took place from (10) representatives of other regions and at this mass, the conference itself, were these 2,000 delegates came together, was it ever suggested by anybody that the origin of the UDF was not Dr Boesak's call, but a call by Mr Oliver Thambo of the ANC? -- No. It was generally understood that the call for the United Democratic Front was made from the first instance by Dr Allan Boesak. It is not known of any other call by any other person.

At all these meeting where you took place in the discussions leading up to the formation of the UDF, these private (20) meetings and so on, was there ever any illusion to the possibility that this was not really Dr Boesak's call, but one of Mr Thambo and the ANC? -- That was never said.

At the time of the launch, did you have any particular responsibilities yourself? -- Yes, I did have. As a member of the advance planning committee, I had a whole range of things to attend to in the course of the conference and the rally.

Did that keep you occupied at all? -- That is so. I did get time on occasions to be part, to concentrate on (30) the/...

the conference.

You mean you were at the conference, but you had a lot of other responsibilities as well? -- That is so.

There has been a transcript produced in evidence which are EXHIBITS V1 AND V26 dealing, allegedly dealing with what was said on the occasion - on this occasion, the occasion of the launch and according to EXHIBIT V26 - it might be EXHIBIT V1, I might have it wrong, I am sorry, you are shown or you are recorded as having read out a program of action. -- That is so. (10)

Have you read that part of the transcript as far as it relates as to what you are recorded as having done on that occasion? -- I did read it some time, yes.

As far as it reflects what you are recorded as having said on that occasion, are you able to say whether that is correct or not? -- I am satisfied that that section is perfectly correct.

Are you able to say whether the rest of the recording is correct or not correct? -- I am unable to say it.

ASSESSOR (MR KRUGEL) : Are you now referring to EXHIBIT (20) V1?

MR CHASKALSON : Yes, V1.

ASSESSOR (MR KRUGEL) : Page?

MR CHASKALSON : He is shown at page 68 as having read out the program of action.

COURT : So, only page 68 is correct?

MR CHASKALSON : Let us get this correct. You say as far as it records what you are recorded to have said, you are satisfied that it is correct? -- That is so.

As far as the rest is concerned, are you able to (30)

say/...

say whether it is correct or incorrect? -- I am not in a position to say whether it is correct or incorrect. I simply do not know. I have already indicated that I had a whole range of things to attend to and I was not in a position to pay full attention to everything that was said.

Are you able to remember what speakers said on the occasion of the launch and if you are asked what different speakers said, could you give what your recollection was? -- I can simply give a gist of what they said. I cannot say everything that they said. (10)

If we could go to page 68 of EXHIBIT VI. Immediately before the passage to which you have drawn our attention - to which your attention was drawn where you read out the program of action, it is recorded that you had been elected to the position of national secretary. Is that correct? -- That is correct.

Were you so elected? -- I was.

Had you been spoken to beforehand about taking up that position? -- Yes, I had been spoken to beforehand.

And were you quite willing to take those responsibilities? -- Well, initially I had a lot of reluctance. I was reluctant to do so. I did not want to, but I was persuaded in the course of time to accept it. (20)

And by the time you got to Cape Town, were you willing to take that position? -- Yes, I was.

You mentioned that you had a certain reluctance. Was there any particular reason why you were reluctant to take that position? -- My initial reaction to that was first that I felt that I did not have the necessary experience to handle that kind of a job. I felt that it was just too big a (30)

job/...

job for me. Secondly because I felt that it was really going to make it difficult for me to participate in the activities at a local level. Most of the time I would be really expected to be looking at broad national issues. I think that that was really my concern at that stage.

I think you told us earlier you were born in 1952? -- That is so.

So, you would have been approximately 31 years old at the time of the launch? -- In 1983? That is so. I am not very good at arithmetic. (10)

It is also late in the day. You were asked according to the speaker immediately before your reading out the program of action, it says "I am asking Popo to read the last half of it. It has been recommended by the secretariate for acceptance and implementation by region." There are a number of questions I would like to ask you. First of all the secretariate, what was that? -- I think what this person really wanted to say was it has been recommended by the joint secretariate, that is secretaries from structured regions of the UDF, the two secretaries from Natal, the two (20) secretaries from the Transvaal and the two secretaries - have I counted all the regions? Natal, Western Cape and the Transvaal.

There were only three regions at that time? -- Yes, but this was not in terms of the UDF national. This is not really what we know today or at least at the time of our arrest as the national secretariate of the UDF. It was simply a coming together of secretaries from those regions. It is what one can call joint secretariate.

Who were the secretaries from the Transvaal? -- I was (30)
one/...

one of them. The other one was Mohammed Vali.

So, you were a member of that joint group? -- That is correct.

And it says that it has been recommended by the secretariate for acceptance. Was it in fact discussed by the joint group? -- That is so.

Is the statement that it is recommended for acceptance and implementation by regions correct or not? -- Could you repeat the question?

The statement that the working program, the program (10) of action, has been recommended by the secretariate for acceptance and implementation by the regions, is that a correct statement? Had you discussed it and had you recommended it? -- That is correct.

It says that you read out the last section. Would you like to just read out that section which is in the transcript which you have confirmed as correct? Perhaps I should read it because you are coughing a lot. It begins "It is my wish that in bringing these programs of action, I do not raise any controvercies. We are actually here moving against time.(20) That is why I am going to choose to read the last few parts, which is the objectives of the campaigns and the tasks." Can you just comment on that? What is this a reference to, you moving against time? -- At that stage - may be I should start by saying this. When we planned the conference we seemed to have bitten more than we could chew. We had planned that by certain time the conference would be over and then the rally would take place, but the discussions that took place within the conference, indicated very clearly that we were wrong in estimating that. In fact the discussions (30) dragged/...

dragged longer than we had expected. As a result of that we became late. The time was against our plans. Because of that it was impossible for me to read the whole document as it were and it was suggested that I should read those aspects that were regarded as crucial, the thrusts and objectives of the program.

You said you were going to read the objectives of the campaign and the tasks and you say the objectives of the campaign and it is "To oppose the constitutional bills and any election emerging therefrom, to oppose the Koornhof (10) bills and any election emerging therefrom, to mobilise every section of our people into the front, to educate people about dangers from the proposals and the need for unity in action, to promote democratic consultation and participation throughout the campaign, to encourage co-operation and united action between all sections against co-operation." do you think that word "co-operation" is the right word or not? -- I am not sure, I think it should be against the constitutional proposal. It is a typing error.

Perhaps we can let you listen to the tape again. We (20) can make some arrangement for you to hear it and you can tell us whether it is right or not. We will try and do that before your evidence-in-chief is finished. Then under the heading tasks "To establish the United Democratic Front as the only representative front representing all sections of our people. (2) To popularise the UDF within and outside the country. (3) Mobilise all organisations and communities into the UDF. (4) Establish UDF branches throughout the country. (5) Implement door to door campaigns throughout the country. (6) Encourage the strengthening of all grass-(30) roots/...

roots democratic organisations, community and other barriers" and then you say "sorry, sorry, I jumped one line" and then you read again. "Encourage the strengthening of all grass-roots democratic organisations. (7) Promote meaningful co-operation in united action across all communities and barriers. (8) Ensure democratic participation and consultation and all aspects of the campaign." Those were the passages from the program of action that you read out? -- That is correct.

K804 I would like to show you EXHIBIT AL3. That is an (10) exhibit headed "Program of Action." Is that the document from which you were reading at the time? -- It is a similar document.

You say that you - when you commenced you say that you were going to leave out a part of it and read the rest of it. If we look at EXHIBIT AL3 we will see there what has been left out? There seems to be an preamble which begins "All sections of oppressed South Africans will be affected by the bills, workers, students, rural and urban communities, African, Coloured and Indian" and it carries down - it is (20) really a fairly short introduction. Is that the part which is left out? -- That is correct.

I would like you to go back to EXHIBIT A1 please. The introductory section. In the fifth paragraph of the introduction there is a reference to "It was resolved at the founding conference to fight both the nationalist government's new constitutional bill as well as the Koornhof bills. It was felt that, taken together, these two areas of legislation carried within them, the main thrust of the new style apartheid, the attempted co-optation of certain middle-class (30) Coloureds/...

Coloureds and Indians and the enforcement of harsh controls over the African working class." It is referred to as the new style apartheid. Are you able to say or express any view as to why that language might have been used? -- Yes.

Could you explain very briefly why it is regarded as a new style apartheid? -- Previously the apartheid system had outrightly excluded the Coloureds, Indians and African people from the constitutional processes of this country. They were never allowed to participate in anything that was near to parliament, but in terms of this new constitution, whilst (10) the overall apartheid system was to be retained, the Coloured and Indian communities were granted some kind of a token vote that will make it possible for them to sit in some form of parliament, which themselves remain separate from the central government of the country, but they were by no means the same as the kind of structures they had had in the past. Apartheid was to be retained but in a much more subtle form.

When you talk about apartheid to be retained, will you describe what you understand by apartheid in that context? (20) What do you have in mind as having been retained? -- The fact that White people cannot be together in one parliament with other races. Even when they were given that tri-cameral parliament, the tri-cameral parliament itself suggested that apartheid must be maintained. It means you will be there with your own affairs, those there with their own affairs, we as White people would have our own affairs, but in addition to that, we will control all matters of importance. Matters of policy, matters relating to foreign affairs, national budget, defence, security and so on. (30)

Why/...

Why would that be in the control of the Whites? -- To attempt to deal with the provision of the new constitution. The ratios provided by the new constitution were formulated such that the White people would always be in the majority. The new constitution also provided that the State President will have the powers that transcend all limits. He can veto any decisions. In the President's council a body that was set up to deal with conflicts that might have arisen in different houses of parliament, that ratio of White majority, of four is to two, is two to one. That four White for every (10) two Coloureds and four Whites for every one Indian, was to be retained. When you look at that structure, those ratios by themselves without looking into any other sophisticated aspect of the new constitution, it makes it patently clear that the White people will remain dominant.

As far as apartheid structures were concerned, are there other structures which you would regard as structures of apartheid which are going to remain in place notwithstanding the new constitution? -- The new constitution was going to retain the group areas. It was going to retain the home-(20) lands. It was going to retain separate urban areas for African people with their own local authorities. It was going to retain the influx control, harsh influx control system. All those things were going to be part of this constitutional proposal. There was no way in which it was promising to end all those things.

What about education? -- Education will remain inferior. Black people would remain subjected to conditions of, deplorable conditions in the townships. The housing shortage that existed in the country would continue. All those things (30) would/...

would remain, but there would be a new constitution in which the Coloureds and Indians will be participating very next to the White representatives, the White parliament.

If you look at the six paragraph of the introduction it says that the "UDF campaign will focus attention on their own democratic and authoritarian way in which the nationalist government's new deal is being imposed on the people of South Africa. As a minimum demand the UDF has called for all political prisoners to be released or individuals and political organisations to be unbanned and for the return of all (10) exiles before a democratic constitution can be drawn up by all South Africans." I am going to ask you to comment on that paragraph and there are really two statements in it. The first statement is that the new deal is being imposed by the government in an undemocratic and authoritarian way. Can you comment on that? -- The new constitution was formulated by the nationalist party government. They said they discussed what they thought would be the best constitution for the country. The constitution that could maintain the relations of domination that existed in the country. When (20) that new constitution was formulated, the majority of the people in this country, both Coloureds, Indians and Africans were not consulted, they were not asked for their views as to what is the kind of a new South Africa you want. What is the type of constitution that you think can best serve the interest of the people of South Africa. That was not done. The nationalist party arrogated to itself the power to decide for everybody and then they came with that new constitution and they imposed it on the people of South Africa. That constitution also, I have already pointed out that it gives (30) the/...

the State President powers that nobody else could do anything about. In that sense therefore I find the word, the description given to the new constitution here to be very correct.

Do you know whether at that stage there was any suggestion about establishing the views of the Indian or Coloured communities in regard to the proposed constitution? We are talking now about August 1983. Had there yet been any talk about whether the views of the Indian or Coloured communities were going to be assessed in any way with regard to the constitution? -- Oh, yes, there had been a talk of a referendum (10) where the attitude of the Indian and Coloured South Africans will be clustered in respect of the new constitution.

Was in fact such a referendum ever held? -- It was never held.

As far as the African section of the community was concerned, was there ever any suggestion of ascertaining its views in regard to the proposed constitution? -- The attitude of the - that was never suggested. The attitude of the government had always been that Africans have got a vote in homelands and their issue does not warrant any attention (20) except participation in local government. I remember very well a statement made by the late Deputy Minister, Mr John Wiley when he was asked about the possibility of a fourth chamber. His attitude was very clear that there is no place for a Black person in the White parliament in this country. The message was loud and clear. Similar statements were made by other people, including the leader of the nationalist party in Transvaal, Dr De Klerk and many others.

The second part of the statement in that sixth paragraph, deals with what the UDF puts as a minimum demand. "It is (30)

called/...

called for all political prisoners to be released, for individuals and political organisations to be unbanned and for the return of all exiles before a democratic constitution can be drawn up by all South Africans." Can you please comment on that? -- As we understand it, those organisations that are banned and individuals who are jailed and those who are in exile, all of them are people to whom these things - people and organisations, to whom these things happened, because they spoke out against the policies of apartheid. They were forced into exile, by the implementation of the policies (10) of apartheid. We believe that if a new constitution has got to be established, has got to be formulated, one that would accommodate all the South Africans, it must also recognise that those people have got a crucial role to play in the formulation of that constitution and they too are part of this country. They belong here. They must be allowed the opportunity to come back and participate in processes which lead to the formulation of that constitution. It is particularly crucial that those people participate because the raging violence that is taking place in this country (20) is so taking place because at a particular point in time they had reached the stage that the government had closed all avenues through which they could articulate aspirations of the oppressed people. They also did that because they believed that - they honestly believed that apartheid is a simply unacceptable, they were not prepared to submit to apartheid and this is the reason why there is no peace in the country today. We are simply saying that the necessary conditions have got to be created if a proper constitution has got to be formulate acceptable to all the people of (30)

South/...

South Africa and that one would be based on the principle of non-racialism.

At the second page of the introduction, it is actually the page numbered 3, there is a reference to the UDF campaign will be conducted on a number of levels. On a national level the UDF will challenge the new constitution, through meetings, rallies and media, drawing together as many different organisations as possible in a campaign to demonstrate the overwhelming rejection of all forms of apartheid both old and new. The main purpose of the UDF campaign, however, will (10) be at the local and regional levels, organisations affiliated to the UDF will run campaigns around certain aspects of the new constitution that affect their membership in a direct way. This is to ensure that the UDF does not simply become a political protest group, but is able to build and strengthen non-racial democratic organisations as an alternative to apartheid itself. Thus for example campaigns have already been planned against community councils and Black Local Authorities in all African townships. These institutions are a particular example of the way in which the nationalist(20) government's new deal will adversely affect the majority of South Africans. Other local campaigns involve organisations against removals in the Northern Cape, the incorporation of Lamontville and other townships into Kwa-Zulu, the removal of the people of Crossroad to Kaialitsha, low wages, high rents, inadequate public transport, gutter education, lack of child care facilities, in fact around any aspect of apartheid that affects people's daily lives. I am going to later in your evidence take you in some detail through the various issues which are referred to as being of concern (30) to/...

to the United Democratic Front and ask you to explain why they were of concern and what you hoped to do about them. So, I do not want to deal with that now. What I would like to ask you at this stage is why you saw - first of all, can I ask you this. Does this correctly reflect the thinking of the UDF at the time of the launch? The passages I have just read out to you? -- I have a bit of a difficulty, because of this I lost track of what counsel was reading. I was looking at a different page.

COURT : What counsel wants to know is whether what is read(10) out here, that is this - let us take the whole of the introduction in EXHIBIT A1. Does that reflect the thinking of the UDF at the time of the launch? -- That is so.

MR CHASKALSON : And part of that thinking as recorded at page 3 of the introduction, is to demonstrate the overwhelming rejection of all forms of apartheid both old and new by means of meetings, rallies, media and the like. Can you explain why that was seen as important? -- Does the question require me to deal with why the methods were considered important or why exposing all forms of apartheid was necessary. I am(20) not sure what I am required to do.

Let me make it clearer what I would like you to deal with. I would like you to deal with why it was seen necessary to demonstrate the rejection of apartheid? We will deal later with the methods, but I would like to know why you thought, why it was thought that there was importance in making this demonstration through meetings, rallies and media? How you sought to do it, I will deal with a little later, but why it was seen as important to do that? -- From the outside the question of the new constitution and the (30)

Koornhof bills and the question of apartheid per se was regarded as a very serious matter by those who love democracy and who love peace. I mean the UDF in this instance and we believed at that time that when the government formulated its proposals for the new constitution and the concomitant bills it was doing it on the basis that, on the belief, that in the belief that it is something that the oppressed people, something that would be acceptable to the oppressed communities. We believed that if the contrary was demonstrated to the government, the attitude of the government in respect of (10) the new constitution and the Koornhof bills would change. Therefore, it was very, very crucial for us to demonstrate this massive rejection because we wanted to persuade the government to abandon the course that it was taking. We believed that that course was a disastrous one and we honestly believed that that was possible if a massive shore of support was demonstrated. I think the reason was to persuade the government not to go ahead with the proposals for reform.

WITNESS STANDS DOWN.

COURT ADJOURNS UNTIL 4 AUGUST 1987.

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-I2-13-248

Document Title:- Vol 248 p 13168-13209