

MEMORANDUM OF M. E. DIEDERICKS. DET/SGT.

This witness testifies to two meetings, Nos. 534 & 535, pp. 7325 (V.37) and 7670 (V.39). Both these meetings were recorded by a tape recorder, and meeting No. 534 is one that is referred to by Adv. Pirow when he read portion of Resha's speech, which contained the "murder, murder" there. (See Coaker's memo, p.20) It is not my function in these notes to comment on the speeches themselves and the interpretation to be placed thereon, but it does seem that if the whola of the speech is taken into consideration that portion which refers to the necessity to be violent, if necessary to "murder, murder" does not necessarily carry the sinister interpretation which the Crown endeavours to place on it.

The only comment I have to make in regard to the tape recording is (a) that the machine appears on two occasions to have developed a fault and the tape was silent on each such occasion, and (b) that it has been conceded by Det. Vlok and Dt. Swanepoel, pp. 7293 to 7297 (v.37) ^{that it is possible to falsify tape recordings,} 7316 (V.37), (c) that as protection is afforded the accused against such falsification as is done and required when offences under the Gold and Diamond Laws or under the Foods & Drugs Act, s 7297 to 7299 and 7318 to 7320 (V.37),

If necessary expert evidence should be obtained to establish the fact that tape recordings can be tampered with and falsified. Statements from the accused and other speakers at this meeting have, however, not as yet been taken, and I do not know therefore whether they admit or repudiate the accuracy of the recording.

Re Meeting No. 535:

I am not in possession of the transcript, Ex. G. 1155, and am therefore not in a position to offer any comments in regard to this meeting, other than to point out that the witness has stated that the tape-recording itself is no longer available because the words of the speakers have been erased from the tape in order to use the tape for other recordings. p. 7671 (V.39). Objection was taken by the defence to the production by the Crown of the transcript but this was overruled.

N.B. The Roll Call of delegates as reported on Ex. G. 1089 is not in all respects the same as that reported on Ex. G. 1090, both of which exhibits refer to the same meeting. The reason for the difference is not clear to me and was not explored at the P.E.
Cf 1089 and 1090 p.1.

Collection: 1956 Treason Trial
Collection number: AD1812

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand

Location:- Johannesburg

©2011

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.