

Pardon? --- That is correct.

Did you never tell him that you were working on this project? --- I don't remember specifically.

Would you have kept a thing like that from him? --- Not on purpose.

Are you suggesting that he had no knowledge of it? --- As far as I can remember I never discussed it with him.

So this was a little thing, a little scheme which you and Leftwich - I am sorry - you and Schneider were working  
10 entirely on your own. Is that correct? --- It was a line of inquiry which we were ... (ends answer).

A line of inquiry, suggested by whom? --- Mr. Schneider.

HIS LORDSHIP: What is the number?

MR. SNITCHER: (CONT.) Just have a look at C 66, Miss van der Riet. You are not suggesting - before you look at this document - that any person, I want to understand you clearly now, outside you and Schneider had any idea that this project was being worked on. Is that correct? --- To the best of my knowledge, no.

20 What do you think would have been the reaction, as you know people, you have seen some of the other accused in the dock here - I am talking now of yesterday, they pleaded guilty to some charges - take a man like Trew, did you know Trew? --- Not very well.

But you knew him didn't you? --- Not in the organization.

But you met him, isn't that so? --- I have met him.

What do you think their reaction might have been, of some of your members might have been if they had suddenly been told that you are now going to embark on a campaign of  
30 bacteriological warfare? --- May I define bacteriological warfare?

HIS LORDSHIP: Yes, certainly you may.



introduce  
 --- The idea was to use/bacteria which would not be pathological to human beings, which would only affect plants and trees.

And cattle as well? --- That was not our intention.

Sometimes sheep? --- That was an example of foot and mouth bacillus and the sort of thing that I was trying to get Mr. Schneider to look for also.

The foot and mouth bacillus? --- May I make myself clear please?

10 Yes? --- When he asked me about this bacteria he offered to help me. He had no idea about bacteria, he asked me to give him an example of what one looked for in a bacteria.

I see, yes. --- I then wrote out - we had been discussing foot and mouth, he had seen a film in which foot and mouth disease featured, and just as a matter of interest, taking any bacteria, I gave him an example as to moisture as to what it affects, that would be the cattle and sheep. It is not that we planned to attack cattle and sheep.

MR. SNITCHER: (CONT.) Hadn't the idea of foot and mouth disease  
 20 entered your mind at all as being possible, you see this document C 66 actually deals with it properly now, actually deals with foot and mouth disease, isn't that so? --- As I tried to explain that was an example of a bacteria.

Assuming somebody had suggested the introduction of foot and mouth disease into the cattle population of this country, would you have objected strongly to that? --- I think so.

Why? --- That was not the sort of thing which we were attempting to do.

But the vineyards you might attempt to do? --- Yes.

30 What is the difference? --- Well, probably logically not very much, it is just that I preferred not to do the other.

I couldn't hear that answer? ---



HIS LORDSHIP: Logically not very much. It is like vegetarians, eat the heart out of the lettuce but not out of the animal.

MR. SNITCHER: But in principle, as far as you were concerned with your frame of mind, your dedication, your loyalty to this organization, as far as you were concerned you had no objection in principle towards this form of bacteriological warfare, let me call it by its name? --- It is very difficult to make principles in this instance as the practical applications are sometimes a bit different from the principles one had in mind.

10 May I just make one thing very clear. At all times all of us were very reluctant about what we were doing, including explosives, the whole lot. In fact it was often mentioned at the Planning Committee meetings and they often discussed it, so that that is a more accurate background to our feelings.

You mean you would have liked to dissolve the whole organization? --- We would have liked to feel that it was not necessary.

You certainly did this, is that correct? You went into this? --- I went into that.

20 Let me give you another little thing that you became interested in. Sorry, My Lord. Will you mind giving the witness C 42, Mr. - Just look at C 42, Miss van der Riet, that is your handwriting, isn't that so? --- That is correct.

Will you just tell us, let's get it a bit clearer, what does it deal with? I have a photostat copy which is very obscure, just read it out please? --- My photostat copy is equally unclear.

30 Give her the original please. My Lord, it is one of the unfortunate processes of modern civilization having to rely on these photos, they are very difficult to follow. Just read that to us please? --- Does the gentleman want me to read it out word for word?

*General Reluctance*



I want you to read out the document, if you don't mind, just read the opening lines of it, what does it say? "Wemmershoek, Cape Town and 14 other centres applied."

Carry on? --- "Earth embankment - I can't make out the next word (Reads EXH. C 42) .... from 34 square miles ... it is 200 feet above ground level and 250 feet above underlying rock. It comprises jetted alluvial.."(interrupted)

Then you go on to say ... (His Lordship interrupts)

HIS LORDSHIP: Comprises of what? --- Jetted alluvial film  
10 or something.

MR. SNITCHER: What does that mean? --- I don't know.

Where did you get this from? --- I think it was a Municipal bulletin.

Does Your Lordship know what it is?

HIS LORDSHIP: Yes, I know a lot about it. The alluvial was jetted in with strongwater jets.

MR. SNITCHER: Then he talks of the turbines and all that sort of stuff, it is a very full description of the whole of Wemmershoek, is that so? --- Yes.

20 At whose suggestion was this little investigation undertaken? --- Mr. Schneider.

Did Mr. Leftwich know about this? --- To the best of my knowledge not.

So he couldn't have known about this at all, is that correct? --- That is my impression.

HIS LORDSHIP: I don't understand and I never understood before, what are you inquiring into Wemmershoek for, were you going to upset the Government. What were you wanting to do with Wemmershoek to find out these details of the construction and  
30 its foundation and how much water? --- As Mr. Schneider explained it to me, that he wanted information as detailed as possible about reservoirs, certain public buildings and that



sort of thing.

What did he want the information about reservoirs, he wasn't interested in water business? --- He never explained to me why, but one thing was very clear, that we were not going to blow them up. In the first place we had not the knowledge, in the second place we would probably never have enough dynamite. It would take very large quantities. It was purely (His Lordship interrupts)

Can you suggest one single reason to me, why an organization such as yours would have wanted details of reservoirs other than either destroying them or polluting them? --- I am afraid I can't.

Nor can I think of another. Yes, Mr. Snitcher?  
MR. SNITCHER:(CONT.) I want to suggest to you that <sup>that</sup> according to your evidence was kept locked up as between you and Schneider, isn't that so? --- It was not meant to be kept locked up, it was being inquired into.

You say as far as you are concerned Mr. Leftwich didn't know anything about this? --- To the best of my  
 20 knowledge not.

Did you ever discuss it with him? --- Not as far as I remember.

You never mentioned it to him that you were engaged in this inquiry or in this investigation? --- I don't remember anything like that.

You don't remember? --- I don't remember mentioning it to him, My Lord.

What would his reaction have been, again I want to know, you were very intimate with him, if you had mentioned it to  
 30 him? --- I could not say what his reaction would be.

What was his attitude, I want to know, to this whole question of sabotage at this particular stage? What was

*Does this document figure in our case?*



Leftwich's attitude? --- I think roughly the same as all our attitudes.

At this stage, in this particular stage of the organization - this was all done during this year, isn't that so? --- Yes.

Yes, and so was the foot and mouth disease thing done this year, isn't that so? --- I think so.

That is correct. Again you are not suggesting that any member outside you and Schneider had any knowledge of this at all? --- No.

Very well. There is another document that puzzles me somewhat, look at C 58. I am very puzzled about this document, perhaps you can help us C 58, it is a typed document which is headed "Fluoridation, Rat Poison, do we want it?" Do you know anything about that? --- Nothing whatsoever.

Have you seen this, has it been shown to you? --- By the Police.

Can you cast any light on it? --- None whatsoever. I too am very interested toknow.

20 You see I have read the document, it sounds to me, with all respect a lot of balder dash, doesn't it sound that to you as well? --- Yes.

Suggesting that fluoridation is a great communist plot or something, to try and poison the whole of mankind? --- That is my impression.

That is what it said. I want to know whether there was anybody in your organization which having read this might have thought that we should now advocate fluoridation because it is a form of rat poison and therefore we might hurt the people of South Africa that way. That is the only sort of thought that can pass through ones mind? --- No, My Lord.

30 That was never discussed with you? --- No.



Who do you think would have compiled a document like this? --- I have not the slightest idea.

Schneider perhaps? --- I don't think so.

Watson? --- I really couldn't say.

I take it Mr. Leftwich wouldn't have compiled this, would he? --- I don't think so.

Miss van der Riet, I'll come back to this a bit later, I want to get on to another incidence at the moment. You have told us that with regard to the June 18th and 19th incidents you - there was some intimation was given from Johannesburg that pylons have got to be blown up in Cape Town. Is that correct? --- All I knew was that pylons were going to be blown up in Johannesburg, too.

To coincide with what was happening in Johannesburg, that is what you understood, is that correct? --- That is correct.

Did you know how it had come down here, this idea that it should coincide with Johannesburg? --- No.

Very well. You remember that you and Leftwich and Adrian, and Spike and De Keller, accused No.2, you met each other before actually the job was done on the night of June the 18th and 19th. Is that correct? --- That is correct.

You met at Le Riche, do you remember that? There is a cafe called Le Riches in Rose-bank or rather Rondebosch? --- I don't remember that specifically.

But do you remember being to that cafe quite a bit, haven't you? --- Yes, but not with Adrian and Spike.

I see. You may have been there alone with Leftwich, but at any rate you remember going in a car with the two of them prior to this job on June the 18th and 19th. Do you remember that? --- With the two of them I went on a few reces to this pylon.

10  
Johannesburg  
bombings



That is right. I want to suggest that Spike will say that it was only once he went on a recce with you, he may have gone with other people as well but the three of you went one evening to go and inspect the site before the job was done. Is that correct? --- I remember that specific instance.

I think it was the night before possibly? --- I couldn't say.

But it was in that order, is that correct. Very well.

10 I just want to put it to you, do you remember that you people were sitting in the car, even before, I can't remember the exact details of where it was, but whilst you were in the car do you recollect a discussion taking place between De Keller and Leftwich about whether this thing should be done at all? Do you remember that? --- I think so, yes, My Lord.

Yes. Of course you remember, just try and remember please. I am on the 18th and 19th charge. Do you remember that De Keller at that time discussed this matter with Leftwich in order to try to suggest to him that this whole thing should  
20 be given up. Do you remember that? --- I remember a discussion in which Mr. De Keller suggested that pylons should be dropped. as a project, he objected to it,

He objected to them, very well. That is correct. I want to put to you the reason, just try and remember, I'm sure you will if you will just try and remember. Do you remember De Keller, do you mind - let's call him Spike and Adrian because that is the way you spoke to each other at the time, isn't that so? I want to try and get the atmosphere of this. Do you remember that Spike said to Leftwich - this is a brief  
30 summary of it - that he said that he objected or he thought that this whole thing should be dropped. Is that correct? --- Yes.

That is so. I want to suggest to you that these were the



reasons that he gave. Just listen carefully. Did he say to you that he felt that he was being used by people whose decisions he had no chance of influencing. Do you remember that? --- Yes, I do remember that.

And that he objected to the whole non democratic framework of the organization, do you remember that? --- I remember something like that.

Something to that effect, he said that he was just a tool and he objected to being just used in that sense. Is that correct? --- Yes.

The next one, do you remember him saying to Leftwich that he felt that sabotage was as a form of protest, was completely ineffective and was having an adverse effect both on the public and the Government. Do you remember him saying that? Such a discussion taking place? --- I remember, I think I remember him saying that sabotage was ineffective, but I don't think I remember that he said anything about having an adverse effect.

But he thought the whole thing was silly, was ineffective is that so? --- That was the general impression, as far as I can remember.

Yes, that is correct. I want to suggest a third one. He went on to say, didn't he, Miss Leftwich - I mean, I am sorry, Miss van der Riet, he went on to say that he also felt that this whole thing on which this organization was engaged was only bringing about more stringent<sup>and</sup>/suppressive legislation, isn't that what he was saying to you? Do you remember him saying that? --- It is possible that he said it, I don't remember it specifically.

But I mean you have a feeling that he did say it? --- I think so.

You think so. I want to give you another reason which is



very important. Do you remember him saying to Leftwich that the at that time Minister of Justice, Mr. Vorster, had publicly intimated that he was seriously considering repealing the 90 day law, and De Keller said to Leftwich, "look, I think we should stop this because it could only afford a justification for a further continuance of it." Do you remember that being discussed? --- Once again, it is vaguely at the back of my mind. I do not remember specifically, it is possible. I remember something like that.

10 Do you remember something along those lines? --- Yes.

You remember there was some discussion about the 90 day law, is that correct? --- I don't remember that.

Was there some mention of it? --- It is possible.

You have some vague recollection that it was, is that correct? --- Yes.

At any rate, De Keller was voicing his objections to all this, is that clear? --- Yes.

And Leftwich, Mr. Leftwich, he brushed them aside, isn't that so? --- I think there was a discussion.

20 What was Mr. Leftwich's attitude about this? Adrian's attitude? --- Once again I don't remember, I would not have remembered this conversation had the gentleman not mentioned it, I do not remember specifically what Mr. Leftwich said.

But Leftwich is a very - I mean as you know him he is a kind of fellow who once he has embarked upon a scheme he doesn't lightly go off it, isn't that so? He is quite a determined fellow, isn't that so? --- Provided he believes in it.

Pardon? --- Provided he believes in it.

30 Yes I know, if he believes in a thing firmly then he is determined to go through with it, is that correct? --- Yes. I found him very open to objections and suggestions.



What was your reaction to Spike's suggestion? --- I don't remember having said anything specifically.

Is it possible that you may have reacted against it, at that time you were very dedicated and very loyal, isn't that so? --- Yes.

You remember that Spike mentioned something on that occasion and Adrian said "look here, why are you starting all this again, you told me that for a whole year nothing more was going to happen?" --- No, I don't remember that.

10 And that you then expressed surprise to Leftwich why you had not been informed about that decision? --- No.

Is that possible? --- I don't remember that at all.

Is it possible? --- I don't know, I don't remember it.

You don't remember it. I want to go a bit further. Didn't you indicate at that stage to Spike, you know when this discussion was taking place, that he was the chicken? --- Possibly jokingly, I would never have said that seriously.

You see - you don't deny it? --- If I said it, and I don't remember ...(interrupted)

20 You don't deny it - you see if De Keller says that he had this discussion with Leftwich, he had very serious doubts and very serious misgivings about the thing, Leftwich was very determined to go through with it, you say jokingly, but leave out the jokingly, and he says that you indicated to him that he was being a chicken, being a coward? (interrupted)

HIS LORDSHIP: How can the witness possibly go further than she has done? She says "I had no recollection of saying anything of the kind, if I did say anything of the kind it could only have been a joke, it is not the sort of thing I could say seriously." What more could you ask her? What could she say?

30

MR. SNITCHER: What more could she say with regard to what?



HIS LORDSHIP: What more could she say in answer to the line of questioning?

MR. SNITCHER: I want her to say a little bit more.

Miss van der Riet, would you deny that you said to him that he was being chicken or cowardly or something, not the word chicken possibly, but that he was a coward and that he was trying to pull out? --- May I say most emphatically that I regard the fact that I said it jokingly as very important, because I think if I had made such a statement it could be  
10 ignored altogether. I would never have meant that seriously.

You would never have ? --- I would never have meant that statement seriously.

Why not? --- I would just not have felt that way about a person who had that attitude.

Is that so? --- Yes.

I want to suggest to you, you see, I am going to show you how strong your determination was at the time, I want to suggest to you that by this time the organization had dropped to only a handful of people and there was really nobody left  
20 who could do these jobs? --- I did not know that.

You didn't know that. Well, you see there was an expedition that night, one of them - on two of them there were you, Spike and Adrian, is that so? --- That is correct.

And another one that evening on which Schneider was engaged. Is that so? --- Is that the evening on which the pylons were going up?

Yes, I am talking about the pylons? --- Yes.

You see, so determined were you people about this, that when the one pylon on which Spike was engaged, you remember the  
30 one where you said he assisted Leftwich in attaching the charger. You remember that? --- Yes.



They didn't go off? --- That is correct.

What was your impression, why it didn't go off? --- We thought that something had gone wrong, it could have been the timing mechanism, it could have been a break in the circuit, anything could have gone wrong.

(CONT. ON PAGE 114)



Could it have been clumsily attached? ---- Anything would have been possible.

Anything would have been possible. And that thereafter you drove - he drove to the other pylon and you and Leftwich did the job? ---- That is correct.

But so determined were you about this that when you realised that it had failed to go off, you actually decided to go back a couple of nights later - is that so? ---- That is correct.

10        How many nights later did you go back? ---- I don't remember.

What would it be? Can you tell us? About two or three nights later? ---- It would have been on the Sunday evening that we did the second pylon.

That you did the second job; you were determined that this pylon had to be blown up, isn't that so? ---- May I explain my reasons, please? ---- We felt - we went back to this pylon immediate.... - I think about the next day afterwards to have a look as to whether there were any activities around  
20 it. We saw there were no people around it and we felt that the charges had not yet been discovered. It was then mentioned very strongly that people - there were lots of huts nearby - and some of the little African children might have got the charges - touched them and they might have gone off, or for that matter, any workmen walking past might have seen them. We felt that if possible, we had to go back and either remove the things or blow up the pylon. That was our reason for going back.

And then you saw in the paper - the way you described  
30 it yesterday - you saw in the paper that it had gone off and that satisfied you then? ---- Yes.

You didn't think of asking Spike to come along again



to put it off, is that so? ---- May I explain how we decided to do this job? Mr. Leftwich and I discussed it. We were completely uncertain about it and we just dropped the whole thing. Mr. Leftwich and Mr. Schneider saw one another the next day - this was the Sunday. They discussed it and they decided that we would do it. They then came to me and the three of us discussed it and we decided that we were going to do this job. Well, the three of us were together and we decided that we would go and do the job.

10 Now tell me this. Did Adrian have any knowledge - I want to ask you again - that you were engaged on bacteriological investigations? ---- To the best of my knowledge, no.

Now will you look at document D.1. Do you recognise that? ---- I've read this.

Do you recognise it? ---- That is correct.

Pardon? ---- I have seen it before.

You have seen it before? ---- Yes.

Where have you seen this before? ---- I think it was handed to me at some stage or another.

20 You were handed it when? ---- It was handed to me at one stage or another.

One stage or another? ---- Yes, I don't remember the specific instance, I don't even remember this document very well. Quite a few things that I've read now I don't remember very well.

There is something torn off at the top. Can you tell us? You see, it is headed D.1 - I am sorry - you see, this was found in your handbag? ---- That is correct.

Now you see - "... get all members to check their old  
30 places, if still O.K. and get the addresses and names of people from them as well as conditions of entry and any other circumstances peculiar to them, to suitable ones."



What did that refer to? --- I am not absolutely certain. I think I will take a guess that if people wanted to, as I explained yesterday, go underground, that each one of us had to try and get people who would be prepared to put this person up. And I think this probably referred to checking up whether the people were still prepared to do it.

You see, this was handed to you, isn't that so? ----  
That is correct.

It was in your handbag? ---- Yes.

10 It was part of your activities, isn't that so? ---- I don't think so because quite a number of these things I would not have had to do.

Well now, look at the next one. "Commence immediately a plan for emergency escape, including method of contact, pick-up and transport to H.I.O." What is that? ---- I do not know.

Also "Details for onward transport to Jo'burg which could be worked out by Reg." ---- I do not know anything about that.

Why was this document handed to you at all? ---- As I  
20 say, I don't even remember clearly when it was given to me.

"Establish close relations with doctor". Who is the doctor? Was there a doctor? ---- Yes.

Was that one of your duties? ---- Yes.

Yes. "Inform Reg. of the final and tight plans in this regard." Who is Reg.? ---- I think Reg. might stand for Regional.

Oh, Reg. is the Regional you think? ---- I interpret it in this sense, yes.

"Also Norman's position in relation to doctor - you  
30 cannot meet Norman." You didn't know who Norman was? -- No.

"Commence a first-aid course". Was that one of your jobs? ---- Yes.



"And prepare notes on the key things necessary for day-to-day F.A." What is that? "First-aid for distribution"? ----  
Yes.

Now "Bact." what did that stand for? ---- Bacteriologic-  
al, I take it.

"Work must be seen as a long-term project to be worked on continuously. Anne will work with you on escape." Who is Anne? ---- Miss McConkey.

"While she will work with Luke on act." What does 'act'  
10 mean? ---- I think action.

Now can you give us any idea where this document emanated from? ---- As far as I recall, it was given to me by Mr. Leftwich. As I say, these other things I have no knowledge of, and I do not know why I was given - these others I do have knowledge of and I can see that it is related to me.

I want to suggest to you that it was given to you because it affected some of your activities? ---- Some of them, yes.

Bacteriological work? ---- Yes, well, it is on this  
20 document.

And also the first-aid. Is that so? ---- Yes.

And you were supposed to work on escape? ---- Yes.

HIS LORDSHIP: I know you were dedicated but doesn't it all sound tragically silly when it is brought out in this Court?  
---- Yes.

All this stupid cloak-and-dagger stuff.

MR. SNITCHER: You see, what I am getting at is this, that at this particular time there was really just a handful of you, isn't that so? ---- It was my impression that we were only a  
30 few.

HIS LORDSHIP: But down to the hard core.

MR. SNITCHER: You see, if Leftwich had handed you this



document, you must have known that the bacteriological work was being gone into and discussed? ---- Reading this document, I draw the same conclusion, but I do not know of any specific discussions by them.

THE WITNESS STANDS DOWN.

THE COURT ADJOURNS AT 12.26 UNTIL 2.15 P.M.

---



ON RESUMING AT 2.15 p.m.

HIS LORDSHIP: Yes, Mr. Snitcher?

MR. SNITCHER: My Lord, that concludes my cross-examination.

LYNETTE VAN DER RIET, still under oath:

RE-EXAMINED BY MR. BEUKES: Just one question, My Lord.

You were asked about Watson, can you tell the Court more or less when did he leave this organization? --- At a rough guess I would say towards March, April 1963.

March, April 1963? --- Yes.

10 HIS LORDSHIP: You tell me that there is a lot in this organization that you don't know of? --- Yes, My Lord.

When you joined it I take it it was clear to you that you weren't to be told of everything that might go on? --- Yes.

I understood the whole structure of the organization was so that not every member would know everything that goes on? --- Yes, that is correct.

You wouldn't even know, and didn't even know how many people were involved? --- Oh yes.

You did know? ---No one did not know.

20 So that inspite of not knowing what excesses may be done in the name of this organization, you still joined it? --- Yes.

You knew its basic purpose was to achieve whatever it sought to achieve by violence? --- My Lord, possibly we interpreted violence differently. I think we had in mind a sort of restricted violence with no injuries.

Well now, there are things over there, the photographs we've had contained high explosives, could do a lot of damage.

You had it in your flat? --- Yes, My Lord.

30 You must have known it was highly dangerous stuff to have? --- Yes.

You must have known that in the hands of people, perhaps

*Judge or dangers*



not quite as dedicated or quite as responsible as you, a lot of damage could be caused by such material? --- Yes.

Inspite of that you were and remained a member? --- Yes.

You knew that although you were on the Planning Committee the real decision were taken on the Regional Committee? --- Yes, I think one more or less tried to find out as much as one could about the aims of the organization and one trusted in what one heard.

One had to trust? --- Yes.

10 Your's not to reason why, your's just to do and die? --- And to trust.

You joined it on? --- Yes, My Lord.

The high command was above you? --- Yes.

Any order you got you had to obey? --- Unless one specifically objected, one was free to disobey.

One was free to disobey? --- To my mind, yes, My Lord.

Is that what you were told the first night or the first day when you were talked into joining, that you could disobey whenever you felt? --- No, I was not told that but  
20 I made it very clear.

You made it clear? --- Yes.

In what way? --- I made it very clear that whenever I - something came up that I did not approve of I objected very strongly.

For instance, when you were on the Planning Committee makes it very different, but when an ordinary member was told that on such and such a night you had to report at such and such a time and you were then given a task, I presume such a member would be expected to do so? --- Yes.

30 that  
So/you took your High Command, whoever they were, you took them on trust? --- Yes.

Virtually gave him a blank cheque? --- Of necessity, yes.



Of the necessity the very nature of the organization commanded that? --- Yes.

And what you said to me about yourself, would that be basically true about all members? --- So I thought, yes.

So you thought? --- Yes.

You were not aware that your ranks were dwindling, it was put to you by Counsel that at the end there were only a few of you. Were you aware of that? --- No.

10 You had no reason to know that there was any general departure from the organization? --- No, My Lord

Have you any reason to believe that now? --- No.

As far as you know those who dedicated themselves to this task stuck with it? --- Yes.

Stuck by it? --- The only person of whom I knew that left was Mr. Schneider.

What is the other gentleman who talked you off? Mr. Watson, he thought you were tough enough? --- Yes.

20 And then Schneider came back, didn't he? --- Towards the end just before we were detained a few weeks before, Schneider left the organization completely.

You also knew that this thing was not localized in Cape Town? --- I knew there were branches in other places.

Did you know whether the High Command, if I may call it that, was in Cape Town or somewhere else? --- No, I did not know that.

So in joining it one undertook to take orders from whoever it came from? --- Yes.

And carry them out? --- If ones conscience allowed it, yes, My Lord.

30 And you say the little bit you remember from the conversation in the car, accused No.2 who was apparently not on any Committee as far as I know? --- No.



**Collection Number: AD1169**

**Collection Name: Alan Paton Papers, 1952-1988**

***PUBLISHER:***

*Publisher:* Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand

*Location:* Johannesburg

©2016

***LEGAL NOTICES:***

**Copyright Notice:** All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

**Disclaimer and Terms of Use:** Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document forms part of the archive of the South African Institute of Race Relations, held at the Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.