

LYBON TIYANI MABASA

Well-spoken and glib. A revolutionary, and wholly untrustworthy witness.

1. He is not as informed as he wants to make out. He does not even know what the Koornhoff bills are or their number.
2. He testified that AZAPO had four branches in the Vaal: Sebokeng, Zamdela, Boipatong and Sharpeville, but that the latter two had fizzled out by 1983/4. Accused no. 2 was the chairman of the Sebokeng branch.

This conflicts with accused no. 2's evidence. He stated that there were branches in Sebokeng, Bopelong, Boipatong and Sasolburg (Zamdela) but not in Sharpeville.

Both conflict with exh AB.14.

3. His attempts to explain the revolutionary language of AZAPO were not even ingenuous and were totally unconvincing. We have dealt elsewhere with the policy of AZAPO. His attempts to white wash it prove him a liar.
4. He blames the police for the riots in the Vaal and schools unrest elsewhere, without basis in fact.
5. His explanation of the preconditions to a national convention was unintelligible and evasive.

GEORGE MABENA

An untruthful witness.

1. He contradicted himself on whether a COSAS branch existed at Davey high school. He first said it did and later denied he had said so stating he had said Mabuya. If it is borne in mind that Davey high school was one of the leaders of the boycotts his denial of a COSAS branch there becomes significant.
2. His explanation of the complaint against the prefect system as a basis for a claim for SRC's shows there was no prefect system in existence.
3. He was vague - on the persons and circumstances surrounding this claim for SRC's to the headmaster.

4. His evidence of a spontaneous protest at Nyathi senior secondary school is in conflict with exh ABA.65 and the fact of the joining of the other schools and the demands on the placards which do not refer to the grievance about cleaning the school premises, but to universal demands only.
5. He is vague and evasive on who suggested that they go to Davey high school and who the leaders were.
6. He says the aim of the march was to go through the townships to impress the parents - but this was not discussed in advance. So we have the strange evidence: A protest at the school about cleaning the premises spontaneously becomes a march in the grounds against the age-limit and corporal punishment, which then spontaneously goes to Davey high school, which then spontaneously goes to Mabuya with the spontaneously formed intention to march around the township.
7. He contradicted himself on whether the pupils on the march sang "Come and join" or merely shouted it.
8. He first denied there was a fourth high school and later stated he had forgotten about Hulwazi high school.
9. His explanations on why he went to school on 10 August and 13 August are false. He clearly went to join a march.

10. His evasion of the fact that the second march (on 10 August) would inevitably lead to a confrontation with the police is obvious.
11. He gave contradictory versions on whether the police blocked their way on 9 August or 10 August and on whether he had said so before.
12. His evidence was contradictory on whether he knew the school would be boycotted on 13 August and on whether he noticed from the movement of children that there would be no school on 13 August 1984.

FINTA MAGCUNTSU

A witness who did not impress in the witness box. She is wholly untrustworthy.

1. She told the court in chief that she first met Bloem 2 or 3 days before the funeral of 18 February 1985. In cross-examination she said she had known him for years. He was a wood and coal hawker and she had bought from him.
2. She got mixed up and testified that accused No 20 spoke at the funeral on 21 February 1985.
3. She denies:
 - having seen any sign of political activity in the black township
 - having fore-knowledge of the march
 - hearing of agitation against councillors and the council system and the education system
 - having knowledge of the resignation of councillors.This is of course possible but hardly likely.

4. In chief she stated the children on the protest march sang *senzeni na*. In cross-examination she added *Nkosi*.
5. In evidence in chief she put the time between the protest march passing her home and the children returning running at 2 to 3 hours. In cross-examination it was about 1 hour.
6. She is very vague about the direction the looters took after they passed her house.
7. Her evidence is that Joseph Matches was not killed as one of the rioters - he was killed on the way from the golf-course (she heard). And Papi Makoko was also not killed on 11 February but on 18 February (she heard). Yet this evidence was never put to the two policemen who testified that the two killed in the riots were buried on 18 February and 21 February respectively. The police evidence was never disputed.
8. Having first denied that she had heard of the attack on the mayor of Seisoville and the arson of his vehicle and the attack on the Teachers Training College and the attack on police houses, she later admitted she had heard of these events.

9. She is very vague and evasive on whether speeches were held at the wakes of the two deceased, whose funerals she attended.
10. She is evasive and wholly contradictory on the movements of the hearse and its joining the cortege on 18 February. She also conflicts with Bloem and with the defence case as initially put.
11. Her version that people sat on the bakkie holding the coffin aloft conflicts with accused No 20 who said they stood.
12. She denies that accused No 20 spoke on the UDF. Accused No 20 says he did.
13. She stated that accused No 20 said in his speech it is not proper to damage the property of ordinary people. When she grasped the implications she retracted it and said she had never said so.
14. On what Bloem said at the grave on 18 February her version conflicts with that of Bloem.
15. It is unlikely that she would not know which school Papi Makoko her neighbour's son attended.

16. In cross-examination she gives a version of police shooting tear-gas at the pedestrians returning from the funeral at the edge of the township - a version she did not give in chief despite the fact that she was led in detail on her movements and the actions of the police.

F S MAGUDLWA

This witness is not very bright. He is also contradictory and has a bad memory. He is wholly unreliable.

1. He states he could not afford the rent increase. This is not acceptable. His rent was R63,76 per month (before the R5,90 increase) and he earned R164 per week net. That is far more than the average. And it is clear that as rents increased over the years so had his wages.
2. He states that at the meeting of 26 August 1984 at the Roman Catholic church Small Farms the reason given for the demand that councillors resign was that they did not attend to the needs of the people (they did not improve roads, erect some stop-signs, plant some trees and attend to the graveyard.) He is not borne out by other witnesses on this.

3. He states that nothing was said about councillors' shops, but in cross-examination he said there was talk of a boycott.
4. He states that he does not remember the songs at the meeting. He heard them for the first time and it took a lot of probing in chief to get an "Amandla" to join the lifted fists. Then he stated that he had heard it for the first time. But still stated that there was no shouting. This version was contradicted in cross-examination.
5. He first said the fact of the stay-away and march was known to everybody in the township, later it shrunk to the meeting of 26 August 1984 and then expanded again to the Vaal and eventually shrunk again to Zones 3, 7, 12, 13, 14 and Evaton.
6. His version is that he normally goes home during his break from 9h00 - 13h00 but stayed to play cards on 3 September. Asked whether this was because there was no transport he stated that the buses were running till 11h00. This is untrue. Sechabela (a co-worker) told the court that he had to walk home at 9h00 as there was no transport. (Also to Zone 7). This was not disputed. Maphalla, defence witness, says from 6h00 there were no buses in Zone 7.
7. It is unacceptable that he did not hear of the disturbances till 11h00. He was sitting at the bus depot from before 9h00

and this is the nerve centre of the bus services. Sechabela's damaged bus arrived there before 9h00.

8. He did not participate in the 1983 elections as the councillors did nothing for them. "Dis net om myself daar te moor". He could not explain this phrase. He testified about empty promises. He was rather vague about who did supply the existing services and it transpired that he last heard promises made by councillors first-hand in 1972.
9. He denies without foundation that buses were stoned in Sharpeville in the week of 20 August 1984.
10. On the meeting of 26 August 1984 he is very vague:
 - (a) he denies that the aims and objects of the VCA were mentioned;
 - (b) he does not remember elections for Area 3 committees;
 - (c) he does not remember whether VOW or ERPA were mentioned or whether anyone spoke on behalf of the youth/COSAS/VAYCO/VAYO or about black education.
11. He denies that a specific person answered Masenya's objection about arrest of marchers. This conflicts with the defence case.

12. He states that the resolutions were never put to the meeting of 26 August by the chairman. As proposed they were accepted by popular acclaim and not adopted formally. This conflicts with the defence case.
13. He does not recall Esau Raditsela taking over the chair at the elections at the end of the meeting.
14. He first stated that people were angry when they heard Masenya had been a candidate. Later in cross-examination he denied this.
15. His prejudice against councillors is evident from his answer to the question why he did not take steps in 1984 to lay his complaints before his councillor Nkhiwane. His answer is: "Nee dit is lank dat ons huur betaal, selfs nou dit sou nie aandag geniet het".
16. He denied having previously said that in 1984 the streets in zone 7 were graded.
17. He conflicts with Maphalla on whether the buses were silent from 6h00 on 3 September.

EDWARD MAHLALELA

A wholly mendacious witness.

1. It is strange that he does not know why his friend Moses Monale left Hwiti high school in 1985 and went to another school.
2. His version that Willie Letswalo called on women, children and workers to unite but did not say to what end and that the witness had not thought what was meant is not acceptable.
3. His reason for joining the group from the university is wholly unacceptable as is the reason he gives why they all ran away.
4. His version that they ran away from the police (who do nothing) and flee into a room in a hostel where they stay for two hours and not even look what is happening outside

and totally oblivious of what is going on, is absolute nonsense. His version that they were not even interested is a lie.

5. In chief he said Joel's room was on the third floor. In cross-examination it became the fourth floor.
6. He falsely denied Shadrack Mafokoane had been a member of MAYCO. Exh C.134.

DOBI DAVID MAHLANGU

A wholly unreliable witness. On UDF links he lied.

1. His version of Morajane advertising the meeting of 28 October 1984 by loud hailer saying the police will be present and all talkative people will be shot, is strange, to say the least.
2. His version that the Black Sash was invited by the Leandra Action Committee to the meeting convened by the councillors to lecture on section 10 rights and that this had been agreed upon between the LAC and the councillors (witness ic.19) - was never put by the defence, although the state's case was that the councillors objected to their presence. The defence version had been they only came with the attorney to observe. It was also never put that they had been arrested.

3. He first stated that the councillors at that meeting gave an assurance (waarborg) that the people would not be moved. He later retracted it as it did not fit in with his version.
4. He first stated that after Nkabinde's arrest the LAC planned a mass protest meeting. Then he became vague when the date upon which they started planning was mentioned. Later he totally denied that they planned a protest meeting.
5. He falsely denied that the LAC had links with the UDF. This in the face of exhs AM.15 p.27, C.99, T.3, S.14, S.17 and 0.2.
6. His denial of the LAC's attendance of a workshop and its three sub-committees conflicts with exh C.99.
7. His denial of a visit by Pat Lephunya to Leandra and of members of the executive committee of the Transvaal UDF addressing a public meeting on 31 December 1983 there, conflicts with exhs S.14 and S.17 and with exh 0.2.
8. He denies any knowledge that the chief commissioner addressed the council at Leandra, but the letter handed in says so. Exh DA.204 (which was in the possession of the defence).

9. He says it was never said after exh DA.204 that people were held in the waiting place pending removal to KwaNdebele or that it was a trick of the authorities or that there were complaints about the facilities at the waiting place. Yet all this had been the defence case as put to the state witnesses.

E.C. MAHLATSI

His general demeanour was satisfactory but there is the following criticism against his evidence:

- (a) He was reluctant to disclose whether he had started off as a councillor without any assets, and later feigned that he did not know what he had when he started.
- (b) His denial of having said what is reported in the Star of 10 July 1984 exh. AAQ.21 and his explanation that the reporter must have fabricated the purpose of the alleged R6,00 rent increase, is totally unconvincing.
- (c) His ruling out of order of the motion of no confidence exh AAQ.26 on the basis of incorrect spelling of Lekoa Town Council was an abuse of his position as chairman and his evidence that he thought it did not refer to him and his council is so mendacious that it is an affront to the intelligence of the court.

- (d) He was evasive about his knowledge of the Mofokeng who had been allotted business sites as stated in the motion of no confidence exh AAQ.26 p.560 para 2.
- (e) He denied that in 1984 he had heard of any rumours of corruption on the part of councillors - yet the motion of no confidence, tabled on 27 November 1984 sets out various examples.
- (f) His denial of prior knowledge of the purpose of the group visit to accused no. 3's residence on 27 August 1984 is improbable.

REVEREND J.L. MAHLATSI

On demeanour this witness cannot be faulted and except for one aspect dealt with hereunder he gave his evidence forthrightly and without hesitation.

There was no evidence that this witness had an axe to grind with the accused. When evaluating his evidence it should be remembered that he is not very intelligent and is also illiterate. His evidence should also be regarded as that of an accomplice.

There are two serious criticisms of his evidence:

1. He stated in chief that Mrs. R. Mokoena had spoken of violence against councillors but in cross-examination and re-examination he denied it and said this had been a mistake, he had been referring to another woman.

2. He was evasive on whether he and accused no. 15 had been in adjoining cells at Benoni police station and first denied it and when it eventually transpired that they had been, he stated that he had such respect for police regulations that he would not have attempted to make contact with accused no. 15. This seems improbable.

WILLIAM MAINE

Wholly untrustworthy.

1. His so-called concern about the replanning of Evaton appeared to be without foundation in fact - he had no property and would probably never acquire any. The replanning would greatly improve the amenities of the whole area.
2. He attempted to base his concern on a possible purchase of a stand by himself - but he had never heard what prices are!
3. He was unco-operative when asked the number of persons residing on this stand where he lives.
4. He is a member of the "ratepayers" but does not know what a ratepayer is and does not own property.
5. He did not hear accused No 5 speak on the meeting of 26

August. Yet No 5 did.

6. He denied resignation of councillors was called for on the meeting of 26 August. Yet this was the defence case.
7. Having stated that councillors were accused of depriving people of their property by "skelm" means - he later denied this.
8. Having first given the contents of Kabi's speech in part, he later denied that he heard any part of it. This led to an extremely uncomfortable period in the witness box.
9. He denied that Rina Mokoena had asked "Why have you allowed strangers to steal our land". Yet this was the defence case as put.

JOSEPH MAKOATSANE

There is serious criticism against this witness. One does not know what portion of his evidence is conjecture.

1. He could not see the gate where the two groups got together, though he first told the court what happened there.

2. Having said in chief that the children from Bodibeng came to the gate, were joined by children from Kananelo and marched back on their tracks, in cross-examination he said he had not seen this happen at all.

CONSTABLE N.W. MANTEWU

This witness suffered a total loss of memory on the raid which followed the shooting on 11 April 1985. We conclude that he was deliberately evasive.

ALEX MAPELA

This witness created a very poor impression. He was one of the worst we had. He stood with bowed head and held his chin in his hand. He was evasive and wholly untrustworthy.

1. He states the boycotts started in September and ended in October 1984. This conflicts with Gqobane's initial evidence.
2. When asked whether COSAS committee members spoke at the COSAS meeting in September 1984 he was first evasive and then stated that he could not remember. That cannot be true.
3. His version on the warning by the hippo and dispersal by the sneeze machine differs from that of Gqobane and Ngwalangwala (see sub voce Gqobane).

4. It is highly unlikely that he was not a member of COSAS at his school. He was one of the leaders and the oldest and physically the biggest scholar. We view his evidence in this regard with scepticism.
5. He was evasive on who suggested the boycott and who convened the meeting where it was decided.
6. He lied when he said he did not know what COSAS' feeling was at this meeting about the boycott and that no COSAS executive member spoke.
7. His evidence that during the boycott they went to school but sat outside doing nothing at all - not singing, not having a meeting, not marching or shouting - is so improbable that it is rejected.
8. His reason for the September 1984 meeting in the community hall is wholly unconvincing and also his evidence that Gqobane was appointed by the scholars to speak on behalf of the parents.
9. His statement that he does not know if the scholars were satisfied with the PRC is false as is his statement that he has never before heard of a PRC. Teacher Gqobane says it

existed at that school in 1984 and was replaced in 1985 by an SRC.

10. Having lied in this respect his memory failed him in the next portion of the cross-examination where he was totally evasive.

11. His explanation that they did not know on 4 February 1985 who put up the anonymous notices, but complied out of fear is, having seen this big witness, laughable.

12. His version on the events on 11 February 1985 differs from what was put to the state witnesses in respect of:

(a) leadership;

(b) whether Memese spoke or not;

(c) whether Memese called the workers at the beerhall to attack the scholars;

(d) whether Memese shot three scholars in the school yard.

13. He denies that he ever heard that scholars threw stones.

14. His statement that the procession to the grave and back on 16 March 1985 walked in absolute silence is not only highly improbable but conflicts with Gqobane who says freedom songs were sung.

15. His evidence that Mathew Goniwe did not take part in the procession conflicts with Gqobane who says he was one of the leaders.

M. N. MAPHALLA

(Sebokeng)

18280

18 331 - 18407

An unimpressive, wholly unreliable witness.

1. He knows accused Nos. 6, 7, 9 and 17 quite well.
2. He states that the marshalls prevented children below 18 years from joining the march. There is no other witness who says this and it is in conflict with exh AN.15.2.
3. He saw no smoke at Motjeane's house when the procession passed there. This coincides with Pitso Ratibisi but is in conflict with accused Nos. 8, 9, 5, 2 and 13.
4. He earned R65,00 per week. He states he cannot afford the increase. He has only one child. He has not paid any rent since 3 September 1984.

5. He denies that people sang in the hall. He states only accused No 17 and Esau spoke and denies that accused No 8 spoke. This conflicts with accused No 8.
6. He denies accused No 17 (and accused No 8) addressed a particular group - their own area's people. This conflicts with the defence case as put.
7. When cross-examined on what happened at the front of the march at the intersection he offered the suggestion that the placard bearers walked backwards.
8. He could not see what happened at the intersection and lane to Ceasar Motjeane as he was at the BP Garage and on the right of the march and that happened in front and to the left.
9. His evidence that there were no road obstructions conflicts with that of Keyter and other witnesses.
10. And his evidence that he saw no smoke at Motjeane's is in conflict with the state and accused's versions.
11. His description that youths are between 18 and 20, middle-aged 20 to 30 and elderly people are above 35 years is silly.

12. His evidence was contradictory about the placards.

(a) In chief he stated that the wording was "asinamali" and "away with high rents". In cross-examination it first was only two placards "asinamali" and "harena tsjelete" and then as an afterthought "away with high rents".

(b) He stated in chief that he only looked at the placards while they were being made and not afterwards and only from a distance of 12 to 13 yards. When the matter was referred to in cross-examination he shifted his ground stating that the placard bearers had filed past him and therefore he could read all the placards.

13. His evidence on Raditsela's speech outside the hall conflicts with that of accused No 8.

14. His denial that Esau referred to preparations against tear-gas is in conflict with what was put on behalf of the defence.


15. He states that except for the absence of buses from 6h00 everything was absolutely normal.

16. His evidence that he could not afford to pay the increased rent is nonsense. It was R5,90 per month and he had that year received a raise at work of R15 per week. He earned R65 per week. He got annual raises and in November 1987 earned R120 per week and yet

paid nothing since September 1984 and made no provision for the arrears. He had no good reason for not paying. Saying "a word" got round after the riots that rent would not be paid till it was reduced. He would not say who said it, saying he did not know. Yet he followed the instruction! And this was not a lessee but the owner who had to pay instalments!

Z. 283

WARRANT OFFICER L.J. MAROLONG



A good witness.



NAPHTALI MASEKO

This witness did not create a favourable impression in the witness-box. An arrogant and very intelligent witness. Wholly untrustworthy.

1. His version that one tear-gas canister shot without reason on 10 October 1984 into an empty school yard from a hippo triggered all the rioting and school boycotts in Tsakane thereafter, is highly improbable - especially if it is borne in mind that the army had cause to move into Tsakane two days prior to 4 October 1984.
2. His version that they did not go into classes but sat outside because they were scared of a hippo at the gate (or patrolling) is nonsense.
3. He contradicted himself on his position in the funeral procession of Vusi Diale.

4. His evidence conflicts with Diale's on whether there were people on foot in the procession and on when tear-gas was shot during the proceedings at the grave and on the actions of the hippo.
5. The reason he gives for not writing exams in May 1985 namely that he was scared for his life because of the proximity of hostel dwellers to the examination room, is either a lie or he is one of those involved in the attack on the hostel.
6. He is vague on the COSAS committee.
7. It had been put that Pancretius Mkhonza was in December/ January 1984/5 secretary of COSAS and that he later became its vice-president. He denies that COSAS existed before the end of January 1985 and denies that Mkhonza was ever on the committee.
8. He changed his evidence on the number of shots fired by the police on the hippo at the funeral of Diale.

9. About his membership of COSAS he gave contradictory versions and on its policy he was evasive.
10. His denial that the scholars agitated for SRC's conflicts with the evidence of Mkhonza who says as far as the schools were concerned it was their sole grievance.
11. His evidence was contradictory on the episode in January 1985 at school and their attendance at assembly.
12. His attitude towards authority is evident from the fact that they chased the principal from the school.
13. Though he is against black local authorities he did not hear of dissatisfaction with them and does not know why the council's property was attacked. This is hard to believe.

L.J. MASENYA

A bit self-important but cannot be faulted on demeanour. He should be severely criticised for serious contradictions between his evidence in chief and under cross-examination on material aspects.

Inter alia the following contradictions emerged:

- (a) He stated in chief that accused No 8 said that this type of person (referring to the councillors) have to be got rid of. In cross-examination he said the words used had been "should be killed". When cross-examined hereon he was extremely uncomfortable and gave an unacceptable explanation.
- (b) According to him in chief a woman said "die raadslede se bestaan moet vernietig word". Under cross-examination he stated that she did not mention any violence.

(c) According to him in chief accused No 5 stated that the councillors were sell-outs and puppets of the government. Under cross-examination he added that accused No 5 had said that they are bound to be killed. This conflicts with his evidence in chief and also with the indictment.

No reliance can be placed on this witness unless corroborated.

COMMENTS ON O S MATLOKO


He cannot be faulted on his demeanour in the witness-box. Taking into account his propensity to be somewhat long-winded he was an impressive witness.

The attack on this witness to a great extent dealt with the collision on 16 June 1985. In this respect the defence version put to the state witnesses and that eventually testified to in court by the defence witnesses differed so widely that it is wholly unreliable. See sub voce London, Mosiapo and Moketsi. In the light hereof the denial of the witness that he drove a vehicle which was involved in a collision, as Mosiapo testified, is accepted.


JACK MATONSI

A good witness.

E.H.K. MATTHYSSEN



No adverse comments. Demeanour satisfactory.



T C MAZIBUKHO

A political activist who down-plays his role. Untrustworthy.

1. He is rather vague about the names and areas or area representatives of the proposed (Vaal) Youth Organisation. In fact he was not at ease when the names of a full committee were put to him, and he denied it.
2. It is wholly unacceptable that throughout all the meetings no name was discussed for the proposed organisation. This conflicts with accused No 5's version.
3. In chief he stated he had lost track of the organisation and in mid 1984 he tried to find out from Peter Kekane what the position was. In cross-examination it transpired that he had kept contact throughout with accused No 5 and that they had discussed the progress of the organisation upon meeting. When this discrepancy was put to him he gave an evasive answer.

4. He tends to blame the police for disturbances and pleads ignorance of what caused the arrests that led thereto in 1977.
5. He is the only witness who says that on 26 August 1984 it was decided that people could themselves in their discretion decide whether their work was so important that they need not adhere to the stay-away.
6. There is a discrepancy in chief and under cross-examination about the words used by the woman who stopped Masenya.
7. He denies that this woman demanded that Masenya repudiate the council. This conflicts with most witnesses.
8. It is very unlikely that Esau would at the meeting of 26 August arrive and go and stand at the back of the stage (and not join the chairman) in the light of the fact that he was vice chairman of the VCA.
9. He gave conflicting versions on the procedure followed at the meeting of 26 August 1984 in relation to the discussion and voting on resolutions.

10. His version on the group joining at the intersection differs from the ultimate defence version.
11. He denies that there were people in the lane, or others in the intersection or that a group joined from the stadium - all at some stages part of the defence version.
12. He saw no smoke at all on 3 September till the smoke at Motjeane's.
13. He knows accused No 14, who was his class-mate, he is a great friend of accused No 5, he knows his father Amos Malindi - but disclaims knowledge of the COSAS connection of accused No 14 and Amos Malindi. This is unlikely.
14. His denial of the existence of the Vaal Youth Congress is highly improbable as Joseph Sithole was buried under the banner of this organisation in September 1984 (exh AAU.3 and see exh AN.8 sheet 2 page 7); and his denial of the existence of Boipatong and Bophelong Youth Congresses is likewise suspect. He said he would have known had they existed. Yet they were active already in November 1983 at the election. Exh CA.9 (but see exh AN.4).

15. His allegation that he does not know what "sell outs" means is false.
16. His political activism is apparent from the fact that in Evaton where he lived there had been no rent increase and he was not affected and had no grievance, yet he joins the march, which did not concern him and for which he lost a day's wages.
17. His initial denial that they wanted to get councillors to resign he had to retract.
18. He was very reluctant to admit having heard freedom songs of Mandela and Tambo at meetings he had attended.

MANDLA PETRUS MAZIBUKO

A wholly unimpressive witness whose memory is bad and whose evidence is subject to the following criticism:

1. He was evasive when asked about his relationship to DUCA.
2. He was very vague on the rent and rent increases.
3. He has no first-hand knowledge of promises made by councillors at meetings but is very prejudiced against them.
4. His version on the way the coffin was handled at the funeral of Douglas Mcunu on 4 November 1984 is the third defence version.
5. He says there were no COSAS banners at the funeral whereas the defence case is that there were.

6. His version about the meeting of 17 February 1985 differs from other defence versions:

(a) he says the proposal to take the buckets of night-soil to the offices was long debated. Some said now and some said the next day. And no youths were involved in the debate though some were there. The defence version as put was that the youth took over and decided to do it immediately. In cross-examination he stated that nobody said it should be done now. After the proposal the meeting just acted;

(b) his version that the buckets were to be put down and left conflicts with the other defence evidence that the night-soil would be dumped and is in any event improbable as that would leave them without buckets.

V M MBATYAZWA

[Shayerville]

P 18895 - 18995.

Verbose and not averse to being untruthful. His evidence cannot be relied upon.

1. His evidence in chief that residents had told him that to get a house he had either to bribe his councillor or pay the arrears of the previous lessee, was later belied by the fact that he had gone to his councillor several times over a number of years and never was this suggested to him by the councillor. In fact it turned out he could not get a house as his wife did not qualify for residence.

2. His evidence that his lodger permit fees were increased by R5,90 was totally wrong. See exh AAQ.19.

*possibly
amplified
not recorded*

3. When asked about his inability to get a house he offered that people in the same circumstances had told him they got houses through bribery. When asked who they were and what their addresses were he could not name any.

P 18926

P 18930

4. In conflict with the defence case he denies that P Hlube on 12 August made a speech in support of accused No 3.

P18932

18900 - H
18937-8

5. He makes statements which he cannot substantiate. He says that councillors promised not to increase rents. When asked which councillors he falls back and says their organisers did it. When asked which organisers he does not know and falls back on general talk in buses.

18906

6. When asked who was chairman at the meeting of 12 August he asked "what chairman" - stating a chairman is always elected. When asked who elected the chairman on 19 August he was evasive.

7. He did not see a banner in the church on 12 August which accused No 3 says was at the pulpit. The same applies in respect of the meeting of 19 August.

8. His evidence on the meeting of 19 August is in conflict with exhibit AAQ.7 which was put by the defence to state witnesses as a contemporary news report.

P18911 in hand

9. After positively stating repeatedly that accused No 2 explained why the boycott should take place of councillors' businesses, he changed his ground dramatically when it was put to him that his evidence was at variance

with that of accused No 3, accused No 16 and accused No 2.

Two points out of one

10. He did not hear anybody ask what would happen to people who did not pay their rent. His explanation is that one only registers part of what is said at meetings.

11. He did not see Albert Botha at the meeting of 19 August and says he did not speak. This is in conflict with the defence case. Botha asked the question what would be done to those who pay the rent.

Albert

12. He has not paid lodger's fees since September 1984. His reason is when he went to the office there was nobody. He did not go again. This is nonsense. Clearly he is unwilling to pay.

*P 118 993-14
Not clear that he went at all*

13. His version which conflicts with all the other evidence (except Nhlapo's) is that at the meeting of 19 August accused No 16 was at the back in the audience and came forward when called upon to speak.

*P 18944-5
mistake -
others did come from audience*

MRS. ROSELINA MBONANI

A barely literate simple witness who was not observant and who was not candid with the court.

1. She is very vague on the funeral. She does not remember who spoke at the house. She cannot say whether a COSAS representative spoke at the stadium. She "thinks" others than bishop Tutu and her minister spoke at the grave.
2. She says she has not heard of ERAPO, or the demand for SRC's. She did not know of COSAS, SOYCO and ERAPO and UDF speakers at the funeral or that ERAPO was involved in the funeral arrangements. She is probably very uninformed. But this shows how unreliable her evidence is as the programme shows that ERAPO helped arrange the funeral and speakers of the three organisations spoke. Exh CA.29.

3. She denied having heard children shouting Tambo, Tambo at the stadium. The video (exh 42) shows that the whole pavilion thundered it out as one man. The video also shows that she was lying when she stated there were no political speeches. The whole funeral was a political rally.

4. She feigns ignorance of the riots in Daveyton especially those on the day of the funeral - of which she must have heard.

THAMI MBOTYA

His evidence is on numerous material points in conflict with other defence witnesses and of course absolutely in conflict with the state's case.

1. He was evasive when asked whose idea SERA was.
2. His evidence on the venue of the second meeting of SERA (Methodist church) differs from Plaatjies (Anglican church).
3. His evidence on the so-called prayer meeting of Dr. Boesak January/February 1985 differs from that of the other defence witnesses:
 - (a) on starting time (on which he was rather evasive);
 - (b) on whether Boesak prayed at all (he says no);

(c) on the contents of Boesak's speech.

4. His evidence that the father of the deceased spoke at the house on 16 March 1985 conflicts with the evidence of Ivy Ngwalangwala, Alex Mapela and Hamilton Gqobane.
5. His evidence on Goniwe's position in the cortège differs materially from that of other defence witnesses.
6. His evidence differs from Gqobane's on whether freedom songs were sung on the way back from the cemetery.
7. On the hippo's alleged warning the three defence witnesses differ.
8. Like all other defence witnesses he does not explain how the beerhall, etc. came to be burnt down.

MRS. MARIA MBUTUMA

1. Her rent was R64,00 per month. Her husband earned R200,00 per week and she says she could not cope with R5,90 increase. At present they participate in the rents boycott.

2. Her evidence that nobody did anything yet the police attacked with tear-gas and sjamboks is very improbable. Possibly this lop-sided evidence is due to the fact that her sole view of Seiso Street was to the east of Putsoa Stene - which is outside the township except for two very short sorties to the corner.

LORD McCAMEL

He created a good impression as a witness.

Rather subdued - which is not the picture one gets from the evidence as such, but is to be expected after his long detention. The evidence shows that he was a charismatic leader - a pastor of the largest church (building) in Evaton, sought after as Master of Ceremonies at political and social gatherings and even funerals.

The subdued and peace-loving impression he created in the witness-box does not tally with his oration on the text Lamentations five (1 to 7) and the wording of the pamphlets he was involved with, eg exh 04.

He testified in open court and as a well-known pastor would not likely agree that an organisation he belonged to and led, was committed to violence or to the overthrow of the government. His evidence in cross-examination where he ate out of the hand of counsel for the defence should be seen in that light.

Z. 307

He became inactive in the VCA from March 1984 onwards and cannot testify to its aims after that date.

WARRANT OFFICER H.M. McDONALD

A good witness.

CAPTAIN P.J. MEISTER

A good witness.

DANIEL MGAWU

Not a satisfactory witness.

He contradicted himself on various points.

But what is clear is that Skosana and Molokwane did utter a threat (be it serious or joke) at the shebeen and that that threat was the basis of a prosecution in 1984 against the one of them that was before court.

His evidence supports that of his wife.

J.H. MGCINA

Though he states that he is 50 years old this witness looks much older than that. He has attained standard 5 at school and is not very bright. He was a welder by trade. He complained that he has a tendency to forget - since the shock of the burning of his house.

He contradicted himself on whether Tuso Morobe, Hlanyane and Mboke were present at his first election meeting. Though he stated this in his evidence in chief he later denied that he had said so.

His statement that he had not heard rumours of corruption by councillors before Majila was brought to court is doubtful.

His evidence that he was not against the use of community halls by trade unions and the VCA and knows of no resolution by the council against it is suspect, in the light of the evidence of his co-councillor P. Mokoena.

He was not a satisfactory witness in all respects.

SERGEANT M.B. MGUBA

This witness withstood a lengthy cross-examination well. He did not try to embellish and gave evidence calmly. There are a number of criticisms against his evidence:

1. He did forget to repeat in cross-examination two important parts of a speech in November 1984 namely about the wheel of progress and the setting alight of people associating with him. This part of his evidence will be treated with great caution.
2. He also got mixed up on whether Ntsudu or Panama Njenje called on the councillors to resign at the second meeting in November 1984.
3. There was also a discrepancy between his evidence in chief and his evidence in cross-examination as to whether the councillors were forewarned of why they had to attend the second meeting.
4. He differs from Rich on the existence of SERA in 1984. This places a question-mark over the correctness of his evidence on the participating organisations in the meetings in 1984.

5. He was criticised on the difference between his description of his view of the house of Memese and the photographs the defence handed in. Exhs DA 189 and DA 190. According to the photographs he could see the front garden but not the house itself. He had stated he saw and heard Elizabeth Sibande speak. Where exactly she stood in relation to the house is not clear. He had said he could see the front of the house.

There was no application for his recall to put the photographs to him and his sketch was never contested.

He did testify that he could not see the buckets in front of the house as he was not right in front of it. It is possible that the podium on which Sibande stood was not at the front door which fronts on the street but in the garden where the people were. He did see the large quantities of food being prepared, which was not done in the street but in the front garden. The defence evidence shows that the activity took place in the front garden of which Mguba would have had a view according to the photographs.

In the result nothing turns on this point.

SIPIWE EZEKIEL MHLAMBI

He contradicted himself on certain aspects.

1. He wants better services but is not prepared to pay for them.
2. One of his reasons is that his tenure is not permanent - he can be moved any time. This sounds thin. He has been living in that house for twenty years.
3. He stated in chief that there were no banners at the Thobela funeral on 18 May 1985. In cross-examination he stated there were banners of Duduza Youth Congress and of COSAS.
4. Having stated in chief that the reason for the primary school children being sent home early was to avoid them being injured by the boycotting seniors, in cross-examination he changed this to say they were no longer attentive.

5. It is strange that he saw nothing of the rioting on the day of the funeral of 18 May 1985 or on the days thereafter. It is only the police who shoot tear-gas.

DR. S.R.M. MILLER

A good witness.

LAWRENCE VIKI MKHONZA

A political activist, not averse to violence. Highly intelligent and untrustworthy. At times intentionally false.

1. His version that he was asked by the sister of the deceased on 11 October 1984 to speak at Vusi Diale's funeral is in direct conflict with the evidence of Paulus Diale, the father of the deceased, who organised the funeral, that on the day of the funeral a boy who alleged he was a friend of the deceased told him he wanted to speak but that he had stage fright and that his brother Mkhonza would speak instead.
2. His speech at the funeral (exh DA.183) evidences that he is in favour of violent reaction against the SADF. That the masses are the liberators. That the seeds of hatred and of

war have begun to germinate in the hearts of the students. In fact it is a revolutionary speech against the background of the violence in the township.

3. His evidence that at Andries Raditsela's funeral on 13 May 1985 there were only workers' banners conflicts with the evidence of Maseko who said there were also COSAS and TSYCO banners.
4. He resigned on 20 November 1984 and was unemployed in 1985 (till his detention in July 1985). He does not seem to have attempted to obtain employment. This lends credence to a suggestion that he was busy with political activities.
5. He denies that he was on the executive of the Tsakane Parent-Students Committee or that it existed. Yet he attended the meeting of Parent-Student Committees in Soweto on 28 December 1984 where he set out the position in Tsakane. For a 20 year old man who is not a parent or a teacher this is a strange interest. His denial of knowledge who convened this meeting is rejected as false.
6. His activities in the educational field are also evident from his organising a meeting of parents at the end of October 1984 to inform them of the grievances of the

children. His evidence that the scholars there promised and guaranteed they would return to classes conflicts with his evidence that it was a parents meeting with only some uninvited youths in the audience. Those could not have given any undertakings on behalf of the scholars. He is not frank with the court.

7. He first stated Tsakane was calm till the problems started. Then the police came. He later contradicted this stating the police came and thereafter the problems started. His latest stand that the police (read army) came into the township for no reason at all is untenable.
8. He supports Vusi Diale's violent resistance to the army whole-heartedly. His denial that he saw Vusi Diale's resistance as part of the liberation struggle is false in the light of exh DA.183, the funeral oration.
9. He could not explain the origin or the relevance of the quotation at the beginning of his speech, exh DA.183. This is an evasion.
10. His version of the shooting of tear-gas at the cemetery and the police movements differs totally from that of Diale and Maseko and is also intrinsically improbable.

11. He shies away from mentioning any names of COSAS and TSYCO executives:

(a) they were on the crisis committee - but he says they did not turn up at meetings and therefore he does not know who they were;

(b) at the funeral they spoke but as they did not introduce themselves he does not know their names.

As he was the Master of Ceremonies this is false.

12. The funeral of the eight is also politicised - the government is blamed for the deaths caused by hostel dwellers.

13. He falsely denied that the police removed documents from his home and that he instructed an attorney to write about it.

H.M. MOCHUDI

Reluctant to come to court.

Deliberately vague.

5. He is vague on the meeting of 5 September 1984 - which is not strange as he was only requested to make a statement on 16 March 1988. (He says the windows were broken. This is in accordance with the state case.) He denies Johnny Marolong's version.

6. His evidence that he did not know COSAS to be an organisation of scholars and that he only knew it to be against apartheid is unacceptable.

CHRISTOPHER MODISE

Quite frank except as indicated hereunder.

1. He was a junior and does not know much about COSAS activities at his school. His evidence in chief that no organisations were involved in the school boycott was in cross-examination retracted. He could not say what the position was.
2. He was so afraid of being accused of being an informer that he did not even ask the names of the COSAS leadership.
3. Where particulars of COSAS were concerned he was rather obtuse - probably out of fear.
4. About the singing of freedom songs at the mass funeral on 17 November 1984 he was evasive.

S.P. MOFOKENG

This witness is a simple man of little education. He is a serious man who answered each question directly, honestly and to the best of his ability.

Despite having lost his house and his work because he is a councillor he is still convinced of the importance and value of his office.

ALINA MOGATLA

A good witness. No adverse comment on her demeanour.

ANGELINE K MOGOTSI

No adverse comment on demeanour. An untrustworthy witness.

1. Her evidence conflicts with Phali's evidence on whether VCA was consulted before Louw was seen. She says she had never heard of VCA prior to the troubles in September 1984. Her version is to be rejected in the light of Phali's evidence which is supported by that of Louw.
2. She denies that she ever heard that the rent increase had been scrapped. Yet Phali admitted that Louw had told them this and Louw confirms that it was scrapped on 18 September 1984.
3. She differs from Phali whether Sharpeville was part of the committee that went to Louw.
4. She gives a nonsensical explanation of how they arrived at the R30 which they decided on would be the rent.

5. She denies that residents got notices monthly to inform them that the rent is what it was. Phali said they did. She cannot admit this fact as then the excuse for non-payment of rent since September 1984 would fall away.

6. Contrary to what was put to state witnesses she says that councillor Mokoena did not draw his fire-arm and did not walk backwards and forwards on the stage at the meeting of 29 August 1984.

7. She denies councillor Ramakule on the meeting of 29 August 1984 said that people with problems could come to his house to find out what was going on. Yet this had been put by the defence to state witnesses.

S.P. MOHAJANE

On demeanour this witness cannot be faulted. We got the impression that he ex post facto tended to minimise his responsibility for the resolution to increase the rent and exaggerated his concern and efforts on behalf of the aged, pensioners and unemployed. Though he was against the sale of the liquor outlets to the councillors he raised no objection.

PETER MOHAPI

This witness cannot be faulted on demeanour. He was totally at ease in the witness-box and gave his evidence calmly and forthrightly.

There were a number of unsatisfactory features.

He contradicted himself on a material aspect namely whether he had been told privately by accused No 11 of resolutions taken at Sharpeville or whether the committee was told this by accused No 11 and also adopted those resolutions.

There is also a question-mark over his evidence on the reason why he, No 11 and Sotsu joined the mob that went from place to place in Boipatong attacking homes and looting a shop of councillors.

It is probable that he glosses over his own knowledge of the intention behind the march.

His evidence which was struck out was not covered by the indictment. It was material.

M. A. MOKATE Soboley - Zone 7 D

185558 - 185599.

A very poor witness. Totally unreliable.

1. He differs from the other witnesses on the songs sung on the march (asiyeni e Houtkop) and on the wording of the placards (asiyeni e Houtkop).
2. His version is the same as Tau's on the round about route followed. The same criticism applies.
3. It remains unexplained why when they were late for the march (30 to 45 minutes) they did not in Vilakazi Street or at Masenkeng - on the route of the procession - enquire whether the march had passed already. Mokati's explanation that they only thought of the church is nonsense.
4. There is no explanation why the march was not followed and joined from the back or why when they attempt to get to the front of the march and succeed they do not join there but only in the middle.

5. He could not explain his evidence that the decision was taken as inhabitants and parents to join the march. His denial that it was said because as parents they supported the children is unconvincing.
6. His evidence that they did not know and did not enquire about the starting time of the procession and just decided it was 9h00 is improbable and conflicts with his friend Tau.
7. Having first stated that the bus route was in front of his home and that he lived in Sebe Street he later said the bus route was behind his house and that he did not live in Sebe Street.
8. He denied having seen the smoke of councillor Nkhiwane's house though he and his friends passed in the next street at approximately 9h30 and it was set on fire at between 8h30 and 9h00.
9. Having stated that their aim was to reach the front of the procession, with the next breath he denied it.
10. He maintains the route they took to catch up with the procession was the shortest route. This is in conflict with Tau and is palpably false.

11. He denies having seen any signs of damage or fire on the way to join the procession. Even from the alleged round about route it must have been visible.

12. Asked why he did not after the dispersal take the shortest route home, that is through Zone 11 to Zone 7 instead of through Zone 12 he denied that that would have been the shortest route. This denial is false. When cross-examined thereon he stated that from Zone 13 where he hid after the dispersal the shortest route home was via the original route to join the march. This is nonsensical.

13. He knows accused Nos 7 and 6 and has seen accused No 8 before, but says he did not see them on 3 September 1984.

MARIA MOKATI

A venerable old lady. Totally dogmatic even when totally wrong. She reconstructs and it would be dangerous to rely on her for detail. She creates an honest impression and she would not knowingly further a revolutionary cause. She is averse to violence and lawlessness. She would therefore tend to gloss over any inciting statements made in her church. It is significant that she seems not to have noticed the strange attitude of accused No 3 in respect of the destruction of buses. Her evidence has little weight, if any.

Roman Catholic

1. She did not see Nosipho Myesa at the meeting of 19 August 1984. The witness sat right in front.

19374

2. She got mixed up on whether Botha spoke at the meeting of 19 August 1984.

mere mix up of meetings

See 19374-5

3. She says no songs were sung at the 19 August 1984

meeting. NBT correctly summarised the evidence Koocho also says no singing other than two mentions but her.

4. On the meeting of 5 August 1984 she differs on various aspects from other defence witnesses and/or the defence

case: P18052

Having ~~insulted~~ ^{strongly criticised} ~~interviewed~~ ^{interviewed} one of counsel for the state for ~~an~~ ^{an earlier} witness Mjeje on the events of the 5th August 1984 ~~which~~ ^{which} he considered irrelevant, the court allows ~~a subject~~ ^{a subject} this witness to be

but 19366 began with abeyance

No songs p. 19375

CP Koocho IC 8 what has he said? criticism?

- (a) She denied that it was said that the rent should have been much higher but the councillors fought and brought it down to R5,90.
- (b) She denied there had been a reference to clinics, parks and roads.
- (c) She denied that Nosipho Myesa was at or spoke at the meeting. *see 19396 - Did not see her*
- (d) She did not hear Dlamini say: "Don't be surprised if the rent rises to R100 per month". *was not present with other witnesses*
- (e) She denies that there was an altercation between councillor Mokati and Mrs Motlaung. She says the former said nothing.
- (f) She denied that anybody had aimed a fire-arm at any stage.
- (g) She denied that councillor Dlamini explained what the increase was and why it was necessary.

(5) Pertaining to the meeting of 19 August 1984:

- (a) She did not see the banner being put up - which must have been right in front of her.
- (b) She says the lettering was blue. Defence counsel put it as "big red letters".
- (c) She says accused No 16 greeted normally at the beginning of his speech and with two hands joined together at the end saying unity is strength. Other witnesses give a different version.

- (d) She says it was not explained why the meeting was held. This conflicts with the defence case as put to Koaho.
- (e) She denies that accused No 16 referred to the paper he had in his hand. It was the defence case that he did read the rent increase from it.
- (f) She says the sole reference to Ratanda and Mohlakeng was that their rents were not as high. Yet it was the defence case that the resignation of councillors there was the highlight in the speech.
- (g) She denies accused No 1 was introduced as from AZANYU - she says she has never heard of it.
- (h) She denies that accused No 1 said that he had been sent by the youth of Soweto to support the people of the Vaal.
- (i) She denies that accused No 2 had been introduced as from AZAPO and that he spoke from the floor. This was accused No 16's version.
- (j) She stated that accused No 2 agreed with the proposal for a boycott. Later she retracted this saying he proposed the boycott.
- (k) She did not see Nosipho Myesa at the meeting of 19 August, yet she sat on the stage and the defence case was she allocated the seats.
- (l) She denies that accused No 1 put up his fist and shouted Amandla. This was put by the defence.

(m) She denied that on 19 August accused No 16 said:
The government must pay the rent, they put up
apartheid houses. This was accused No 3's evidence.

(n) She denied that accused No 16 referred to his
notes. This conflicts with accused No 2.

6. Pertaining to the meeting of 26 August 1984:

(a) She did not see the banner (yet she sat right in
front).

(b) She did not see Nosipho Myesa there.

(c) She denied that Hlube on that meeting referred to
the question how the money for the bottle stores
was spent. This conflicts with exh V.31 page 3.

(d) She positively denied that anyone on 26 August
referred to VTC buses and that VTC exploited the
people. Immediately thereafter she conceded
accused No 3 had said it.

7. She does not pay rent because the offices at Sharpeville
are closed since 1984.

HILDA MOKETSI

A wholly unimpressive witness who was evasive and had no regard for the truth. Wholly unreliable.

1. She stated she had been a member of the committee of HUCA and thereafter retracted it.
2. Her evidence that HUCA only affiliated to the UDF in 1984 after Jomo Khasu had been to Cape Town cannot be true in the light of exh 26 and exh AM.20 - yet she persisted in the version and the date. She also was adamant that only one person went to Cape Town. This conflicts with London who says there were three others.
3. Whereas Thebe stated that there were only commemoration services in 1984 and 1985 this witness said there were four or five commemoration services of June the 16th. She testified in chief that on 16 June 1985 the injured child

was far from the hall and in the street leading from the hall. The defence case had been put that the injury was in front of the hall. In cross-examination the child was in the intersecting street.

4. She said there was no trouble outside the hall. This had not been the defence case as put.
5. She stated Matloko and those in his company threw stones at the children. London had said only those in Matloko's company did so.
6. She attended only four or five meetings of HUCA and cannot give a definite view on its policies.
7. Her evidence that there was no UDF office in Vryburg conflicts with that of Tom Thebe.
8. She was evasive on her knowledge of a UDF region in the northern Cape.
9. Her evidence on meetings held by the UDF (only Chikane and Sisulu) indicates her lack of knowledge. The important meeting where accused no. 20 spoke is not even mentioned.

10. Her evidence on the rent and its increase in 1984 conflicts with the undisputed evidence of Dikobe.
11. She is biased against the councillors - she did not want to have anything to do with them, stating they had done nothing and was angry at them.
12. She stated that after the launch of HUCA she did not want to have anything to do with councillors and did not attend their meetings anymore. This conflicted with her evidence in chief and she tried to retract it when it was pointed out.
13. She is very vague on the meeting of February 1985 convened by the councillors.
14. She contradicted herself on whether it was light or dark on 16 June 1985 at Matloko's house.
15. Her version in cross-examination that at the meeting before the delegation went to Kimberley the community said they did not want the councillors and that they should resign conflicts with her previous evidence and with the defence case as put.

16. Her evidence on two meetings convened after the Kimberley excursion, one by councillors and one by the delegation, is incomprehensible and conflicts with all the other evidence, including her evidence in chief.
17. Her evidence that never were any freedom songs sung or slogans like Tambo, Mandela, UDF and HUCA shouted, is not true.
18. Having first stated that there had been schools boycotts for three weeks in 1983, she later denied there had been any boycotts.
19. She denied knowledge of attacks on property of councillors and the police. It is very unlikely that she would not have heard of them.
20. She states that there were no arrests before 16 June 1985. This conflicts with Thebe's evidence who states that in 1983 there were and heavy arrests in 1984.

ALINA MOKHOBO

A dignified lady whose evidence did not take the matter further.

She participates in the rent boycott.

MRS. P.R. (RINA) MOKOENA

This witness who was warned as an accomplice in terms of section 204 of the Criminal Procedure Act initially testified that she and accused No 17 had at two meetings on 26 August 1984 stated that councillors should be killed. After an adjournment which encompassed a week-end, however, she could not remember that she had said this at the meeting though she would not exclude the possibility. She could also not remember any resolutions passed whereas she had listed them comprehensively the previous week.

She was still in detention at the time she gave evidence and had been since November 1984.

She paused long before answering and at times her emotions got the better of her. She was rather pathetic at times.

Z.344

The difference between her evidence before and after the week-end was striking. She was an unsatisfactory and unreliable witness.

PIET MOKOENA

This was an impressive witness. He is a composed, forthright, self-assured person. He was never evasive and he made concessions where those were called for. On demeanour he is an honest witness.

MPULAHENI MOKWEBO

A witness who is very vague and whose knowledge is very limited.

1. On TCA he cannot give helpful evidence as he was not on the executive and became inactive at the end of 1983.
2. His evidence that he did not see UDF posters and pamphlets does not amount to much. They were there and are before court.
3. He is very vague on the type of meeting he attended of TCA - he never attended any mass meetings of TCA.
4. He denies that TCA was affiliated to UDF. Yet that is a fact since 20 August 1983 (exh A.1 p.60). He has no knowledge of the political activities of TCA, did not pay membership fees and never saw a constitution.

5. He seems to have a certain bias against councillors - he sees them as self-enriching.

6. He is very uninformed on political activities and activities of organisations in Tembisa.

7. He participates in a stay-away for two days without knowing what it is about. He only knows it is to get people arrested released. What people and what they did he does not know.

MRS. MIRIAM V. MOLELEKE

A rather subdued witness who did not give the impression of being untruthful except on some material aspects.

1. She testifies that she was not in Worcester when exh ABA.1 was distributed and that she had never seen exh ABA.2. But warrant officer McDonald's evidence that she and Kapa and others distributed these pamphlets was never challenged (she says she was consulted after he gave his evidence).
2. Her evidence that they never discussed a campaign against councillors conflicts with the fact of exh ABA.1.
3. She was not re-elected to the executives of UWO and WCCA and ceased being a member thereof in August 1985 (UWO) and October 1985 (WCCA).

4. When cross-examined on her attendance at the funeral of Mathew Goniwe in July 1985 she first denied that she attended. Then stated that she did not remember if she went. Then admitted it and recollected quite a few particulars of the funeral. This was an initial deliberate evasion.

5. The contents of the pamphlets (exhs ABA 1 and ABA 2) evidences that her organisations had decided to get rid of the councillors by whipping up feelings for a boycott through distorted propaganda. If her disclaimer of knowledge of exh ABA 2 and of responsibility for the contents of exh ABA 1 is true, she was totally out of touch with her organisations. This we do not accept. In view of warrant officer McDonald's uncontested evidence that she distributed them, we find that her testimony that she was absent that week-end is false.

ISAAC MOLOI

An angry young man whose evidence was false in numerous respects.
Totally unreliable.

1. He is a member of COSAS but says it had no committee. That is highly improbable. He had to concede that at least there had to be a secretary to issue membership cards. He denies Billy Makobo was on the committee - but this had never been disputed.
2. COSAS exist since before October 1983 in Thabong. It is unlikely that he heard of it only in March 1984. Exh C.52.
3. He has never heard of Thabong Youth Congress which existed since 1983. This is unlikely. According to SASPU National exh AU.8 p.9 November 1983 it worked in close association with COSAS.

4. His version that after the COSAS meeting in March 1984 he never heard of COSAS again and did not enquire is highly improbable. That he did not think about making enquiries just cannot be true.
5. In chief he had stated the March 1984 meeting was called because some scholars who had not been reregistered complained. In cross-examination he denied this saying it was the founding meeting of COSAS.
6. He lists a number of complaints which differ materially from those published in exh W.64 p.3 the SASPU National.
7. His version of two letters both handed to Hanekom whereas the second was intended for the principal Jordaan is strange.
8. His version about the length of the closure of the school by the vice-principal conflicts with what was put by the defence to Hugo.
9. His version that a girl was kicked from behind by teacher Rossouw conflicts with the defence case as put to Hugo that a boy was kicked in the stomach.

10. His date set for return to school, 30 July 1984, conflicts with what was put to Vorster namely 1 August 1984 and with the state case.
11. He contradicted himself on whether Hanekom had been asked the reason for the closure.
12. His version is that they wanted to march on 30 July 1984 through the township to make known their grievances. Yet they only went to Tutagauta which is 120 metres off and then dispersed. His reason is silly and the whole story is highly improbable.
13. His version that 30 July 1984 was the first occasion upon which they marched, is in conflict with the detailed version put by the defence on 23 July 1984.
14. His denial that the scholars ever sang freedom songs and his statement that he does not know what they are is rejected as false.
15. He says the police did not use sjamboks on 1 August 1984 - yet this was put by the defence.

16. His explanation why they ran into the class-rooms of Tutagauta and not right through the premises to get away from the police, is not understood. If they were so afraid of the police why did they regroup and proceed to Lebogang high school? The only acceptable explanation is that they wanted to disrupt the classes.

17. That he did not think their going to Lebogang would invoke police action is nonsense.

18. His evidence that in the whole of August and September 1984 he knows only of riots on 1 August is so improbable that it is rejected as false.

SOLOMON MOLOI

Wholly unreliable. Unfavourable impression in the witness-box.

1. He says he does not know what an SRC is! That is palpably false.

2. His evidence that after the dispersal at approximately 9h00 he ran directly home and went to sleep till approximately 12h00 or 13h00 is highly improbable. It was changed in cross-examination to hiding under the bed - which is equally improbable.

3. He had not heard spoken of COSAS at his school in 1985. He has in fact never heard of COSAS at all. This is so improbable as to be false.

4. Many questions had to be repeated when he feigned not to have understood them. When questioned about it he said he had trouble with his left ear. But the interpreter was next to him on his right side. He was merely being evasive.
5. He could not explain how Kananelo school could help them in their quest for SRC's.
6. He denies that any songs were sung by the pupils on 11 February 1985. This conflicts with the other witnesses.
7. He stated two people who spoke at the grave wore T-shirts. Bloem and another person whom he did not know. This other was not accused No 20 as he knew accused No 20's name and as he could not remember what No. 20 was wearing. Yet he had only heard two people speak at the grave, Bloem and accused No 20. He could not clarify this contradiction.
8. He stated accused No 20 spoke Sotho and English and used an interpreter for the English part.
9. In chief he testified what Bloem said. In cross-examination he said he did not understand Afrikaans. When asked for an explanation he said he had asked the person next to him.

10. He denies that Bloem and accused no. 20 spoke of the UDF.
Yet Bloem said they did.

11. His explanation of the visit to Bloem where per chance he
and George found the seven others on the stoep but he does
not know what they did there, is flimsy.

12. He denied that he and Daniel George were friends. Yet he
accompanied George all the way to Bloem's shop - just because
George wanted to visit Bloem.

BABALLO ANINAH MONYKOSELI

(Daweyta)

Overall not a bad witness though unsatisfactory in the following respects:

1. It is highly unlikely that she does not know what an SRC is - she was deeply involved with the demands.
2. Asked if at the joint funeral Tambo, Tambo was shouted she first replied "not by all". When further asked about it she became evasive and could not remember it.
3. She says she does not know the cause of the stay-away or who organised it. That is unlikely.

MAGDALENE MOROBE

Unsatisfactory and unreliable.

1. She stated in chief her house was attacked by brown clad police who invaded it on the morning of 3 September. In cross-examination it became the evening.
2. She said in chief she went to the neighbour's house to look at two boys who had been shot at approximately 13h00. In cross-examination it became 9h00.
3. In chief she did not say a word about the stone-throwing and general riots in her vicinity since approximately 9h00. That only came out in cross-examination.
4. In cross-examination she first said her daughter could not go to school at 7h50 because of the riots. She retracted that later and said she only referred to police hitting people.

5. Her version that police stood on the island since before 6h30 not interfering with anybody but suddenly at 8h00 other police arrive and for no reason start using tear-gas and sjamboking people, is hard to believe.
6. In cross-examination she first said her daughter could not go to school because of the riots and later she denied she had said so and testified her daughter in fact went to school.
7. She is prejudiced. She states that the police started it all. Without cause at 8h00 they attacked. But in fact it happened four blocks away at the entrance to Putsoa Stene and she could not have seen the cause. And we know there was trouble long before 8h00.
8. Having first stated positively that she heard of Buti Sekobane's house on fire between 9h00 and 12h00 on 3 September 1984 and that she saw the smoke before that time, she later stated she was not sure if it was on 3 or 4 September 1984.

LEONARD MOSALA

An impressive witness, rather self-important but of little help in the case. He retired from the executive of the Soweto Civic Association in 1982 and was wholly inactive politically (because of his studies) thereafter. He cannot testify to events and the policy of the SCA after 1982. He did not even attend any UDF meetings.

What is significant is that this witness - who is prepared to work with the system and who is outspoken against violence, as from 1983 becomes totally inactive politically - and that is the time when the political fermentation in black society really took off. Can it be that he was not happy with its direction?

EMMA MOSIAPOA

A stubborn unreliable woman who would dogmatically state what she did not know personally and often lie as well.

1. She stated that the councillors in 1982 changed their stance about the removal to Pudimoe and themselves moved people in lorries to Pudimoe. This was already before the delegation to Kimberley. This evidence conflicted with the defence case thus far.
2. She stated that the people moving to Pudimoe were forced to move by the councillors. She had no personal knowledge of this and yet was adamant. This was also a new version.
3. Her evidence that councillor Dikole at the report back meeting proposed that a temporary committee be elected conflicts with all the other evidence. Yet she was adamant.

4. She stated that at the HUCA launch only Khasu and Galeng spoke. She was adamant about it. She is the only witness who says so.
5. She is wholly uninformed on HUCA. She attended only its launch.
6. Her evidence that at the HUCA launch only Nkosi Sikelela and senzeni na were sung and no slogans were shouted is unacceptable.
7. Her evidence is that there was no violence at all in Huhudi before 17 June 1985. This conflicts with other evidence about hand-grenade attacks and attacks on shops and houses of councillors.
8. Her version that Matloko intentionally drove into the youngsters was not the defence case as put and is improbable as on the defence case he must have driven off and within a few minutes returned (to speak to London). This is unlikely if he had attempted murder. Her version differs from the case of the defence as put as to where this allegedly occurred.

DR. NTATHO HARRISON MOTLANA

A well-spoken, courteous witness. We reject his evidence that the UDF was averse to violence and non-revolutionary. In fact he himself helped build the revolutionary climate in South Africa.

1. In chief he stated he had first been appointed to a position in the UDF at the national launch on 20 August 1983, that position being the REC Transvaal. In cross-examination it was shown he had been elected in the Transvaal REC already on 6 August 1983 and not at Cape Town. Exh A.5 p.4.
2. He stated he did not attend any UDF meetings in Transvaal before the national launch and after the national launch only three or four meetings of the REC Transvaal. Nor did he receive any minutes or papers. They were sent to the secretary of the SCA.

3. He is an adherent of the Freedom Charter - as is his whole executive in the SCA (bar one).
4. Exh CA.46, the keynote address of Sisulu at the NECC conference in March 1986, though outside the period of the indictment, indicates the type of organisation to which the SCA and Motlana gave birth and which it supported wholeheartedly. Exh CA.46 is an over-sight of the revolution's progress. It indicates what is meant by peoples education and peoples power. It gives a stark and realistic view of the type of man who this witness is - one who associates willingly with and works with revolutionaries.
5. We find it hard to accept that he, ex ANC youth league, friend of Oliver Tambo, would not know that the ANC annually broadcasts a New Year's message.
6. We also find it difficult to believe that Dr. Motlana does not know who invited him to join the Transvaal REC of the UDF or who was behind the organisation for a UDF in the Transvaal. Accused No 19 who was on the SCA executive would probably have discussed this with him fully. Furthermore Dr Motlana, a leader of the Black community in Soweto, would be one of the first to know of this new development. We find he is being evasive.

7. We disagree with his view of the Working Principles of the UDF para 3.4 exh A.1 p.8 (accredited liberation movements). This is dealt with elsewhere.
8. His attempt to distinguish chants from freedom songs to make the point that chants differ from place to place and time to time, is without substance. He may be correct on the difference between chants and songs but whatever they are called, materially the same words are heard at all meetings.
9. His attitude seems to be that religion should be used for political ends. Jesus Christ is a freedom fighter and Lamentations of Jeremiah (5) are very handy in any political meeting, he says.
10. His attempts to argue that the repeated slogans Oliver Tambo with fist and outstretched thumb do not identify with the ANC are ludicrous. He has the difficulty that he himself stood on the stage at the SOYCO meeting with fist and extended thumb raised high and joined in the singing. Exh V.25 p.45.

11. The UDF stands indicted from the mouth of this witness. He says Pesheya Komfula (we will catch them with their children) is a song sung only by irresponsible street children. The type that necklace people. All responsible people in the UDF would be appalled and stop it. These were his words. Yet nobody ever even remonstrated. And this song was regularly sung at meetings.
12. His attempt at an explanation for the song "the Supreme Court is burning" is flimsy.
13. In cross-examination he stated that he regards the South African government as illegitimate and illegal. In re-examination he retracted the statement that he regarded it as illegal.
14. We do not understand his argument that his speech on the history of the militant ANC youth league and songs like "We will follow Tambo, ANC" at the SOYCO launch (exh V.25) did not have the effect of popularising the ANC. He admits the ANC is the mother organisation.
15. He is not speaking the truth when he says that he does not know that Mandela was commander of Umkhonto we Sizwe and that Oliver Tambo is now its supreme commander.

16. We reject his denial that he used the word militarisation exh V.25 p.15. It fits in with the context and is in the video. He falsely denies he used the word as he cannot explain it away. It is not ridiculous English as he says.
17. The same applies in respect of his use of the words "discipline of events" which he also denies using. Exh V.25 p.18.
18. Cross-examined on the phrase "pray like revolutionaries" of Aubrey Mokoena in exh V.19(b) p.2 he said that they (of the SCA) never said they were revolutionaries. When cross-examined on exh V.25 pp.20 and 21 where the word "revolution" is used, he said it merely meant fundamental change and does not carry connotations of violence. If so it is strange that the SCA never used it. In any event in the context here it is used in a violent sense and Dr Motlana is vainly attempting to explain it away. The same applies in respect of the COSAS message. Exh V.25 pp.41 and 42.
19. Dr Motlana stated in cross-examination that the purpose of meetings like the SOYCO launch and others was to popularise the struggle. It follows that if the emphasis is laid on the ANC by speech and song it popularises the struggle of the ANC.

20. In chief he was led to give an expert medical opinion on the mental condition of Oscar Mpetha. The purpose was to use it as basis for an argument that Oscar Mpetha did not know what he was doing when he shouted Viva ANC, Viva Umkhonto. Exh V.25 p.47. This opinion was watered down in cross-examination to a mere possibility. An opinion expressed without examination of the patient and in conflict with the objective facts such as the tone of the meeting (frequent references to revolution) and the coherence of Mpetha's speech. It was a transparent attempt to explain away an embarrassing fact. Exh V.25 pp.45 and 47.

21. He contradicted himself on whether the young man at Bongani Khumalo's funeral who prevented him from speaking came from the audience. This young man, a member of COSAS, was known to Dr Motlana. Neither he nor COSAS ever apologises to Dr Motlana. This incident illustrates the unnatural dominance of the youth in the Black community.

22. He stated that he could not remember any of the revolutionary slogans or the revolutionary songs at the funeral. We have them in the video and transcript. Exh V.27. If the witness tells the truth it indicates that this revolutionary material is the normal fare at this type of gathering. Otherwise the witness would undoubtedly have remembered these particular occurrences.

23. He evaded the question whether COSAS was behind the boycott at schools.

24. The evidence of Dr Motlana that he cannot remember the stay-away of 5 and 6 November 1984 is suspect. It was one of the biggest stay-aways of recent times. Exhs W.11 p.1 and AB.7(6) indicate that the SCA was one of the organisers of this stay-away.

J.N. MOTSOENING

A good witness.

0 | AMOS MSIMANGA | 0

How many papers of 19th = 6
" " " 2nd = 5

The Interpreter = 2 minutes

A venerable old Zulu who belongs to Inkatha and participated in the UBC and council system. He has a foggy memory which is wholly untrustworthy. No adverse comment on demeanour.

1. He says that on 19 August only two resolutions of 12 August were referred to: the R5,90 should not be paid and a petition. This conflicts with other evidence.

He says in chief that he only orally remembers the 2nd 19463-4 - Why a criticism

2. He has virtually no recollection on the pamphlet produced by the woman at the meeting of 2 September and the resolution set out thereon of the Small Farms

In chief he gives an explanation that he was concerned with Suswille - not Swaton where it came from.

3. His version that the meeting of 2 September decided to come to the church on 3 September to complete the petition and then decide whether to see lawyers or not is

flimsy. Why flimsy? - other witnesses gave similar evidence - NO evidence to contrary - finding that 1st 1, 2, 8 evidence of other purpose like March not acceptable.

In chief 19473

~~Waste of time on this?~~

NOT correct to say all the evidence - defence witnesses said NO1 spoke 16

4. He says on 19 August accused No 16 spoke, then accused No 1, and accused No 2 he saw there but did not hear speak. This conflicts with all the evidence that accused No 16, then accused No 2, then accused No 1 spoke. This is a material mistake as the witness says that he interpreted for accused No 16 and then accused No 1 and then left the hall.

[List witnesses therefore (the clear misdirection)]

Also find whether IC 9 & Kocho may have conceded that they gave wrong order

5. He says accused No 1 was introduced as from AZAPO. This conflicts with all other evidence. He says AZANYU was not mentioned. Similar sounds AZANYU unknown organisation - did not appear 1949 2

See 1244
1250 - 7 do not know
IN ISSUE p 1252, 1243
I.C. 9

6. He admits having been overcome by high blood pressure on the 19 August meeting and it is probable that this affected his perception and recollection. Letter J/P/19468

NB
for press air -
Only pushes when NO1 p 1949 2

7. His allegation that he did not know the meaning of the word "puppet" is unacceptable as he was called that when in the UBC already. - He said on record see p. 19498-9
People in high positions lots of things said

8. He denies that accused No 1 stated the moneys of the increased rent would be used for the SADF. Yet this was the defence case as put. He could have forgotten the instructions need not have come from him.

9. He states that at the meeting of 2 September the resolutions of the previous meeting were not read out. Accused No 2 testified to the contrary. to Council
He remembers the petition - presumably in connection with the rent -
Not valid reason.

19507 - who pointed out

10. He denies that at the meeting of 2 September the names of the volunteers for the distribution of the petition were written down. Accused No 2 testified to the

contrary. *i.e. Major wrote them down*
Why is a reason to disbelieve him

11. He denies that there was discussion of the document produced by the woman on the meeting of 2 September 1984. But accused No 2 had testified that he spoke on it and accused No 3 supported him.

p 19510

He explains earlier in chief his lack of concern
P19472

12. There is an appreciable discrepancy between the version of the witness and also the defence case put at various stages, on what would be done on 3 September at the church.

Petition - see howyer - why discrepancy see putting of P. 19513 et seq

13. His willingness to pay rent but inability to do so since 1984 are suspect. *Reference - rent general Complaint*

He does not pose the question as to whether he would have interpreted the offending words.

see p.

Was he XX on it -

S. MULLER

An impressive witness.

NOSIPHO MYESA

Sharpeville.

An unsophisticated witness who expressed herself well but who is totally untrustworthy.

1. It is strange that this alleged part-time clerk at the Union's offices and a Union official Hlube temporarily allocated to Vereeniging and not resident in Sharpeville but in Soweto, play a vital role in all the meetings at the church of accused No 3 - to which they do not belong.
2. It is peculiar that Nosipho Myesa and Peter Hlube are on 2 September asked by accused No 3 not to go to work on 3 September but come to the church just to see what was happening, together with the church council member Mosuoane.
3. In chief no mention is made of the burning house of Boetie Sekobane. That emerges only in cross-examination. //

4. It is unacceptable that of the whole mob not one is known to the witness who lived all her life in Sharpeville.

5. She has a fantastic story of her flight from the Vaal. She says her house was attacked in the night of 3 September 1984 and she feared for her life. What remains beyond comprehension is:

(a) why she was satisfied to leave her only child living in the same house from one week after the event;

(b) why she took no steps to see the child or her family till November 1986;

(c) why the matter was not reported to the police - she loses her house, child and work through this attack;

(d) why she took no steps to get her clothes. She left in her night-gown (she says). If as she says she could not get at her clothes because of the tear-gas, a few hours waiting would have solved the problem;

(e) why she could not hand the moneys of the Union and cheque-books and other documents to Peter Hlube - her chief - instead of taking a lot of trouble to get to Soetvelde Farms to hand this to the chairman of the Union Daniel Mzaia. In any event it is strange that this valuable handbag could be reached but not her clothes!

- (f) why she never wrote home in the period after she fled. She never spoké to her father till 1987, she was too afraid to go back to the Vaal;
- (g) why, when she had not thought of leaving till she was on the way to Soetvelde, did she not turn back for her personal effects;
- (h) why did she flee without even discussing the matter with the family head, her father;
- (i) after the night attack early next morning the uncles are called to the scene. Everybody stands around and inspects the damage. Yet she hides away at the neighbour's, peeping through the window, too afraid to go out. Her reason is that she is afraid the attackers may be part of the crowd. How she can say that after she told of tear-gas, canisters and rubber bullets being part of the attack we cannot understand;
- (j) she did not see any attackers and did not hear them;
- (k) she says she went to look early on the morning of 4 September and looked through the window of her father's room. Yet she did not attempt to get into the house. This is peculiar as the house had been left standing open the night before and she alleges the money and cheque-books of the Union were in her handbag lying within easy reach. One would have expected

her to verify that everything was intact.

This whole version is a concoction. She fled from the police to avoid arrest. Her denial is false.

6. In chief she stated that the knife-wielding man accosted them at 8h20 and that the mob met them at approximately 8h40. But in cross-examination he was just one of the four runners. When this discrepancy was put she stated that she had had no watch.

*As a
to
evidence
did
The original
more than
one incident*

7. She is shocked to see people being dragged out of houses to join the mob. She has only just escaped from the mob itself. Yet she stands in the doorway of her house looking at the oncoming mob till she and her father and child are also dragged into the mob. This is very improbable. *improbable?*

8. Nosipho Myesa's evidence conflicts with that of accused No 3 in a number of respects:

- (a) whether Hlube was there on 10 August 1984 when accused No 3 and Nosipho discussed the pamphlet exh AN.15.5;
- (b) whether accused No 3 asked Nosipho and Hlube to assist him at the meeting of 12 August 1984;
- (c) whether they were an ad hoc committee of the parish council;

(d) whether accused No 3 referred to councillors in his speech on 12 August or not;

(e) whether Hlube referred to the petition;

(f) whether Nosipho blamed the councillors for the increase;

(g) whether the non-reading of electricity meters was blamed on the councillors;

(h) she does not remember that it was discussed on 12 August that people could do gardening in accused No 3's yard as accused No 3 testified. Had it been discussed it is likely she would have remembered it;

(i) her evidence conflicts with that of accused No 3 on whether she produced and hung a banner at the meeting of 12 August;

(j) and on whether the chairmanship of the meeting of 19 August and what would happen there were discussed in accused No 3's house;

(k) on whether accused No 3 stated the meeting of 19 August to be one of a series to be held (as put by counsel).

9. Her evidence that accused No 3 did not discuss the petition or court interdict beforehand with her and Hlube is improbable. #

She says his proposals came as a total surprise. ||

10. Her denial that councillors were criticised at the meeting of 12 August was contradicted by her own evidence. || *Cher*
11. Her evidence that no mention was made on 12 August that petitions be circulated is in conflict with the contemporaneous report of the Rand Daily Mail. Exh DA.10 para 9. || *Cher*
12. In chief she stated that it was resolved on 12 August that the R5,90 increase in rent would not be paid till the councillors had been met for a discussion of the issue. In cross-examination she denied ever having said so. || *Cher*
13. Her allegation that she could see who the driver was of the police vehicle at the church on 19 August through the tinted windows is suspect. ||
14. Her statement that "look out, there they are, they are present" is not a warning against the police is unacceptable.
15. In respect of the meeting of 19 August 1984 her evidence conflicts with that of other witnesses:
 - (a) with that of accused No 16 on the effectiveness of replacing councillors with new ones (this, however, may be a misunderstanding of accused No 16's speech by Nosipho); ||

- (b) with accused No 2 on whether accused No 16 looked at the paper in his hand or read from it and on other aspects;
- (c) in conflict with what was put on accused No 1's behalf;
- (d) in conflict with accused No 2 on whether Nana spoke from the floor or from the stage;
- (e) in conflict with accused No 3 on whether resolutions were read at the end of the meeting;
- (f) in conflict with accused No 2 on whether she called accused No 2 to the stage.

16. She is in conflict with exh AAQ.7 (the Sowetan) on whether

- it was an emotion charged meeting
- or slogans were shouted
- or freedom songs were sung
- or leaders of political organisations addressed the meeting
- or that a scathing attack was launched on councillors.

17. It was conspicuous that this witness would shift her position as soon as the evidence of other witnesses was put to her. See for

example P18056

18. She was evasive when cross-examined on the reference at the meeting of 26 August 1984 to what would happen on 3 September 1984 - as stated by Mokgema (see exh V.31 p.14). Her statement that she did not listen after the word impimpi was used is nonsense.

18157
Goza

19. She confused Botha's and Mokgema's speeches at the meeting of 26 August 1984.

20. As regards the meeting of 2 September she is in conflict with accused No 3 on whether accused No 3 discussed the pamphlet of the stay-away with her and Peter Hlube and whether Hlube asked the audience about this pamphlet.

*He changed his mind 18174
self against it*

she was opposed by No 3.

21. She states she was totally opposed to a stay-away on 3 September and so was Peter Hlube. Asked why both she and Hlube then stayed away she stated Hlube and she went to the church because accused No 3 asked them to keep an eye on the proceedings at his church. Asked why one only would not have sufficed, she stated that she had to look after Peter Hlube as he had a stammer and was not a good chairman. This is nonsensical. This version is all the more improbable as she says she did not think the stay-away call would be heeded by the majority of those at the meeting of 2 September 1984.

Be that as it may not remember words

In chief 17964 go to church yet Sep.

22. She contradicted herself on whether she went home from the meeting of 2 September or first collected signatures for the petition.

Horribly important -

In Chief 17965 - went collected after med

XX ^{circa} 181179 *

1 Not clear contradiction a year or so
He finds the question of infestation -
was a petition -

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-K2117-L14-6

Document Title:- Witnesses M Z249-383