20

25

30

existing members of the Congress of Democrats, or with a 1 view to getting recruits as well? -- (A) My lords, these would be discussed by branches." ("Q) Confined to members ?-- (A) We might invite other people to come." ("Q) When these discussions took place can you recall whether nonmembers were invited to attend these discussions?-- (A) 5 It was quite a practice that we would invite our friends who would be interested and say well, so and so is going to lead the discussion on this topic; would you like to come along?'. It was not confined entirely to Congress members. We were free to invite other people but the discussions 10 took place at branch levels. I don't remember specific instances but I know that it was our practice to invite people to share with us in our discussions."

My lords, my submission is that from the evidence so far, to which I have drawn the Court's attention — and this evidence of Helen Joseph — it shows in my submission that these discussion notes were nothing else but propaganda material, putting forward the viewpoint of policy of the South African Congress of Democrats.

Then your lordship the Presiding Judge asked:

("Q) Looking only at this document briefly, as I have
done, to the references which have been mentioned, if a
person had been present at the discussion of this topic
based on this particular document, at a branch meeting,
who was not a member of the Congress of Democrats, I take
it he would have gone away with the idea that for the
Colonially oppressed people through liberation, it is
through the liberation that is shown as having been
effected in China. India is a good example but they
should have gone further, or should go further, and the

really true beacon of hope for oppressed people all over

MR. TERBLANCHE

1

30

the world is China? -- (A) My lords, I think on the reading I would say - I don't know what line the discussion would take - - the discussions should be very full and free - on the document itself I would agree; as I say it was a basis for discussion! (Q)" May I say this: at that branch 5 meeting, would the majority of members of the Congress of Democrats have supported the point of view expressed in that document? -- (A) My lords, it is very difficult to say; I think it would be possible. I should imagine so, bbut I really could not say..... I didn't discuss this particu-10 lar document...." ("Q) But knowing your organisation and knowing its approach wouldn't it be very likely? -- (A) I think it would be likely, $(/\!\!/Q)$ The majority of the members would supmy lords." port that? -- (A) I think they would; they migh disagree 15 with some things expressed in this document, but I think broadly - I imagine - in India the liberation hadn't sufficiently effected the wellbeing of the people of India. The point I wanted to make in the beginning was that to the best of my knowledge the Congress of Democrats 20 didn't express itself officially on the question of India, other than asking its members to discuss it. (Q) One may get a point of view from an organisation not expressed officially but expressed in various documents?-- (A) Yes, that, of course, is so, my lords." ("Q) It may then be 25 regarded also as a point of view of that organisation without purporting to be an official statement...." and there is no answer to that, my lords. Then there was an adjournment, my lords, and

the evidence continues on page 14464. The Prosecutor

5

10

15

20

25

30

says: "("Q) Yesterday, Mrs. Joseph, we were dealing with this lecture 'National Liberation Struggles in Asia', and you said that on a reading of this document it was possible that it meant that the form of indepence achieved by India was not approved of, but that the struggle should go further and achieve the form of independence as in China?--(A) My lords, I don't think I actually expressed that view; I think I finally agreed with the suggestion put to me by his lordship that it was felt that the struggle for independence in China had gone further than the struggle for independence in India. I don't think I expressed it as strongly as it has been put to me now." ("Q) But now, when the document says that the form of indepence achieved in China is the most outstanding illustration, doesn't that suggest that the author of this document recommended this form of independence or liberation achieved in China ?-- (A) I imagine so, yes, but what I suggest is that the suggestion that there was so much comparison between India and China, from the very cursory glance I had of that document, I felt that that aspect of it was being overemphasised now. That is my opinion."

My lords, may I pause to say that it's quite correct, there is no direct comparison in that document between India and China, but the purport of the whole document in my submission is quite clear, that there is such a comparison.

Then the next question, ("Q) I suggest to you that the whole object of this document was to show that the form of independence achieved in India was not sufficient, but that the people should achieve a higher form of independence as in China?-- (A) My lords, I have not

10

15

25

30

studied the whole document; I think it mentions a number of other liberatory struggles. Might I ask to be given an opportunity really to read this document as a whole?"

Then, my lords, the Prosecutor says "Yes, we'll come back to this document again, Mrs. Joseph; in the meantime I want to put to you this question: this document was prepared by your Propaganda Committee, was it not?--(A) That would be so, my lords." ("Q) And the Propaganda Committee, as I understand it, consisted of members of the National Executive Council, or National Executive Committee of the Congress of Democrats? -- (A) The Propaganda Committee would consist of those members, but with regard to the preparing of the discussion notes the Propaganda Committee was quite free to call in the assistance of people outside the Propaganda Committee; that I think was always made clear. They did not necessarily prepare documents themselves." ("Q) I understand that, but any document that would be issued by an organisation would have to have their approval? -- (A) The approval of the Propaganda ("Q) Yes?-- (A) That would be so, the final Committee?" form would go through the Propaganda Committee. (Q)"You see, the need for a Propaganda Committee was discussed at the Inaugural Conference, was it not? -- (A) I don't remember specifically; it may well have been. I think the question of propaganda for political education was always discussed at each of our conferences."

Then there are certain questions, my lords, in regard to who were the members of this Propaganda Committee but the witness could not assist in that at all, except that she says "Yes, my lords, I myself served on the Propaganda Committee".

5

10

And she said that Mrs. Hepner and Norman Levy - - I am really speaking about after 1955, after the first Conference, not after the Inaugural Conference

Then, at the bottom of page 14466, this question: ("Q) You see, I want to put it to you that this Propaganda Committee put forward publications as a means of propagating the views of the Organisation?-- (A) As far as publications are concerned that would be so, but this document we are discussing was not a publication. It was issued by this Committee for internal discussion, my lords. I do actually see a difference between that and a publication which is made available to the public."

My lords, I have already dealt with that attitude of Helen Joseph's with regard to this document.

Then, my lords, the next reference by this witness to this document starts again on page 14467, line 28, to 15 The Prosecutor says: ("Q) Now this page 14471, line 22. document, the National Liberation Struggles in Asia deals with the composition of the National Movement on page 2". Then there's a question by your lordship the Presiding 20 Judge, ("Q) What National Movement?". The Prosecutor says: "The National Movement in Colonial countries, my lord." ("Q) Let me put a general question to you first, Mrs. Joseph. Do you agree that the emergence of the Industria; working class in the Colonial Liberation Movement serves 25 to strengthen the Movement? -- (A) I've not really given serious consideration to that. I would generally agree but it's an aspect I have not really given serious con-("Q) Would you agree that it would be sideration to. desirable for the working class to lead the National Liberation Movement? -- (A) My lords, did you say to lead?" 30

5

10

15

20

25

30

("Q) Yes?-- (A) My lords. I've never seen it as desirable that any particular class should lead the Liberation Movement. I see the importance of the Liberation Movement including many classes." ("Q) But it's the working class who suffer oppression primarrily, does it not?-- (A) The working class does suffer oppression, yes." ("Q) And it's the main body in any Colonial country that suffers the main oppression? -- (A) That would be so my lords. " ("Q) Yes, and would it not be correct then for that working class group to be in the struggle? -- (A) My lords, I say again it would be correct for the working class in my opinion to play a very important part in the struggle.....to be in the vanguard, not so much to be in the lead, but to be in the I'm not clear what is intended forefront of the struggle. by 'to lead'." ("Q) In the forefront is good enough for me, for my purpose, Mrs. Joseph", then there's an answer (A) "I thought you meant the actual leadership...... I'm perhaps taking too narrow a view." ("Q) Does the Congress of Democrats not recognise the important role played by the working class? -- (A) Oh, that is undoubtedly ("Q) Yes, and the role that they would so, my lords" play would be in the forefront, as well as to lead and guide the struggle? -- (A) My lords, with a large working class participation it is quite obvious I think, that that would have a great effect upon the leadershipship, but I do want to stress, my lords, that in the Congress of Democrats they have never thought in terms of which class is to lead the Liberation." ("Q) You see, in this document 'National Liberation Struggles in Asia' the passage appears on page 1761 of the record, the author mentions the following: 'The emergence of the working

5

10

class led to the strengthening of the National Liberation
Movement in a number of ways'. For the moment I am only
concerned with the one aspect, namely the possession of a
theory of social and economic phenomena, a fear of Socialism". Then the question: ("Q) Do you or your organisation hold the view that the possession of a theory of
Socialism by the working class led to the strengthening
of the National Liberation Movement?-- (A) My lords, I
don't recall that our organisation ever formulated such a
view. It would be difficult for me to say whether it
held that view or whether it didn't. I simply do not
recall such a discussion."

Then your lordship, the Presiding Judge, asked this question: ("Q) Broadly put, in a more simple way, was the Congress of Democrats not of opinion that in order to assist the liberation of oppressed people in Colonial 15 countries it was important for the workers in those countries to be politically conscious? -- (A) Yes, my lords." ("Q) And in order to make them politically conscious one should present them with a theory; they should know what their position ought to be? -- (A) Yes." ("Q) As 20 the workers and as oppressed people? -- (A) Yes, my lords." ("Q) Of necessity, was it not the case then, broadly speaking, if one is opposed to Imperialism and the disadvantage of Capitalism, that one would naturally be favourable to a school of thought, a political school 25 of thought that would amount to Socialism in a broad sense: I'm not narrowing it down to Communist Socialism but in a bourgeosie Socialism? -- (A) In a very broad sense, yes, as part of our task. I think we have emphasised it, that we should try to reach the European workers 30

through the Congress of Democrats, in order to educate
the European workers not on any specific lines but to
try to make them see that the future of South Africa
really lies in a multi-racial democracy, and that they
would not in fact be the sufferers . . . that they
must adjust themselves. They should not see the nonEuropean as a competitor and beat them down all the time.
In broad terms, my lords, those are the lines along which
we had to do our task, but I didn't recognise it really
as a formulation as put to me by the Crown."

Then the Prosecutor: ("Q) In this document, Mrs. Joseph, China is held up as an example to the Colonial peoples in their struggles?-- (A) From what I saw of the document yesterday, that is so, but I really only looked at two portions of it." ("Q) In China, Socialism replaced the Capitalist system?-- (A) My lords, I think I have said already I do not know to what extent that is correct; whether it was completely replacing - - I think I have said already...."

("Q) It depends again on what you mean by Socialism because the Communists call Communism Socialism to-day; our school of thought in the West of Socialism is confined to a political system which does not go as far as Communism, so there is that difference?-- (A) I don't know what you mean, Mr. Liebenberg."

My lords, it is not indicated in the record but that seems to be only a member of the Court addressing the Prosecutor. Then Mr. Liebenberg: ("Q) I merely refer to the theory of Socialism which is used in the document, this document; I want to suggest to you, Mrs. Joseph, that the theory of Socialism which is referred to

1

5

10

15

20

25

30

here is the Socialism of China?-- (A) My lords, I think I must ask, if I may be allowed to see this document first."

Then the next reference, my lords, to this is at page 14596 . . .

RUMPFF J: All this evidence that you are referring us to, Mr. Terblanche, is it in support of one of the allegations in Schedule 6?

MR. TERBLANCHE: My lord, this document I will also deal with under another heading, and I don't want to split up the evidence of the witness because it cannot really be split up. It deals with one portion, it deals with another portion. I have prepared a short summary....

RUMPFF J: Go on.

MR. TERBLANCHE: I have prepared a short submission, my lord, of what I would say the evidence amounted to, but yesterday, after objection, my lords, your lordship held that I should rather read the evidence. That's why I'm reading it, my lords.

RUMPFF J: We don't want you to shorten the argument in any way, but is it necessary to read all this evidence that you've read. If you want to make a point can't you pick out one paragraph, or one answer and leave it at that?

MR. TERBLANCHE: My lords, I could do that but...

RUMPFF J: As I understood the Crown's attitude

the evidence of Helen Joseph is going to be dealt with

separately when her position arises.

MR. TERBLANCHE: That is so, my lord.

RUMPFF J: Yes. . .

MR. TERBLANCHE: There isn't much more, my lord.

I've reas most of her evidence

1

RUMPFF J: Now, the evidence that you've referred to so far, what are your submissions on that?--

5

MR. TERBLANCHE: My lords, I've made certain submissions on her attitude to this document, to the value of this document, and I read this, my lords, that her evidence amounts to this, that she does not state that this is not in accordance with the policy of viewpoint of the South African Congress of Democrats; that as far as she is concerned most of the members of the South African Congress of Democrats agree with it; that she herself agrees with it; that there is really nothing And for that with which she disagrees in the document. purpose, my lords, it may be necessary for me to read all of her evidence because the same objection might be made which was made yesterday. I'd be only too happy, my lords, if I could go back to my short summaries of her evidence and submit that that is the effect of her evidence

10

RUMPFF J: Yes. well, it depends entirely on the way one puts it. If you put a fair description of her evidence in regard to certain points there cannot be any objection to it, provided it's fair.

and not read all this in, my lords.

15

MR. TERBLANCHE: Itry to be fair always, my lords, and I hope I am in this case. My lords, there are only three more pages in regard to this document; that appears on page 14596, line 9. ("Q) Mrs. Joseph, has the National Liberation Movement as you conceive it not a dual character?—— (A) In what sense, my lords?" ("Q) Firstly, to establish an independent freedom from foreign oppression, and secondly, a moving forward towards a higher

20

25

1

5

10

15

30

stage of development, namely Socialism?—— (A) Yes, to the first part, no to the second. I think I have said already that in South Africa and in different countmies the National Liberation Movement may play a different role. ("Q) I'm only concerned with the National Liberation Movement in South Africa?—— (A) I thimk I have stated very clearly our concept of the National Liberation Movement here; at least I hope I have been clear."

Then, my lords, I skip two questions and then follows: ("Q) Expressed in purely negative terms, the National Liberatory Movements are resistant movements to the Colonial system?—— (A) Yes, my lords, because that is dealing with Liberatory Movements in Asia. It was not dealing with the Liberatory Movement in South Africa. It would be correct in that context."

Then on the question of the liberation of China this is her answer on page 14598: ("Q) Is your view that the victory of the people in China considerably strengthened the National Liberation struggles in Asia?-- (A) My lords, I imagine that any country which achieves liberation would strengthen the Liberation Movements in other countries."

Now, my lords, I have told your lordships what submissions on her evidence I am making, thather approach to this document is not correct and that there is really no disagreement with what is expressed in this document.

My lords, the document deals - and in my submission its purpose is to teach its members and other people two things; firstly, what the National Liberation Movement is - not only in Asia although it deals with Asia primararily - and secondly, what such a Movement strives for. Now this document at page 1766, line 27, to page 1767, line 4,

deals with India. I've read that extract, in dealing with Helen Joseph's evidence; that's the extract which says:
"For centuries the main base of the British Empire, India, is experiencing great changes". My lords, my submisssion is that that clearly shows that what they set out to achieve in South Africa would not be the independence, or freedom or liberation that was achieved in India, because what was achieved there is expressed as something which was only granted as it were to counter the advance of National Liberation. This so called formal independence.

Then, my lords, at page 1767, line 25 to 26, it says that the form of Imperialist domination has thus changed in India, but the domination still exists; again a clear indication, my lords, that they do not agree with that because they were fighting in South Africa for liberation, and if this was liberation it was not what they want in South Africa, and India is held up by them as their inspiration of achieving what they wanted in a non-violent manner.

And then, my lords, this reference of the witness to the new tendencies; that is dealt with at page
1767, line 26, to page 1768, line 8 of the record, and it
says "Nevertheless new tendencies are today emerging,
(1) the Indian Government desires to promote closer relations with the other great Asian power, China, and generally help to preserve peace (2) within India
mass discontent with social and economic hardships, and
the need for drastic aggrarian reforms have led to an
orientation towards the Left, and a sharp growth of peasant

1

5

struggle. The elections of 1951/52, the first under universal suffrage, showed the shift in political alignment. The Congress Party from an 80 to 90% majority has fallen to a minority of 42% of the total votes and a United Democratic Front has emerged as a principal opposition group and a challenging alternative to Congress."

My lords, therefore the tendencies which brought hope to India are firstly, closer relationship with China . . .

RUMPFF J: You've just read it. Is that what 10 you submit?

MR. TERBLANCHE: As your lordship pleases. And they are in my submission all Leftist sentiments, mt lords.

Then, my lords, I also submit that the read-15 ing of Helen Joseph's evidence shows how they considered the Liberation struggle in China, that that was a beacon of hope. My lords, the next document I wish to deal with is C.284, 'Notes of Speakers'. My lords, I firstly refer the Court to the passage at page 1775, line 2 20 to line 16, and I do not read it. I simply submit, my lords, that it indicates the new form of State the South African Congress of Democrats wished to achieve, which would be a true Democracy according to them. This they say can be achieved by building a mighty political al-25 liance of allon the basis of the Congress of Democrats, and then, my lords, the next document I refer to is C.980. This document is the same as Y.B.34, my lords. It is the Resolutions adopted at the Annual National Conference of the South African Congress of 30

Democrats on the 31st March to 1st April, 1956. Now, in these resolutions, my lords, there is a reference to the Nationalist Party and its Fascist programme, and the struggle to replace the Nationalist Government by a Peoples Democratic Government, and to replace the present denial of social, economic and political rights with a Constitution guaranteeing to all the rights embodied in the Freedom Charter. This replacement is to be achieved by mobilising all sections of the population and by an extra-Parliamentary struggle.

My lords, I'm not reading that passage; in my submission that is what the passage says and that is the viewpoint and attitude of the South African Congress of Democrats as expressed in that resolution.

Now, my lords, the mere fact of calling the State Fascist, of course, might not mean anything, but when it is contrasted with what they want and it's shown that what they are striving for is totally different - then it shows, my lords, that they didn't use those words in the sense in which other political parties may use them, but in the sense to indicate to the people, to make the people hate the State, and to prepare the people for a new State as they were striving for.

Then the next document, my lords, I deal with is C.1001. This is a South African Congress of Democrats' circular dated 5th September, 1956, and I only refer to it, my lords, because of the reference in that circular to the Fascist programme of the Nationalist Government, and on page - - that's the first reference, my lords, - page 2130, line 32 refers to the South African Congress

10

1

15

20

25

l

5

10

15

20

of Democrats' contribution in bringing about the Congress of the People and the Freedom Charter, and in the next passage at page 2131, lines 16 to 24, it states that the struggle is beginning to sharpen; that is the struggle between the two opposing forces in South Africa which they describe in various ways, as already indicated, my lords - that is the Nationalist Party programme will bring about more favourable conditions for winning people to the Congress Movement and the Freedom Charter. These passages again, my lords, have references to the Fascist Government and it's contrasted with the Congress of the People and the Freedom Charter. It also shows, my lords, that in their opinion, in their view, this struggle was now sharpened - it's now coming to a head.

The next document I deal with, my lords, is C.1013. That is "The Counter Attack" of March, 1956, and the first paragraph I refer to, my lords, is at page 2154, line 31 to page 2155, line 40, and I'm not reading it; I submit that its effect is that here the nature and acts of the Congress are contrasted with the nature and acts of the Government. It says that the Congress stands poised against the Government. The two forces opposing each other, and not forces opposing each other in the Parliamentary sense, but in an extra-parliamentary unconstitutional sense.

The next paragraph I refer to, my lords, is on page 2156, line 2 to page 2167, line 26; the same document, my lords. It goes on to show that other groups like the Blask Sash are also starying to fight extra—Parliamentary; it says that these groups are fighting

25

extra Parliamentary to save the 1910 Constitution, and it then points out that the demonstrations of the Black Sash haveandone reason suggested is because it tried to uphold the 1910 Constitution. The document then deals with the role of the Congress of Democrats and that is, it proclaimed the 1910 Constitution as a fraud and doomed to extinction. Now this in my submission, my lords, shows beyond any doubt that as far as the South African Congress of Democrats was concerned there was never any intention of reforming or amending the Constitution; they wanted a new constitution and thus a new State.

My lords, I just wish to read the last portion to which I have referred. It says: "The emergence of the Congress of Democrats, not as a sporadic movement of protest but as a full blooded partner in the struggle for democracy, is one of the major features in this sphere of the struggle against the Nationalist Government. The role of the C.O.D. is self evident; it proclaimed that the 1910 Constitution was a fraud and doomed to extinction; that nine-tenths of the people were debarred from the Convention which gave birth to a Constitution which set thehand for the racialism of the last forty years; that if we are democrats we must agree to the first principle of democratic rule - a Government of the majority of the people by the people."

Now, my lords, to refer to the South African

Constitution in the terms in which this document refers

to it shows beyond any doubt in my submission that the

South African Congress of Democrats was not out to reform

- as has been suggested by Helen Joseph - through Parliament,

but they were going to reform in spite of Parliament.

Now, my lords, this in my submission is confirmed by the following statement appearing on page 2167, line 27 to page 2158, line 1, where it says "Many Europeans will join hands with the Congress Movement and proclaim as sacred not the 1910 Constitution but the principles of the Freedom Charter." My lords, the 1910 Constitution, the Constitution of the Union of South Africa, is not sacred to them in this sense, that it may be amended — it's not sacred at all; it's got to be destroyed.

Then in the following paragraph, my lords, at page 2158, line 2 to line 6, it is stated: "Provided that the Congress of Democrats presents itself and the Congress Movement as a true alternative to Nationalist Fascism, and enters into their daily struggles, there is every reason to believe that many will join the ranks of the Congress Movement." Therefore, my lords, a Party that at no stage had entered, or intended to enter the field to become a Parliamentary Party - they put themselves up as a true alternative and not any of the Parliamentary Parties, or themselves as a Parliamentary Party.

Then on page 2159, my lords, line 8, to page 2160, line 28, there is an article entitled "Can a dishonourable Constitution be dishonoured". My submission my lords, is that this deals with the Separate Representation of Voters Act and the Parliamentary Opposition and the Black Sash are criticised for arguing that the Constitution should be honoured and not on the principle that the Coloureds have a right to vote. It again stresses that there is no real difference between the different Parliamentary Parties - between the different Parliamentary Political Parties and states "We reject it because

we have seen that the people of South Africa want a new Constitution embodying the principles of the Freedom Charter."

My lords, the next document I refer to is C.1014, a "Counter Attack" of June, 1956. I refer to the Editorial, which is 'The People shall Govern'; it deals with the Freedom Charter as an alternative to the Nationalist Government policy and states "Let the celebrations of June 24th increase our determination to struggle for this objective". My lords, that was referring to the Congress of the People and the Freedom Charter Anniversary meeting at Kliptown on that date.

Then at page 2161, line 23, my lords, to page 2162, line 4, it says "The Freedom Charter is not something abstract but represents the aspirations of the people of South Africa." This clearly shows, my lords, in my submission, that the South African Congress of Democrats not only took part in popularising the Freedom Charter as a 1,000,000 signature campaign, but that what they wanted to a chieve was a State based on the Freedom Charter; not a Government based on it, but a new State. As I have already pointed out they did not want to reform the present Constitution; they wanted to substitute it extra-Parliamentary.

The next document, my lords, I refer to is C.1016, "Counter Attack" of October, 1956. There is an article appearing on page 2166 'Legalised Illegality'.

In my submission, my lords, it deals with the Group Areas Act and states, whether legal or illegal, the Government will do by force what it wishes to do, and it then quotes the policy resolution adopted by the South African Congress

of Democrats at the National Conference: "The South
African Congress of Democrats had called for an extraParliamentary struggle to replace the Nationalist Government with a Peoples Democratic Government". Now, my
lords, I have already pointed out that in my submission
the reference to the Nationalist Government should be
equated with the State; their reference to the Nationalist Government is really a reference to the State - to
he Government, to the State, and this, my lords, shows
again that they wanted a new State - a Peoples Democratic
Government which I have already submitted means a Peoples
Democracy as generally understood, and not as explained
here by the witness Helen Joseph.

My lords, then I refer to C.1017, "Counter Attack" of November, 1956, and specially to the portion appearing on page 2168, line 28, to page 2169, line 2, where it is stated, "Congress of the People was an outstanding success and the Freedom Charter was an inspiring document, and the popularising of the Freedom Charter must be one of the main tasks of the Congress of Democrats for the future."

My lords, then the next dœ ument is L.L.M.81, which document is referred to - - it's an "African National Congress document"; it's the Bloemfontein Conference Report, but included in that report, my lords, is what purports to be a fraternal message from the South African Congress of Democrats.. My lords, it will be shown, and it has already been shown, that there was close co-operation between these various organisations, that it was usual for them to send fraternal messages and fraternal delegates, and, my lords, this document

in my submission - the only inference is that it was 1 actually a fraternal message sent by the South African Congress of Democrats to this annual Conference of the African National Congress at Bloemfontein. Now, in the fraternal message, my lords, the South African Congress of Democrats deals with the campaign for the Congress of 5 the People, and with the Freedom Charter adopted there, and it says at page 3357, line 1 to page 3358, line 18: "That it aroused the political consciousness of the people and brought about an emergence of the Liberation Movement as the only effective opposition to the Nationa-10 list Government", and it further states that if this task is not accepted it will mean the abandonment of the country to Fascism. It further states, my lords, in my submission that the Freedom Charter is a policy that leaves no doubt as to the peoples' alternative to the Nationalist 15 Party policy, but that the Freedom Charter is not the expression of a particular creed and it's defended as not being Socialist. Whether it is Socialist or not, my lords, it is very much more Socialist - - I must put it that way - - than the present South African State, and 20 my submission is, my lords, that this pretence in the fraternal message, that it was not Socialist, was done for a specific purpose, and that is to convince those people who may not have been convinced that it's not Socialist, as for instance the witness Luthuli was not 25 convinced at a certain stage, my lords. But the South African Congress of Democrats, however, claimed that the Freedom Charter lays down the basis for democratic government of the people by the people, and even they admit 30 that that will be radically different from the present

set-up in South Africa.

1

Then the document continues, my lords, and says the following: "It aims at the destruction of everything that is responsible for the present system of racial oppression, cheap labour and semi-Colonialism. It is necessary to destroy this system if people are to be truly free." And it says further, my lords, that as such it covers the whole field of government and human relations.

5

Now, my lords, in face of this it is my submission that the South African Congress of Democrats cannot say that they only wanted universal adult franchise, or that it wanted to reform the present Constitution; I submit, my lords, that from this it is clear that they wanted to destroy the State as a whole and substitute a new State therefor, and that this State - at least in the beginning - was to be based on the Freedom Charter.

10

My lords, the next document I wish to refer to is D.C.T.5, a "Counter Attack" undated, and I refer to the Editorial. My lords, this document I'll deal with later - it was found in the possession of the Rev.D.C. Thompson, but it's a "Counter Attack" - it's been admitted to be the official bulletin of the South African Congress of Democrats. Now in this Editorial, my lords, at page 2725, there is again the same reference to the establishment of a democratic system. There is also a reference to a Peoples Parliament which will evoke happy smiles not only from the Government but from every member of the population. It then again stresses that only the Congress Movement can achieve this.

15

20

My lords, then I refer to C.1029, which is a

25

1

10

15

20

25

30

booklet "We are Many", published by the South African Congress of Democrats. It was read into the record as P.J.104, my lords, at page 1456 of the record. One portion was read in from this document at page 2192, my lords.

BEKKER J: Why do you say it was published by the 5 Congress of Democrats; does it say so?

MR. TERBLANCHE: It says so, my lords, and it's On the face of it, my lords, it says C.32, my lords. that it's published by the South African Congress of Democrats. Now, my lords, at page 1457, line 20, to page 1458, line 12, this document in my submission describes what the Freedom Charter is and showing how millions can be won for democracy as opposed to white supremacy, domination, paramountcy, baaskap or what you will, and it further states that they are an army of millions of South Africans who can strike the decisive blow together for democracy, and root out the Fascist cancer in our political life. It not only calls the present system a Fascist cancer, but it again stresses the same idea of a decisive blow being struck at a certain time which was also dealt with in document C.52, C.268, C.281 - documents I have dealt with so far my lords.

Then at page 2192, line 7 - the same document it describes what must be done and what they expected
would be done to uphold the present system, and, my
lords, I read this portion; it's from line 7 to line
22. It says: "White domination is under heavy challenge,
not only by the non-white people but by a growing band
of farseeing white South Africans who have chosen for
themselves democracy; thus to uphold white domination

and defeat that challenge, beat it off and conquer it, they can do so only by force, by naked dictatorial rule; by rigid suppression as in time of war. The challenge cannot be bought off by talk of honour, by equivocations, by talk about setting right grave injustices, by prattle about bastions of right and liberty; this is a challenge grown out of the deepseated principles and belief and faith in democracy and liberty which does not bow down to temporary expediency. The challenge must either be suppressed by force, or be echoed by the white citizens of South Africa."

My lords, here it is clear that the South
African Congress of Democrats foresaw that there was
more than a possibility of violence occurring unless one
or the other side gave in. Now, they didn't expect
the Government to give in because they said they ruled
by naked dictatorial force as in time of war, and in
spite of that, my lords, they continued with their mass
action extra-Parliamentary.

My lords, the next document I refer to is C.1085. It's a roneoed pamphlet issued by the South African Congress of Democrats and it advertises the meeting on 1st December, the year not specified, and it refers to the Freedom Charter as a Peoples Constitution. It further describes it as a new constitution which can never die, and it then says that the Chairman would be R. Press, a member of the South African Congress of Democrats, and amongst the speakers would be P.Beyleveld, and Mrs. H. Joseph — both members of the South African Congress of Democrats.

5

10

15

20

25

30

And it again shows, my lords, in my submission their support for the Freedom Charter, and it would appear that this was a meeting to popularise the Freedom Charter. It shows that they not only considered it to be a programme but that they considered it to be the constitution of a Peoples Democracy which they propagated in other documents; this, together with their further description of it as a new constitution shows that they wanted a new State based on the Freedom Charter, my lords.

The next document, my lords, is C.1092 and I refer to the passage at page 2186, line 32, to page 2187 line 8; it's a Report to the Annual National Conference of the South African Congress of Democrats by the National Executive Committee. This Conference was held on the 31st March to the 1st April, but the year is not specified; it was in 1955, however, my lords. It shows, as a result of a Conference resolution, that the South African Congress of Democrats was committed to do all in its power to bring about implementation of the Freedom Charter.

Now, my lords, the next document I wish to refer to is C.284 which is Notes for Speakers . . .

KENNEDY J: Have you not dealt with that?

MR. TERBLANCHE: My lord, I dealt with it but this is another paragraph which I really deal with specifically to show how, according to the South African Congress of Democrats, the Fascists rule. These are Notes for Speakers "and our policy should be elaborated"; at page 1771, line 29, my lords, this paragraph occurs: "The recent political campaign of the non-Europeans has put South African politics in an entirely new light. The non-Europeans are demanding their rights in line with the

1

5

10

15

20

developments elsewhere in Africa, Asia, and indeed throughout the world. The Declaration of Human Rights has become the goal of all peoples. The Nationalist Government's answer is oppression: use the police, the army, the might of the Government, to crush non-European Movements. Ban their leaders, represss their activities for rights." I submit in this respect, my lords, that your lordships should also refer to C.268, to which I have already referred - "The Threatened People" published by the South African Congress of Democrats. I refer to the passage on page 1396, line 5 to line 23, where it says the following: "The crucial question, the crucial political question in South Africa is the treatment of the non-Europeans in relation between white and black, and has always been. Removing the whole question from the realm of Party political disagreement does not make it in any way less contentious or easier of solution. It means only that the European political parties should drop their quibbling and build a solid white front against Such a united front can only non-European aspirations. be on the basis of Nationalist policy of repression, for obviously their predominant position in the camp will ensure them the bigger hand in declaring the terms of the bargain; it will create more and more dangerous problems in the future; it will mean a future of open coloured conflict. It will mean turning South Africa into an armed camp based on permanent police rule of millions of non-Europeans and Fascist policy."

Now, my lords, I just want to refer - - in my general submissions I have referred to how the South

African Congress of Democrats saw the conditions in South Africa and for that I refer your lordships again to this document C.268, "The Threatened People"; at page 1395, line 12 to line 22, where it says: "The non-Europeans have built political organisations, have tested the temper of battle for political rights in a sharpened form not seen before, and are facing the issue of survival. Race relations have reached an inflammable and explosive stage in South Africa because the opinion of the non-European majority is repeatedly disregarded, and Nationa-list policy is framed on the basis of interest and needs of the white minority - their electorate alone."

And then, my lords, there are one or two references to how the South African Congress of Democrats was going to fight. For that I refer to C.41, my lords - "Notes on the Political situation", page 1456, line 8 to 12, where it says "While C.O.D. has grown in influence and emerges as a serious uncompromising herald of the future South Africa, the self styled opposition, the Parliamentary Opposition has withered away". Then the same page, line 25 to 29: "The anti- Fascist Movement now has its heart outside of Parliament in the mass movement of the people of all colours; it is the mass movement of the people headed by the Congresses, which to-day determines the future of South Africa."

My lords, then I refer your lordships - I call your lordships' attention again to C.281, the draft of the immediate programme of action - where it says that the task of the Congress of Democrats is the mobilising and preparing of the people for decisive action, and the same is expressed, my lords . . .

RUMPFF J: Haven't you referred us to that particular passage in C.281?

1

MR. TERBLANCHE: My lords, I think in passing I did, but I just . . .

RUMPFF J: Well, do you think it's necessary to do it twice?

5

MR. TERBLANCHE: No, my lord, I'm sorry; I didn't realise before I started reading it that I had already referred your lordships to that passage.

(COURT ADJOURNED FOR 15 MINUTES).

10

ON THE COURT RESUMING:

MT. TERBLANCHE: My lords, in addition to the documents which I have dealt with, I wish to draw your lordships' attention to the following articles written by members of the South African Congress of Democrats which have been dealt with - the publications were dealt with, my lords. The article "The Congress of the People" appearing in 'Liberation' No.10 of 1954 which was written by one J. Slovo who was a member of the South African Congress of Democrats, my lords. Then, my lords, in 'Advance' of the 22nd April, 1954, there is an article "Discussion of South Africa's National Question" by one L.F. and it's stated that this was written by a member of the Staff of 'Advance', and that it's not necessarily the view of the paper. My lords, on the staff of the 'Advance' there was a person by the name of Lionel Forman and it's mysubmission that the only inference is that this was written by Lionel Forman, and Lionel Forman

15

20

25

was a member of the South African Congress of Democrats, my lords.

1

BEKKER J: Just a minute. You say Lionel Forman was on the staff?

MR. TERBLANCHE: Yes, my lords.

5

BEKKER J: Were there other people on the staff? MR. TERBLANCHE: Yes, my lords.

Why do you say the only inference

BEKKER J: is that he wrote it?

10

MR. TERBLANCHE: Because of the initials, my lord. It is stated that it's by L.F, my lord, and it is my submission that he was a very well known member of the staff of 'Advance'; he was Editor, my lords, at one time. He was the editor of this paper, my lords, and the initials correspond, and my submission is that the only inference is that it was Lionel Forman who wrote this And he was a member of the South African Congress of Democrats, my lords.

15

My lords, then there is also an article by Lionel Forman - this time not only the initials - which appears in 'Fighting Talk' of November, 1956, an article entitled "Why do we write and argue so little about Socialism"; that article has been dealt with, my lords.

20

Then, my lords, in 'Fighting Talk', Vol.11 of June, 1955, there is an article "Comrades of the Charter" by L. Bernstein who was a member of the South African Congress of Democrats, and he was also connected with 'Fighting Talk', and then, my lords, the document C.975 is a report of the National Consultative Committee which will be dealt with later, but I just want to point out here, my lords, that this circular was also published

25

5

10

15

20

25

30

in the official bulletin of the South African Congress of Democrats, the "Counter Attack", A.162 of the 1st August, 1955. No, my lords, Al86, not A.162, at page 821.

My lords, now I wish to deal with meetings on which the Crown relies in this respect. My lords, I have prepared a Schedule - only one schedule, not as in the case of the African National Congress two schedules - - because there we relied on many alleged meetings. I ask leave to hand in this schedule, my lords; it's chronological, giving the dates, the kind of meeting, where it was held, the name of the witness, and where it occurs in the Policy Schedule.

RUMPFF J: This will be Schedule No. 7.

MR. TERBLANCHE: Schedule No.7, yes, my lords.

My lords, I wish to draw attention to the fact that the meeting of the 27th June, 1954 — Anti-Apartheid Conference — there are no page numbers where it appears in the Policy Schedule. This meeting did not originally appear, my lords, underthe South African Congress of Democrats in that Schedule, but it was a meeting . . .

BEKKER J: Which meeting is this?

MR. TERBLANCHE: On the 27th June, 1954, my lords. A meeting organised by the South African Congress of Democrats in conjunction with the other organisations, and in my submission the South African Congress of Democrats must be held responsible for what was said at that meeting, and, my lords, I'm not going to deal with that meeting; it was fully dealt with when the African National Congress was dealt with - that was one of the meetings that was dealt with, and I rely on the same

5

10

15

20

25

30

speeches as was submitted there, my lords.

My lords, the first meeting I wish to deal with is a meeting of the 1st December, 1955; that was a meeting organised by the South African Congress of Democrats and it was held at the Skyline Hotel, Johannesburg.

The witness was D/Sgt. Coetzee, a stenographer, and he gave evidence on this meeting. His position as a witness and what reliance can be placed on his evidence has been dealt with and I'm not going to deal with that again, my lords.

Now the chairman of this meeting, my lords, was Dr. Press, R.E. Press, a member of the South African Congress of Democrats. He explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Freedom Charter, what it is and what it stands for. He then called on the Rev. D.C. Thompson, my lords, to address the meeting. Now, there is no evidence, my lords, that the Rev. Thompson was in fact a member of the South African Congress of Democrats. The witness Helen Joseph did say that she always accepted that he was a member but she couldn't say that he was, so I am accepting that there is no evidence that he was a member. But he was called on by the Chairman of this meeting which was a meeting organised by the South African Congress of Democrats to address the meeting. He is also an alleged co-conspirator. He was called on to speak on the Freedom Charter, my lords; he did do so, and your lordships will also remember that I referred your lordships to C.1085, a document, in which the meeting was advertised, to take place on the 1st December, but the year was not specified. It, however, said that Dr. Press would be the Chairman, and that Byleveld would

1 be a speaker and that Helen Joseph would be a speaker. Now, at this meeting, my lords, which was on the 1st December Dr. Press was the Chairman; Byleveld did speak and Helen Joseph did speak, my lords. Ay page 7620 of the record, my lords, the Rev. Thomspon said that 5 he was going to speak about the meaning and significance of the Freedom Charter. He referred to the fact that 2,000,000 whites had the political control. That in my submission, my lords, is what he actually said; I'm not reading it. He referred to the fact that two million 10 whites had political control. Now, one could imagine that here he was only referring to the universal adult suffrage which has been pressed on the Court by a Defence witness, but then he continues, my lords, and says this at page 7621: "I think you will agree with me 15 that these problems are ably dealt with in the Freedom Charter, all of them; all the difficulties that beset South Africa to-day..... where a white minority governs the majority", and as far as this speaker is concerned, my lords, he says the Freedom Charter will do much more 20 than bring one man one vote. It will deal with all the difficulties. He sees it as describing the future State which they want to achieve. This in my submission, my lords, is confirmed at page 7622, line 1 - what he is alleged to have said. "Yes, it is a responsible docu-25 ment. All those who agree with it will realise that it is a responsible document built on principles, giving a picture of the South Lifrica of the future when the present shall be superceded". That, as far as he was concerned, was the immediate object - to substitute the 30 present State by the State envisaged in the Freedom Charter

T

5

10

15

20

25

30

and this, my lords, in my submission is proved by the next paragraph where he is alleged to have said, on page 7622, "It will be known throughout the country...." line 9, my lords, "It will be known throughout the country because the people are on an onward course. In a modern world it is imminent that we should give to the people their rights and their freedom. If we deny them their freedom we shall also be denied our freedom."

The speaker then further pointed out, my lords, that there are only two sides with which he could ally himself, namely the people in the Liberatory struggle or the Forces of Reaction. My lords, again there is no compromise - there is no middle of the road group.

Then the next speaker was P. Byleveld, my lords. He was the President of the South African Congress of Democrats and according to the Chairman he said that Byleveld would speak on the significance of the Freedom Charter and its political context in South Africa. Byleveld then made a speech, my lords, and he says this at page 7623, line 18: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Black Sash and then on page 7624 he says: "Mr. Chairman, before I go on to the role of the South African Congress of Democrats, the role which it plays in South Africa, it is necessary that we review developments over the last five years.... I mean the last ten years - - ever since the Nationalists came into power, nearly ten years And according to the summary, my lords, the speaker then gave his views of the developments in the country during what he cells the last ten years, and he deals with the Native Labour Settlement of Disputes Act, the

1

5

10

20

Group Areas Act and the Proposed introduction of passes Then he went on to say: "Now let for African women. us examine the effect of that policy on the non-Europeans. It has caused them to progress politically; it has resulted in the Liberatory struggle of the Congress Move-The African National Congress was originally ment. established on a non-political basis, merely looking after the cultural heritage of the people whom it represented, but the introduction of the policies of the present government resulted in the African National Congress turning to politics; they began to politically educate the African people, resulting in the course of time in the Defiance Campaign. I don't want to dwell on that but it shows that the African National Congress succeeded in making the Africans politically conscious; a conscious-15 ness which culminated in the Congress of the People. In that statement which embodies the aims and aspirations which sets out the objectives of the African people, the non-European people, in the Freedom Charter"

Then, my lords, he says "In future they, the supporters of the Freedom Charter, will form a real opposition to the Nationalist Government in South Africa", on page 7625.

He then continues by stating that in South African politics there are the two extreme poles, the Nationalist Party on the one hand and on the other the Non-European people engaged in a struggle for liberation, and that they are the real Opposition, and that the time must come for Europeans to choose where they want to stand, and that they, the South African Congress of 30 Democrats, had chosen the correct pole. And it's clear

5

10

15

20

25

30

which pole this is from the sentence that follows, my lords, where he says that that is the pole where the non-Europeans ought to stand. And he ends off, my lords, at page 7627 by saying that they must bring the Freedom Charter to the people.

Then, my lords, Helen Joseph spoke; her speech is recorded at page 7627, and she compared the Freedom Charter with the United Nations Declarations of Human Rights.

The Chairman, my lords, in thanking Mrs. Joseph, in my submission said that the turning point had been reached, the Government and its henchmen were trembling in their boots.

Now, my lords, this shows not only unqualified support of the Freedom Charter and the determination of the South African Congress of Democrats to bring this to the people, but it shows that they wanted a new State.

KENNEDY J: In terms of the Freedom Charter?

MR. TERBLANCHE: In terms of the Freedom Charter.

at that stage.

MR. TERBLANCHE: My lords, no, but there is some dispute, whether they wanted in fact a new State or whether it was only an ordinary amendment to the Constitution that they wanted. I submit that it was really a new State that they wanted. They wanted the Constitution amended to agree with the Freedom Charter.

Now, my lords, the next meeting I wish to refer to is the one of the 20th March, 1955. This was a Colonial Youth Day meeting at Sophiatown. The witness was D/Sgt. Coetzee and this meeting has been dealt with when

5

10

15

25

30

the African National Congress was dealt with, and I'm not going to refer to this meeting fully except to point out that Dr. R. Press made a speech there in which he said amongst other things, in my submission, that they were oppressed by those vile facts in Parliament, and he said that the youth of the Soviet Union was free, and he said that people who want to oppress the youth also land together - - Swart goes to Britain and Eisenhower shakes hands with Winston Churchill because they want to oppress the world, putting South Africa into the camp of America and Britain, and he says that the world is divided into teo camps, the Imperialists - the Capitalists on the one hand and the youth fighting for freedom on the other hand. He attacks the West, my lords, and praises the East in my submission - those are the Communist countries.

There was no cross examination on this meeting, my lords, of any importance.

Then the next meeting, my lords, is the meeting of the 13th February, 1955. The witness was S.H. White, a shorthand writer who gave evidence on this meeting, which has also been dealt with, and Peter Byleveld spoke at this meeting and also B. Turok - also a member and office bearer of the South African Congress of Democrats, Cape Town. It was a Congress of the People meeting - I am not referring to any of the speeches, except to say that Peter Byleveld in his speech said that the South African Congress of the People must mobilise the Europeans to ally themselves with the non-Europeans in their struggle for liberation. And Turok called the Western Areas scheme a Fascist scheme and he also said that there was

1

5

10

no difference between the Nationalists and the United
Party. That is at page 9029, my lords. He said that
the working class are the most oppressed section and
there would be no freedom in the country until the workers came together.

This member of the South African Congress of

Democrats, my lords, puts the class struggle in the forefront of his speech and my submission is, my lords, that
it's clear - and as will become more clear from the speech
made by a member of the South African Congress of Democrats
at the Congress of the People - - that although they were
prepared to accept the Freedom Charter at that stage, that
was not their ultimate view of what the State was that
they wanted.

My lords, the next meeting I refer to is the one of the 4th November, 1954; this was an Election meet-15 ing in the Kyamandi Native Location, Stellenbosch. The witness again was Mr. White and the speaker I wish to refer to was again B. Turok. Now in his speech I submit, my lords, he first explained that the South African Congress of Democrats had taken that name because they iden-20 tified themselves with the African National Congress and was part of the Brotherhood of the Congress Movement. He then attacked the Nationalist Party, the United Party and the Liberal Party and said they were fighting that election because they liked to fight the Liberals. There 25 is no middle of the road group, my lords, no indication of compromise; they were fighting all political parties but not for an ordinary European Voters' note.

My lords, then the next meeting I wish to refer to is the one of the 8th June, 1955, appearing at page 9241....

5

10

15

20

25

RUMPFF J: Is there any system in your references 1 to these meetings? You don't take them chronologically, do you?

MR. TERBLANCHE: My lords, no, I took them as they appear in the Policy Schedule,. .

RUMPFF J: Are they put there in a certain order?

MR. TERBLANCHE: No, my lords, they were not, but

I kept them in the order in which they appear in the policy schedule.

RUMPFF J: Why?

MR. TERBLANCHE: For no special reason, my lords, but the Policy Schedule was there to refer to and that's why I kept them in that order.

RUMPFF J: Yes.

The next meeting, my lords, is MR. TERBLANCHE: the one of the 8th June, 1955, the Congress of the People meeting at the Parade, Cape Town, at page 9041 of the record. The witness again was S.H. White and Alex Laguma who has been shown to be a member of the South African Coloured Peoples Organisation was the Chairman, and amongst the speakers was Sonya Bunting - a member of the South African Congress of Democrats, and again Now, Sonya Bunting, my lords, in my submission Turok. said she was there on behalf of the South African Congress of Democrats; she said that one should ask oneself how it happened that a small group of people can hold in subjection a large majority. She then gives the answer. my lords, "Because the small majority happen to have the power and in South Africa this power consists of the police, the army and big business men, and their policy is the exact opposite to Democracy. Again, my lords,

a member of the South African Congress of Democrats puts the class struggle in the forefront, by mentioning the big business men as being part of the power which the Government has in South Africa.

Turok, my lords, at page 9043 analyses the policy of the Nationalist Party and the United Party and said that the United Party did not want freedom and was in fact a supporter of the Nationalist Party; he also attacked the Liberal Party and said the Nationalists could not be defeated in Parliament alone.

Now, my lords, the next meeting is one held on the 3rd July, 1955, a Congress of the People meeting at the Parade, Cape Town, and the witness was again S.H.White. John Ntini (?), a member of the African National Congress was the Chairman on this occasion and amongst the speakers was S. Bunting. In my submission, my lords, - - this appears at page 9045 of the record - - she admitted that she attended the Congress of the People and she analysed the various sections of the Freedom Charter. That's all I wish to refer to there - that she admitted that she attended the Congress of the People. I will be referring to her speech, my lords, when I deal with the Congress of the People.

Now the next meeting, my lords, was the one of the 15th November, 1953; it was a World Youth Festival for Peace and Friendship meeting held in the Trades Hall, Johannesburg, and the witness was D/Head Constable van Pappendorff; he took his notes in longhand and his position as a witness - his reliability has been dealt with when the African National Congress was dealt with, my lords.

1

5

10

15

20

25

1

5

10

15

20

25

Van Pappendorfff gave evidence; he was asked
what the various speakers said, and he gave evidence also
in regard to other observations which he made at the meet-
ing.

My lords, Coloured Detective Sergeant Sharp gave evidence as to the persons who attended. Now, my lords, your lordships will remember that Coloured Detective Sharp....

KENNEDY J: Was his evidence accepted by the Crown?

MR. TERBLANCHE: His evidence, my lords, in regard to notes which he took of speeches made - - the Crown didn't continue leading evidence, but in regard to where he had original notes as to the people who attended, that was presented to the Court.

KENNEDY J: I may be mistaken - I'm speaking from memory, it's a long time ago - but I thought the Crown indicated it was not going to rely on the evidence given by Sharp?

MR. TERBLANCHE: No, my lords, what happened was this: The Crown started leading evidence and there had been prepared from his original notes certain typed notes and these had been corrected from time to time by Sharp.....

KENNEDY J: Yes, I remember that incident.

MR. TERBLANCHE: Then, my lords, an attempt was made to have him read from his original notes which were in a very poor handwriting and he was found to be very unsatisfactory and in other respects too.

KENNEDY J: At any rate is the Crown attitude that you seek to rely on his evidence as far as lists of persons who attended are concerned?

MR. TERBLANCHE: Yes, my lord.

5

10

15

20

25

30

KENNEDY J: Is that the extent to which the Crown relies on his evidence?

MR. TERBLANCHE: That's the extent, my lord, yes.

MR. FISCHER: My lords, if I might just interrupt my learned friend, I'm not quite certain what the position is. There was a stage your lordships will remember when it was suggested that his evidence be struck off the record. Then, I think, one of your lordships said that that would not be the proper procedure and the Crown then said they would not rely on his evidence. But whether that applied to his evidence on attendance I am not sure, my lords.

RUMPFF J: Yes.

MR. TERBLANCHE: If I remember correctly, my lords, that referred to the evidence in regard to what was said at meetings which had been led up to a certain point, and it also referred, my lords, to the one meeting.....

<u>RUMPFF J:</u> Well, are you relying in your argument now on portion of the evidence of this witness?

MR. TERBLANCHE: No, my lord, but I am dealing with his evidence now because he appears now, and that is the procedure we decided to adopt - that when a witness comes up for the first time we deal with his position.

RUMPFF J: Have you got the references to the record?

MR. TERBLANCHE: Not all my lord, because I thought - I may be wrong, my lords, but that was my impression, that at the time it was

RUMPFF J: Well, it's no good relying on one's impressions at this stage. You had better leave it until after the adjournment, or until tomorrow morning when you

Collection: 1956 Treason Trial Collection number: AD1812

PUBLISHER:

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

Location:- Johannesburg

©2011

LEGAL NOTICES:

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

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

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