

AD 2021/12.2.4

VOL IV

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

APPEAL DIVISION

pp. 320-380

In the matter between:-

RENFREW LESLIE CHRISTIE

Appellant

-and-

THE STATE

Respondent

A P P E A L

AGAINST THE CONVICTION AND SENTENCE DELIVERED BY
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ELOFF IN THE SUPREME
COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA (TRANSVAAL PROVINCIAL DIVISION)

ON 6 JUNE 1980

ON BEHALF OF APPELLANT

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT

Mr. R. Tucker
10th Floor
National Board House
94, Pritchard Street
JOHANNESBURG

The Attorney-General
Supreme Court
PRETORIA

Israel & Sapirstein
E.P. Building
Maitland Street
BLOEMFONTEIN.

The Attorney-General
Supreme Court
BLOEMFONTEIN.

VOLUME 4

PAGES 320 - 380

LUBBE RECORDINGS (PRETORIA)

THE COURT RESUMES AFTER LUNCH ON 26 MAY 1980

CRAIG MICHAEL WILLIAMSON, (still under oath):

EXAMINATION BY MR. ENGELBRECHT (Cont.): Now, Captain you said you met Frene Ginwala in London? -- That is correct, My Lord.

That was early in June, you said? -- In the first week of June. I believe it was the 2nd of June.

Now Captain and then you also gave evidence before the adjournment that you and she went to a tearoom? -- Yes, to a teashop.

A teashop. -- Around the corner, near to the old ANC offices in London. (10

And you gave evidence to the Court that she then talked to you about the objects of the IUEF, ANC and Okhela. -- That is correct My Lord. She just gave me a lecture about the IUEF, she felt that it was too Western orientated.

No I don't want to know what was said, she gave you a lecture about that? -- That is correct.

And now thereafter, was there any project discussed? -- Yes, My Lord.

Which project? -- We discussed the gathering of intelligence⁽²⁰⁾ on various topics within South Africa to be supplied to Dr. Ginwala. She said that the ANC Information and Research Department is very interested in gathering information on all sorts of topics to do with South Africa and that I should seek out various individuals who would be able to provide such information. She was particularly interested in what one could term technological intelligence. I can expand on that if..? She was interested in the military applications of Velindaba, she was interested in finding university researchers, particularly in the fields of maths and science, she was interested in finding people who had contact with the CSIR. (30

Just/..

Just a bit slower please. -- So that is people at universities, particularly in the fields of mathematics and science, people with contact at the CSIR, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research. She told me that I should work with Mr. Eriksson on developing this project and that within a short period of time she would clear it out with her authorities, and would let me know whether to go ahead or not.

That was all that was discussed on this occasion? -- That is correct, My Lord. *N*

Yes, and then did you return again to Geneva? -- Yes, My (10 Lord. The next time I heard anything was directly from Mr. Eriksson himself who returned from a trip to London, about mid-June.

And he made a certain report to you? -- That is correct and he instructed me that I was to now carry on with this project.

Yes? -- I then continued, I agreed to undertake the project with certain conditions that I laid down, and over the next period of months I supplied Frene Ginwala with information relating to the topic that she had requested, which was sent to her address in London.

Where did you get this information that you supplied her (20 with? -- The information was supplied to me by my Department.

Yes, would you continue? -- My next dealings with Frene Ginwala?

Yes. -- I next met Frene Ginwala in mid-December, I remember the date, it was what the South African ANC calls "Heroes' Day" the 16th of December, and there was a meeting if I remember correctly in Friends' Hall in London. I met Frene Ginwala there, we discussed the project and she asked me to provide further information relating to an organisation called SALSCOM which stands for South African Liberation Support Committee, which was an organisation working (30 with military war resisters or draft dodgers, and the ANC was

opposed/..

opposed to it, that is why she wished me to gather the information.

Was that all discussed on this occasion? -- That is correct. I met her two days later as well, on the 18th which was a memorial meeting for a person by the name of Jack Hodgson who was a member of the South African Communist Party, who had died. At that meeting Frene Ginwala told me that she was leaving for Africa and that I should send all further reports to her postal address in London.

And up to this time, had you seen or met the Accused again?

-- No, My Lord.

(10)

Now, when was the next meeting? -- The next occasion that I had to meet with Dr. Ginwala, was at the end of August, 1978 when she attended a conference in Geneva, with the International Conference for Action against Apartheid. On this occasion, Frene Ginwala and Mr. Eriksson I saw having discussions together and Mr. Eriksson then summoned me and asked me to get a copy of a certain letter which I was to hand to Frene Ginwala.

Yes, will you have a look at EXHIBIT CCC? Is that the..?

-- Yes, My Lord, this is a copy of the letter, which I took from the IUEF files and handed to Frene Ginwala.

(20)

And had you made a copy for yourself? -- I had made a copy for myself as well.

By whom is this letter signed? -- It is signed by the Accused, My Lord.

And to whom is it addressed? -- To Lars-Gunnar Eriksson, International University Exchange Fund.

Now, Captain will you just go to page 2 of that letter. Is there any information supplied there? -- Yes, My Lord.

Can you just read that paragraph out? -- Well, following on from the last two words on page 1 -

(30)

"I gained access to a surprising number of

confidential/..

confidential or little known documents relating to the South African economy, to South African energy questions, to Namibia and firms operating there, to important historical papers and above all, to information relating to South Africa's nuclear programme. For example, I saw a published Afrikaans only Atomic Energy Board report, dated 1972, showing where it was seismologically safe to explode nuclear devices in South Africa 'for peaceful purposes'. The report advocates (10 the most obvious place, the North Western Cape, Kalahari region. In the light of the persistent denials in the Press by South African ministers, one's laughter is hard to suppress. However, why should the report be published by the South Africans even in 1972?"

It is not necessary to read any further. And this was the letter you handed over to Frene Ginwala. -- That is correct. ✓

Yes, and when did you see her again? -- The next time I saw Dr. Ginwala was in November, of 1978, in Bonn in the (20 Federal Republic of Germany.

And what was this occasion? -- It was at a conference called - a conference on nuclear collaboration between the FRG and the RSA, something like that.

FRG is the Federal..(intervenens). -- The Federal Republic of Germany.

Yes? -- At this conference Frene Ginwala asked me for some further information relating to South Africa's nuclear programme and also asked me whether it would be possible to get some persons to do library research for her in the Republic. She also (30 showed me copies of some maps which came out of an Atomic Energy

Report.

What maps were these? -- They were maps showing areas in South Africa where it would be seismologically safe to explode nuclear devices of varying sizes and power, megatons.

Yes, when was the next occasion for you to meet her? -- (Mr. Engelbrecht continues).

Or did she show you anything else on this conference? -- No, she just showed me those maps.

Maps. And when was your next occasion of meeting her? -- I met her again in February of 1979 at a conference in London. (10

Well, it wasn't actually a conference it was a seminar called the United Nations Conference on Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa. At this conference she once again showed me the same maps she had shown me at the Bonn conference, except they had this time been blown up into a larger size and put on display boards. She also then asked me for various information.

And by this time had you seen the Accused or met the Accused again? -- I had seen the Accused at the same conference the Nuclear Collaboration Seminar in London.

And do you know whether he and Frene Ginwala met at this conference? -- They definitely met at the conference My Lord, I watched them on several occasions speaking together in the lobby of the conference room. (20

Could you hear what they were speaking about? -- No, My Lord, I did not hear anything that was said between them but the nature of their conversation was not casual.

Why do you say that? -- Well My Lord there were various discussions going on in the lobby at the same time and the nature of the one between Dr. Ginwala and Dr. Christie was notable in that they were what one can call huddled together, sitting together away from other people and were discussing just the two (30

of/..

of them together.

Did you discuss anything of importance with Dr. Christie?

-- Yes, My Lord.

On this occasion? -- That is correct.

Yes? -- I had a discussion with Dr. Christie who told me..

(Mr. Wentzel intervenes).

MR. WENTZEL: M'Lord, if this is in the nature of a confession, I object to it, on the grounds that Captain Williamson at the relevant time was a South African Police Officer and it is in conflict with Section 217, if it is in that nature, I obviously do not know what(10 it is going to be.

MR. ENGELBRECHT: M'Lord, it is my submission that Captain Williamson is an officer in the South African Police and even though it is a confession, not - made to an officer, is permissible.

MR. WENTZEL: M'Lord, may I make the objection now. Captain Williamson at all relevant times is a police officer, and in that capacity My Lord, he is a Peace Officer but also..(Court intervenes).

BY THE COURT: I am sorry, I think this is going to take some time. The witness might as well leave the box and..(intervenes).

MR. WENTZEL: As My Lord pleases. (20

WITNESS STANDS DOWN.

MR. WENTZEL CONTINUES WITH OBJECTION: M'Lord, the witness is an officer in the South African Police Force and was at the relevant time, an officer in the South African Police Force. In terms of Section 217, if a confession is made, and it is made to a Peace Officer. of which Captain Williamson fits the category M'Lord, then it is not ordinarily admissible but if it is made M'Lord, in terms of the proviso to a Justice, then M'Lord, it is admissible and it can be laid before Your Lordship. Now I have no doubt that my Learned Friend is seeking to rely upon that proviso in order to (30 introduce the evidence of Captain Williamson as to statements

made/..

made by the Accused. Now it is true M'Lord, that in his capacity as an officer in the South African Police, a commissioned officer in the South African Police, Captain Williamson falls within the category of being a Justice. However M'Lord, his authority as such is confined to the Republic of South Africa. In terms of the Justices of the Peace and Commissioners of Oaths Act, 16 of 1963, Section 1 defines the Republic as including the territory of South West Africa, Section 2 provides for a Minister of Justice to make the appointment for any magisterial district. Section 3 provides for powers and duties of such a Justice and Section 4 (10) provides that the holder of any office specified in the first schedule, shall be a Justice of the Peace for the Republic and shall possess all such powers and perform all such duties as may be prescribed, and the first schedule M'Lord includes inter alia a commissioned officer of the South African Police. Now the moment Captain Williamson left the Republic of South Africa, he did not carry with him his capacity as a Justice but he did carry with him his rank as an officer in the police and therefore any remark made to him does not fall under the exception and is inadmissible and I would ask Your Lordship to exclude it. (20)

MR. ENGELBRECHT: My Lord, I wonder whether Your Lordship could grant me a few minutes' time.

DIE HOF VERDAAG / DIE HOF HERVAT

MNR. ENGELBRECHT SPREEK DIE HOF TOE: Edele, my submissies sal eerstens wees dat dit nie 'n konfessie is nie, met ander woorde nie 'n ondubbelsinnige erkenning van skuld nie. My tweede submissie sal wees dat 'n Vrederegter nie net aangestel is in die Republiek nie maar dat hy ook sy posisie behou in die geval van 'n polisie-amptenaar as hy buitekant die Republiek gaan. Edele, as 'n mens kyk na Artikel 4 wat hierdie geval dek, is dit die ? van 'n amp⁽³⁰⁾ vermeld in die eerste Bylae, is 'n Vrederegter vir die Republiek indien/..

indien my Geleerde Vriend se argument korrek sou wees, is my
submitisie dat dit sou geleses het: 'n Vrederegter in die Republiek.
Die Engelse teks U Edele, is dit -

"..shall be a Justice of the Peace for the
Republic.."

And not "shall be a Justice of the Peace in the Republic".

En my submitisie is derhalwe dat hy 'n polisie offisier, nie verander
sodra hy die Republiek se grense verlaat nie.

DEUR DIE HOF: U voer aan dit is nie 'n konfessie nie. Hoe kan ek
dit beoordeel voor ek weet wat die man gesê het? (10)

MNR. ENGELBRECHT: Dit is so, U Edele kan nie besluit voordat u
dit nie gehoor het nie.

DEUR DIE HOF: Ja, wel dan - moet ek dan nie voorlopig luister oor
en dan chirurgie toepas as dit ontoelaatbaar is en dit uitskakel nie.

MNR. ENGELBRECHT: Dit is my submitisie wat eintlik die posisie is.

BY THE COURT: Yes, but what is the position, Mr. Wentzel, how can
I adjudge whether it is a confession without knowing what the man
says?

MR. WENTZEL: No, indeed My Lord. That is why I said I - unfor-
tunately I have not had an opportunity of hearing what Mr. Williamson (20)
will say in this trial and that is why I have asked my Learned Friend
whether he does tender it as a confession, and apparently he did
then, but now he does not any longer, I presume in the light of
the argument. My Lord, perhaps it would be helpful if the argument
can just be finished so that when we..(intervenies).

BY THE COURT: Yes, on this part of it whether the man carries his
power with him.

MR. WENTZEL: Yes. M'Lord just two aspects, there is a second
difficulty, it has got to be in writing, under Section 217, and
it has to be - a confession made to a Peace Officer shall not be (30)
admissible in evidence, unless confirmed and reduced in writing

in the presence of the Magistrate or Justice, so my Learned Friend has got an insuperable problem, but as far as the - if it is a confession, as far as the Justices of the Peace Act is concerned M'Lord, this is a function to be carried on in the Republic of South Africa. If one might give Your Lordship an example. Let us assume one of these people took an oath in England, you could not use that in even civil proceedings in South Africa.

BY THE COURT: Has this been laid down?

MR. WENTZEL: Well, M'Lord, because it says..(Court intervenes).

BY THE COURT: Is there any decision on that? (10)

MR. WENTZEL: No, M'Lord but on a plain reading of the rules one could not do that because he hasn't the power to act out- M'Lord, let me put it in very simple terms if I may with respect: The first one is that one presumes the territoriality of legislation not its extra-territoriality. One presumes that a Parliament legislates for its own territory, and not for anybody else's and if one looks at the Act itself, the Republic includes the territory of South West Africa, in the definition section and if one reads the way that the appointments are ordinarily made, the Minister of Justice may appoint for any magisterial district so many justices (20 of the peace as he may deem fit and then the Justice holds office during the Minister's pleasure and in Section..(intervenes).

BY THE COURT: Does that - I'm sorry.

MR. WENTZEL: I'm sorry M'Lord. In Section 3, those appointed for a particular district, have the power to exercise their duties within the district, then you have in addition to that an ex officio Justice, the only difference between him and the Justice appointed is that unlike the Justice under Section 3, he is not confined to a particular district, his power extends throughout the whole of the Republic including the territory of South West Africa, but his duties are - (30

He shall possess all such powers and perform all such duties as are conferred or imposed on Justices of the Peace by any law. The only place where duties are conferred is in terms of Section 3. So M'Lord with respect ~~this~~ is a kind of - may I call it with a respect - a quasi judicial office, the person is clothed with the authority akin to that of a Magistrate and that person with respect has his powers and his duties to perform only in the Republic. It is interesting My Lord, it is interesting in the same Act under Section 8, where Commissioners of Oaths are appointed there are particular powers as to oaths outside the Republic (10 and more particularly the Minister may by notice in the gazette declare that the holder of any office in any country outside the Republic, shall in the country in which or the place in which he holds such office, have the powers conferred by Section 7 on a Commissioner of Oaths. The whole tenor and ambit of this Act is territorial, as indeed it really must be, because it would be M'Lord, not an appropriate act for a sovereign Government to allow a judicial officer of its own, to operate within the territory of a foreign place. It really is an insult to the majestas of a country with which we are on good friendly relations. We (20 do not for example My Lord, have a South African taking evidence on commission in a foreign place, that is done by a foreign commissioner. And by comity of nations one confines persons who have power under your domestic law to operating within the domestic law and within the domestic place, in fact the Terrorism Act itself is one of the rare examples of an Act which is made extra-territorial in effect because the common law is that we legislate only for our own territory. So I would with respect say that My Learned Friend has the problems of territoriality in regard to Captain Williamson and also the problem of writing. (30

BY THE COURT: Well, I suppose the objection is based on two legs

and/..

and I take it that for me to be able - to enable me to deal with the one leg namely whether this is a confession, I should provisionally hear this and then I can decide the whole matter.

MR. ENGELBRECHT: As My Lord pleases.

CRAIG MICHAEL WILLIAMSON (still under oath):

EXAMINATION BY MR. ENGELBRECHT: (Cont.): Yes, now you discussed the discussion with the Accused, what was said there? -- My Lord the Accused told me that at the time he was without a job and that he was looking for employment. He said that if he were not able to get such employment, he would consider writing a book dealing with a subject around - to the nature of coal and labour in the Republic. He also then went on to ask me whether the International University Exchange Fund would be able to grant him some funds to carry out a short trip to Europe. He mentioned the countries of France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands, in order to consult with certain experts who are researching into questions related to the Republic of South Africa particularly related to energy and coal. He asked for the amount of £200 to undertake this journey. I, on behalf of the IUEF agreed that he would be able to get that amount but told him that he should contact the IUEF's London office. The Accused further went on to ask me whether, if he decided to travel to South Africa to research certain information in relation to coal, whether the IUEF would be prepared to fund this journey. I asked the Accused to draw up a memorandum and to submit this to the IUEF which he either never did, but anyway I never saw it. However, at a certain time..(intervenes).

Now, before you proceed, did he tell you why he wanted to see these instances in Europe? -- Yes, he wanted to see certain individuals who as I said, were doing research on South Africa in particular in the energy field and to find out what information they/..

they needed, to assist in their research and then he said that he would like to go and research that information for them.

What type of research were these people doing, for what purpose were they doing the research? -- My Lord, the only specific person mentioned in the conversation was a certain Ruud Huisman who is doing research in the Netherlands of a highly anti-South African nature.

He did not give you any further particulars? -- No, My Lord.

Now, you said you never saw a memorandum as you requested (10 him to forward to your office? -- That is correct My Lord, I never saw the memorandum I asked for. However, my London office or the IUEF London office did at a certain stage call me on the telephone and asked me whether they could give Dr. Christie, the Accused, £200.

And did you authorise it? -- I told them that I had agreed and that if he applied for it, he could get it. 17

Yes, and then? Did you either see Frene Ginwala or the Accused again after that? -- I did not see the Accused again until now here in Court. However I saw Frene Ginwala on several (20 occasions after that time, the first occasion was in the first week of June, 1979 when she came to Geneva on a visit.

Did you discuss anything with her? -- I discussed various matters with her, nothing to do with the Accused.

Nothing to do with him. And do you know whether she saw Eriksson? -- She did have a private interview with Mr. Eriksson.

You do not know what the nature of that interview was? -- I have no idea.

And thereafter, did you see her again? -- Yes, I saw her briefly in London that same month I think, it was the 26th of (30 June, which is what the ANC call "South African Freedom Day",

I saw her in London and I saw her again in Geneva in early September of that same year.

And was anything discussed? -- Various matters were discussed..(intervenes).

But not..? -- But not relating to the Accused.

Not relating to the Accused. Now, Captain Williamson, do you know whether there was any application for money apart from that amount mentioned by you when Dr. Christie approached you, were approaches made on his behalf for any..? -- Not directly to me, My Lord. However I was given a certain letter in June 1979 by the Director of the IUEF, Mr. Eriksson and he asked me whether I thought that the sum of £1,000 would be sufficient to allow the Accused to go to South Africa, in other words, to pay for his return air-fare and to give him four months stipend at approximately R250 per month.

Yes? -- I agreed, I said that I thought the £1,000 was more than enough, that is the £1,000 is approximately 3 500 Swiss francs.

Were you also shown a letter on this occasion? -- That is correct.

Who wrote this letter? -- It was a letter written by Mr. Eriksson addressed to a certain Mr. Cyril Ritchie, who is the Director of the - well amongst other things, of the International Schools Association which is also based in Geneva.

My Lord, I see here is a note on this one that I - I don't think I should..(incomplete). If Your Lordship would bear with me for a moment. -PAUSE-.

(To witness): The note at the bottom was made by you is that correct? -- One of the notes on the bottom, the one on the left-hand side is my handwriting.

Would you have a look at this letter? You say you made a photocopy/..

6

15

photocopy of this letter, before you returned it to Mr. Eriksson?

-- Yes, My Lord, I got this letter into my possession during which time I made a photocopy for myself and then returned the original to Mr. Eriksson.

Do you know what happened to this letter? -- Shortly after I had given it back to Mr. Eriksson, he gave it to a secretary in the office for delivery to Mr. Ritchie.

And what is this letter about? -- My Lord, this letter should I read it?

Yes. -- It states -

"Dear Cyril,

A matter has....."

My Lord, I will not - there are several spelling mistakes but I will just read them as they are meant to be.

"A matter has cropped up which needs urgent attention and I am therefore sending this to you by special courier. The courier is not aware of the contents. I would like if possible to again avail myself of the services of the ISA. If you agree to this, you will in a couple of weeks, receive a request from a Mr. Renfrew Christie for funds towards going to South Africa to make a study, probably relating to coal. If such a request is received, you should agree for ISA to make a contribution of Swiss francs 3 500 towards this project. That represents an air-fare, London-Johannesburg return at excursion price and upkeep for 4 months, calculated at R250 per month.

Please let the bearer of this letter in case of agreement have the bank details and I will make

an/..

(10

(20

(30

an immediate transfer so there need be no further delays and/or communications. If the proposal is unacceptable to you and you have no alternative proposal just tell her to tell me no, and send the letter back.

I hope it will work out though. Needless to say, no communications on the telephone, any mail, only to my home address.

Greetings, and excuse the lousy typing."

Then that signature following is that of Mr. Eriksson, and there (10 is a P.S. in his handwriting:

"P.S. Should anything happen and I am absent Craig is available if at all."

Oh, sorry -

"Craig is aware of it all."

EXHIBIT DDD. Now, do you know whether anything further was done about this money? -- My Lord, I was present at I would say approximately several weeks later, where Mr. Eriksson gave instructions to the projects officer to transfer a sum of 3 500 francs to Mr. Cyril Ritchie. (20

What is the ISA? -- ~~The~~ International Schools Association. It is an association to which some - to which schools belong, I am not entirely aware what the nature or the purposes of the organisation are. My Lord, I was also given certain instructions by Mr. Eriksson in relation to this letter which related to the "P.S." because Mr. Eriksson was going on a trip and he told me that were Mr. Ritchie to make any query to me in regard to this letter. I was to tell him that the mission or the trip to South Africa involved was being done on request of Frene Ginwala and he said that if I said that, Mr. Ritchie would understand the matter because he had dealt with similar matters in the past. (30

Now/..

Now just before this - will you have a look at EXHIBIT BEE?

-- My Lord, this exhibit is a photocopy of the latest IUEF Annual Report, the 1978/79 Annual Report.

Yes? -- In relation to - I assume - in relation to IUEF's activities in support of so-called liberation movements if you will refer to page 23, there is a statement there about assistance to Southern African Liberation Movements and in the second paragraph the last sentence reads:-

"In the case of Southern Africa this means action to overthrow the White minority Governments of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe." (10

So in this, the IUEF is setting out its activities.

Now, while you were overseas Captain, did you have anything to do with a certain Horst Kleinschmidt? -- Yes, I met Horst Kleinschmidt on several occasions.

And was this project of the Accused in any way discussed?

-- No, My Lord.

Was it only ordinary discussions you had with him? -- The only things I discussed with Horst Kleinschmidt related to payment of legal defence, that type of matters in the Republic. Nothing to do with the Accused.

Do you know by whom he was employed there? -- My Lord, when I first went to Europe he was employed I believe by a church group in the Netherlands. However in approximately June 1979, I believe..(intervenes).

You do not know from first-hand knowledge, this is what you heard? -- From himself.

Oh, from..? -- He informed me that he was now taking up a position with the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa. (30

What/..

What was - do you know this International Defence and Aid Fund?

MR. WENTZEL OBJECTS: M'Lord, in fact that is not admissible either, it is not a statement made in the sight and hearing of the Accused and nor M'Lord is it made in pursuance of the conspiracy as an executive act and I would object to it.

MR. ENGELBRECHT: My Lord, the only thing I wanted from this witness is what if he knows what the International Defence and Aid Fund is.

BY THE COURT: Well, he went a little further than that, I suppose (10 if the question had been limited to that the objection might not have been made.

MR. ENGELBRECHT: May I ask then if Your Lordship rules that that is..

BY THE COURT: So the objection is on solid foundation as far as the - and to the extent that you go beyond that.

MR. ENGELBRECHT: Now, all I want to know from you Captain, is whether you know from your own knowledge what the International Defence and Aid Fund is? -- Yes, My Lord, I worked closely with the International Defence and Aid Fund for several years.

And what are their aims? -- Similar to those of the In- (20
ternational University Exchange Fund. They deal mainly with the granting of what they call "humanitarian relief" to victims of apartheid and repressive regimes in Southern Africa. They also are involved in the provision of funds for legal defence of persons charged under security legislation and thirdly they are involved in a programme, a very extensive programme of what they call "information about apartheid, South Africa, Rhodesia and South West Africa/Namibia".

My Lord, I have got no further questions.

BY THE COURT: Before you start cross-examination, do you say (30
this is a confession?

MR./..

MR. WENTZEL: No, M'Lord, I am most astonished that my Learned Friend could so characterise it. I have got no objection on those grounds.

My Lord, I am in this situation that I am going to require some time with Your Lordship's leave to prepare a cross-examination. We have not seen these documents and we do not have copies of them, they are new to us and we may have to make certain inquiries in Europe. I wonder if we might reserve this cross-examination until Wednesday morning and give us an opportunity of conferring with the Accused and the like, M'Lord? (10)

MR. ENGELBRECHT HAS NO OBJECTION TO CROSS-EXAMINATION BEING RESERVED UNTIL 28 MAY 1980.

THE WITNESS STANDS DOWN

THE COURT ADJOURNS UNTIL 28 MAY 1980

MR. ENGELBRECHT: V. Diele, ek wil net sê dat ons 'n bietjie onderwys gevend is. Die Staat het nog twee getuies op te roep, generaal Beethling sal hier tuis 'n paar minute wees maar die ander getuie is glad nie vandag beskikbaar nie. (20)

MR. DIE HOF: Hoe sal ek verhoor tot - Is dit brigadier Beethling?

MR. ENGELBRECHT: Generaal Beethling.

MR. DIE HOF: Generaal Beethling hier is ek dan sal ons ook hoor ver aan ons. Die Hof verhoor.

DIE HOF VERHOOR / DIE HOF VERHOOR

MR. ENGELBRECHT HOUT ONTVAAL KUNSTELIER.

LOUIS PAUL KUNSTELIER, verklaar onder eed:

VERHOORING DEUR MR. ENGELBRECHT: Generaal, u is 'n generaal-adjunk in die Zuid-Afrikaanse Polisie verbonde aan die Forensiese Wetenskap-laboratorium, Pretoria. -- Dit is korrek, U Diele. (30)

Hoe u sal vir die Hof 'n kwalifikasies gee? -- Diele, ek

THE COURT RESUMES ON 28 MAY 1980.

CRAIG MICHAEL WILLIAMSON (still under oath):

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WENTZEL: No questions.

RE-EXAMINATION BY MR. ENGELBRECHT: No questions.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS

WITNESS STANDS DOWN.

MNR. SWANEPOEL SPREEK HOF TOE: Edele, kragtens Artikel 236 van die Strafproseswet, handig ek beëdigde verklarings in van eerstens Alfred Frank Duffelt Canham, "office manager" van die Standard Bank, Rondebosch omtrent die bankstate van die beskuldigde en die (10 tweede verklaring van Neville Charles Nesor, assistent-rekenmeester van Barclay's Bank, Rondebosch. Ek sal net die nommers opsit. Edele, ek wil net die bewysstuk-nommers opsit. Die verklaring van Duffelt Canham is BEWYSSTUK FFF, en dié van Nesor is "GGG". Edele, al inligting wat hierin vervat is, is in die tjekboeke en spaarboekies wat reeds ingehandig is. Dankie, Edele.

MNR. ENGELBRECHT: U Edele, ek wil net meld dat ons 'n bietjie onverwags gevang is. Die Staat het nog twee getuies om te roep, generaal Neethling sal hier binne 'n paar minute wees maar die ander getuie is glad nie vandag beskikbaar nie. (20

DEUR DIE HOF: Dan sal ek verdaag tot - is dit brigadier Neethling?

MNR. ENGELBRECHT: Generaal Neethling.

DEUR DIE HOF: Generaal Neethling hier is en dan sal ons kyk hoe ver kom ons. Die Hof verdaag.

DIE HOF VERDAAG / DIE HOF HERVAT

MNR. ENGELBRECHT ROEP GENERAAL NEETHLING.

LOTHAR PAUL NEETHLING, verklaar onder eed:

ONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. ENGELBRECHT: Generaal, u is 'n generaal-majoor in die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie verbonde aan die Forensiese Wetenskap-laboratorium, Pretoria. -- Dit is korrek, U Edele. (30

Kan u net vir die Hof u kwalifikasies gee? -- Edele, ek

is/..

is in besit van verskeie wetenskaplike grade, B.Sc., M.Sc., PhD, D.Sc. Lid van verskillende vakkundige verenigings, onder andere die Amerikaanse Akademie vir Forensiese Wetenskap, lid van die Vereniging vir Forensiese Wetenskap van Engeland, Suid-Afrikaanse Chemiese Instituut en verskeie ander. Twee-en-twintig jaar ondervinding van skeikundige ontledings.

Nou generaal, het u sekere koeverte van luitenant Greyling ontvang? -- Dit is korrek, U Edele, ek het op die 2de November 1979 een bruin koevert per hand ontvang van luitenant Greyling. Die koevert het die volgende bewysstukke bevat: Een bruin koevert (10 gemerk: WA/VP.7/18/7/6 waarin daar twee koeverte was. Hulle was as volg gemerk: C. Needham, 23 Waldemar Avenue Mansions, Waldemar Avenue, Fulham, London, SW.6, Britain.

Watter bewysstukke is daardie wat daar voor u lê, watter koevert is dié? -- Dit is hierdie koeverte.

Hierdie eerste een wat u nou van gelees het, watter.. (tussenbei). -- Nee, dit is altwee - daar was een - hulle was in een bruin koevert saam gewees en die bruin koevert was gemerk WA/VP.7/18/7/6. En het hierdie twee koeverte bevat.

Het hy u nog iets gegee behalwe hierdie twee koeverte? -- (20 Ja, dan het ek een bruin koevert gekry gemerk "1" waarin daar twee tekenpatrone was, en teken-ink en 'n tekenpen en bevattende 'n plastiese houer teken-ink Staedler, merk Mars 745, blou tekenpen Staedler Mars 700 en 'n geel "Stella" (?) tipe tekenpatroon en 'n blou Staedler Mars tekenpatroon.

Is dit daardie bewysstukke 1 tot 4 voor u? -- Dit is korrek Edele.

En wat was u versoek om te doen? -- Edele, ek was versoek om die bewysstukke te ondersoek ten einde te bepaal of die ink waarmee die twee adresse op die twee koeverte geskryf was naamlik (30 hierdie twee koeverte, BEWYSSTUKKE BB en CC, die ink waarmee/..

waarmee die twee adresse op die twee koeverte geskryf is, die ink in die plastiese inkhouer en die ink in die blou tekenpen sowel as die ink op die twee tekenpatrone of hulle dieselfde oorsprong het. En dan enige van die twee tekenpatrone moontlik gebruik kon gewees het om die adresse op die twee koeverte te skryf. Ek het die bewysstukke ondersoek en ek het die volgende gevind: Die ink waarmee die twee adresse op die twee bruin koeverte geskryf is is chemies in alle opsigte vergelykbaar met die ink in die blou plastiese tekenpen, naamlik die Staedler Mars 700.

BEWYSSTUK..? -- BEWYSSTUK No. 4 asook die ink in die plas-(10 tiese houer, hierdie ene, Staedler Mars 745, BEWYSSTUK No. 3. Op die blou Staedler Mars tekenpatroon was die ink nie genoegsaam om 'n chemiese vergelyking te kan tref, daar was alleen mikroskopiese spore van ink aanwesig wat nie genoegsaam was vir 'n volledige toets nie. Dan die blou Staedler Mars tekenpatroon in alle opsigte ooreenstem met die letters wat op die twee bruin koeverte verskyn en derhalwe kan die adresse met hierdie tekenpatroon geskryf gewees het.

Dit is bewysstuk..? -- Dit is BEWYSSTUK No. 2, kon gebruik gewees het om hierdie adresse op aan te bring. Die ink op hierdie (20 koeverte dus en die ink in die pen, BEWYSSTUK No. 4 en die ink in BEWYSSTUK No. 3 het almal dieselfde oorsprong, dit is dieselfde ink chemies en het dus dieselfde oorsprong. Dit is dus heel moontlik dat die betrokke blou plastiese pen en die blou Staedler Mars tekenpatroon, BEWYSSTUK No. 2 en BEWYSSTUK No. 4 gebruik kon gewees het om die twee adresse op die koeverte aan te bring. Hierdie resultate is behaal op 'n bedrywenheid wat chemie vereis, ek het die bewysstukke weer terug onderhandig aan die ondersoekbeampte.

Luitenant Greyling. -- Dit is korrek.

Geen verdere vrae nie.

(30

MR. WENTZEL: Would you bear with me for a moment, My Lord? -PAUSE-.

CROSS-/. .

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WENTZEL: No questions.

HER-ONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. ENGELBRECHT: Geen vrae.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE.

GETUIE STAAN AF EN WORD VERSKOON VAN

VERDERE BYWONING.

MNR. SWANEPOEL SPREEK HOF TOE: Edele, die Verdediging maak sekere erkennings kragtens Artikel 220 van die Strafproseswet, dit is in Engels geformuleer:-

"Firstly it is admitted that the Freedom Charter EXHIBIT NN has been accepted by the ANC as part of its programme of action.

(10)

Secondly, it is further admitted that "Seshaba" is the official mouthpiece of the ANC."

Edele dit is uitgeskryf op 'n dokument, ek sal dit net 'n nommer gee. Dit sal BEWYSSTUK RRR wees. Ek het sekere ander dokumente wat ek sal inhandig wat reeds genommer is.

MR. WENTZEL: That admission is made

MNR. SWANEPOEL: Edele, dan kragtens Artikel 2(3)(C) van die Wet op Terrorisme, 83 van 1967, handig die Staat sekere dokumente in dit is almal die tydskrif "Seshaba" verskillende uitgawes wat gemerk is soos volg: BEWYSSTUK HHH is 'n Seshaba, Volume 11, "First Quarter", 1977. BEWYSSTUK JJJ is Seshaba, Volume 11, "Third Quarter", 1977. BEWYSSTUK KKK Seshaba, Volume 11, "Fourth Quarter", 1977. BEWYSSTUK LLL Seshaba Volume 12, "First Quarter", 1978. BEWYSSTUK MMM Seshaba, "Second Quarter", 1978, Volume 12. BEWYSSTUK NNN Seshaba, "Fourth Quarter", 1978, Volume 12. BEWYSSTUK OOO Seshaba, Februarie 1979, BEWYSSTUK PPP Seshaba, Januarie 1980. BEWYSSTUK QQQ, Seshaba, Maart 1980.

(20)

Edele, op sommige van daardie tydskrifte het ons voorop sekere verwysings aangebring, dit is bloot bladsye in die betrokke tydskrifte wat vir die Staat van belang is en waarna ons waarskynlik

(30)

in betoog sal verwys. Maar dit is wel deur ons aangebring dit is strokies waarop getik is. Dankie, Edele.

SAAK VIR DIE STAAT.

CASE FOR THE DEFENCE.

DIE HOF VERDAAG TOT 29 MEI 1980 VIR BETOOG

regarding various aspects of energy in the Republic to the African National Congress (ANC for short), the International University Exchange Fund (IUEF for short) and to one Horst Kleinschmidt. (10

Count 1 alleges a conspiracy by the accused with inter alia the ANC, Horst Kleinschmidt and/or the IUEF to procure the commission of the act of making all aspects of energy in the Republic available to them.

Count 2 charges the accused with having acquired information regarding the region where the Atomic Energy Board regarded it as technically safe to explode nuclear devices in the Republic and conveying that in a letter to the IUEF.

Count 3 says that the accused removed a drawing of the layout of the Koeberg Power Station and a report concerning Public Relations to the Introduction of Nuclear Power from the Essex library and sent that to the ANC.

The first part of the first alternative to Count 3, also relates to the despatch of the just mentioned drawing and report to the ANC.

Count 4 attributes to the accused the act of obtaining information from the Essex library, of taking photocopies of material found there with the intent of making it available to the ANC, Kleinschmidt and the IUEF.

The basis of Count 5 is that the accused obtained information regarding Durban Power Station, with the intent of making it available to the ANC, Kleinschmidt and the IUEF.

And Count 6 has a similar basis regarding information obtained from/

J U D G M E N T

THE COURT RESUMES ON 3 JUNE 1980.

BY THE COURT: There are seven charges against the accused with some alternatives as well. He pleaded not guilty to all of them. With the exception of a few charges and alternative charges which I shall discuss separately later herein, the feature which underlies the charges concerns the obtaining and making available of information regarding various aspects of energy in the Republic to the African National Congress (ANC for short), the International University Exchange Fund (IUEF for short) and to one Horst Kleinschmidt. (10

Count 1 alleges a conspiracy by the accused with inter alia the AN C, Horst Kleinschmidt and/or the IUEF to procure the commission of the act of making all aspects of energy in the Republic available to them.

Count 2 charges the accused with having acquired information regarding the region where the Atomic Energy Board regarded it seismologically safe to explode nuclear devices in the Republic and conveying that in a letter to the IUEF.

Count 3 says that the accused removed a drawing of the layout of the Koeberg Power Station and a report concerning Public Relations (20 to the Introduction of Nuclear Power from the Escom library and sent that to the ANC.

The first part of the first alternative to Count 3, also relates to the despatch of the just mentioned drawing and report to the ANC.

Count 4 attributes to the accused the act of obtaining information from the Escom library, of taking photocopies of material found there with the intent of making it available to the ANC, Kleinschmidt and the IUEF.

The basis of Count 5 is that the accused obtained information regarding Duvha Power Station, with the intent of making it available to (30 the ANC, Kleinschmidt and the IUEF.

And Count 6 has a similar basis regarding information obtained from/..

from the Kriel Power Station and the AMCO opencast coal mine.

I should at once say that by reason of the similarity of the basis of the abovementioned charges, it was part of the defence argument that while it could not be said that the indictment was open to attack, it would be wrong to convict the accused separately even if the evidence supports the individual charges.

It will be convenient firstly to discuss the counts to which I have just alluded. Part of the evidence on these charges is that the accused made a written statement on 26 October 1979, to a Justice of the Peace. That statement was held to be admissible during the course of this trial and my reasons for having done so are set forth at the end of this judgment. The closing argument submitted on behalf of the accused was presented on the assumption of the correctness of that ruling, and as I understand the argument, it was not suggested that the State had not proved the first count to the extent that it relates to the ANC. The main burden of the argument was that a conspiracy with the IUEF and Kleinschmidt had not been proved and as I have said, that a conviction on count 1 would in large measure if not entirely, cover the factual basis of the counts now under discussion. It is with this approach by the defence in mind, that I now turn to the material before me, and I intend firstly to consider whether the conspiracy with the ANC was proved.

It was common cause that the ANC was declared an unlawful organisation and that its objects include the use of violence against the Government of the Republic of South Africa in order to overthrow it. It emerges from the statement of the accused and from the evidence of Captain Williamson that a certain Frene Ginwala was an active worker for the ANC in London. In that capacity she was interested in the gathering of information on all sorts of topics to do with South Africa, and particularly on what might be termed Technological Intelligence. She had met the accused while he was studying in Great Britain. She knew that he was writing a doctoral thesis/..

thesis on electrification in South Africa and that he was well informed on energy matters in South Africa. Apart from the accused's own statement there is in this regard the evidence of Captain Craig Williamson to whom I shall refer more fully later herein. During August of 1978 he had discussions with Ginwala in connection with possible collaboration between the ANC and the IUEF in connection with the obtaining of information on South Africa, and further on what I might term the "anti-South African strategy". In the course of that discussion he handed Ginwala a copy of a letter written by the accused to the IUEF (EXHIBIT CCC), in which he refers to his researches on energy and to a trip to South Africa, partly sponsored by the IUEF, in which he stated that he gained access to a large number of confidential documents and in which he reveals his feelings against what I might term "the establishment" in South Africa.

She also knew that he not only sympathised with the ANC but supported its views and programme.

Now the accused said in his statement that Ginwala asked him to report to her on behalf of the ANC on all aspects of energy in South Africa, in as much detail as possible. She wanted information on energy utilisation from all sources such as hydro-power, nuclear, oil, coal and any alternative sources. She did not expect to get secret information although that would be welcome if possible, but the objective was to get as much ordinary published detail on South Africa's energy as possible. While she did not specify to what use the information would be put the accused realised that it might be utilised for military purposes or for less ambitious purposes such as boycotts and also for being informed on the growth and change in the South African economy.

It was agreed between Ginwala and the accused that he would send material to Ginwala by the use of two cover addresses, viz. F. Brown, 126 Church Street, London, SE.19 and C. Needham, 23 Waldemar Avenue Mansions, Waldemar Avenue, London, SW.6.

Apart/..

Apart from the statement of the accused wherein he describes his discussions with Ginwala, Captain Williamson, whose evidence was never challenged by the defence, was present at a seminar in London called "The United Nations Conference on Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa". He said that on several occasions the accused and Ginwala, who were both at the conference, were speaking together in what appeared to be confidential tones in the lobbies of the conference place.

It appears further from the statement of the accused that Ginwala provided him with an amount of some £900 with which to return to South Africa. Confirmation that a payment of this order was made⁽¹⁰⁾ is provided by a bank statement of the accused's London banking account, showing a deposit therein in July, 1979 of £924, and I think that it is a reasonable inference that part of that was the money which he said he was given by Ginwala.

It is common cause that the accused returned to South Africa at the end of July, 1979. On 1 August 1979, according to the evidence of the witness Uys, he sought permission to make use of the library of Escom at Megawatt Park and to visit the Escom power stations at Kriel and Duvha. Permission was given and on 12 September 1979, according to the witness Wucherpfennig, he was allowed into the⁽²⁰⁾ library. According to his statement he examined and made photocopies of material in the library such as details of Escom's power generation statistics and of the power station planning. Some of it he said was for research but some of it was for use for his investigation on behalf of the ANC. He also said that at the back of the library he found a big room filled with bookshelves and boxes and therein he came across a large amount of unsorted material, received by the library from other Escom departments for storage. That material was apparently being slowly sorted by the librarians when they had time off from their other tasks. Amongst this material were two copies of a 1977⁽³⁰⁾ blue-print of the general plan of the layout of Koeberg Nuclear Power Station.

Now this plan, which became EXHIBIT F, was said by the witness Spencer, who was the project leader of the Koeberg Nuclear Station to be such that it should not have been kept for open access in the library. The drawing is to scale and it shows and identifies all the important buildings on the site and indicates their location and purpose. Spencer was of the view that possession of this plan would be useful to any aggressor. His reason was that the buildings that contain the new power station proper, particularly the nuclear islands, are very substantial civil structures and access to the interior thereof would be closely controlled so that they would be very difficult to attack or get into to do damage to the plant therein. He thought that any aggressor is likely to pay attention to the outer buildings and the service buildings which if damaged could cause damage and embarrassment to the operation of the station. (10)

The witness Hugo, who is the Deputy President of the Atomic Energy Board, was also of the view that possession of the plan would be of value to any person minded to commit sabotage.

Now the accused said in his statement that he decided to send one of these plans to Ginwala. He also came across a copy of a report by an Escom employee, reflecting his investigations on the best way of dealing with public reaction to the introduction of nuclear power stations. This report we now know to be the EXHIBIT G. It was identified by the witness Uys, and it is titled: "Public Reaction to the Introduction of Nuclear Power Relations Techniques" - Report on an overseas study tour by D.C.R. Hurlin. Uys said that the report was categorised as "restricted", and it was so noted on the report. That report should not have been freely available; even if the accused had wished to look at the report solely for research purposes, he would have had to secure permission from the Atomic Energy Board. The accused prepared a photocopy of this report. (20) (30)

He next purchased a draughtsman's pen and a blue letter stencil and set and used these to address the two envelopes to C. Needham at the/..

the address mentioned earlier in this judgment. We now know that the pen and stencil were those found at the flat of the accused on 23 October 1979 and handed in as exhibits. He put the plan and the report in each of the envelopes, addressed them as planned and posted them. We now know that these envelopes are EXHIBITS BBB and CCC and that they were intercepted by the security police after an order had been obtained in terms of Section 118A of the Post Office Act.

We also know from the evidence of General Neethling that the chemical composition of the ink was used to address the envelope is comparable to that of an ink bottle found in the flat of the accused. (10)

These are the envelopes which the accused saw after his detention and during his interrogation during the night of 23 to 24 October, 1979 and as set out later in the judgment it was this discovery of what the police had found that probably partly motivated him to make a written statement in Cape Town.

Now, the accused said in his statement that when he posted the two envelopes to the ANC he was fully aware of what he was doing, although he added that if the plan of the Koeberg Power Station were to be used for a military operation he did not expect the power station to blow up once the reactors were critical, but rather before the (20) completion of the power station, when a bomb in the pipe work would destroy the quality control so that the construction could be delayed for many years. I quote from his statement:-

For the power station to be attacked, once it was critical, would be suicidal for me, because I live and expect to be living in my flat just across Table Bay. I am not given to suicide and I did not therefore envisage that the plan would be used in this way although on subsequent reflection during my imprisonment it has become apparent to me that the plan might have (30) been used in such a military way.

There are very few nuclear power stations to my knowledge/..

knowledge sited as close to a major city as Koeberg is to Cape Town and the military risk of this siting has become very obvious to me during my imprisonment although obviously I had not seen it in this way before because I chose to take up a flat in Tamboerskloof, Cape Town from which suburb the Koeberg Station could be seen on a clear day."

After the posting of the two envelopes, the accused sent Ginwala some publicly available material on the South African Defence Force which he had found in a copy of the publication "Paratus" and also a publicity hand-out containing diagrams of an Escom power station, as well as press reports on the SASOL share issue. He also intended to send her further relevant material which he had at his flat but he was arrested before he could do so. He also planned to see the Rietspruit Coal Mine in the hopes that he might glean something there for the ANC. It was also proved that the accused secured permission to visit the Duvha Power Station and did so on 19 September 1979.

Now on the aforegoing facts I think that the conspiracy with the ANC represented by Ginwala was proved and also that the accused commenced to act in terms of the conspiracy. (20)

I turn now to the question whether a conspiracy with the IUEF was proved. I should firstly say that it was proved to my satisfaction that the IUEF is an organisation having as one of its objects the giving of support to the armed overthrow of the South African Government. That was the evidence of Captain Williamson who infiltrated the organisation and as from July 1978, he became its Deputy Director. The first contact by the accused with the IUEF of which there is evidence occurs in February, 1978, when on the 7th of that month, he wrote a letter from Oxford to Lars-Gunnar Eriksson who was the Director of the IUEF. In that letter he refers to his research for the purpose of his doctoral thesis on the electrification of South Africa, 1905 to 1975, and undertakes to send a copy of his thesis to Eriksson. (30)

He/..

He also refers to the grant of 3,000 Swiss francs from the IUEF which enabled him to visit various centres in South Africa in the course of which he to his surprise, managed to gain access to a large number of confidential or little known documents relating to the South African economy, to energy questions, to Namibia and firms operating there and above all, to South Africa's nuclear programme. I quote from the letter:

"For example, I saw a published Afrikaans only Atomic Supply Report dated 1972, showing where it was seismologically safe to explode nuclear devices in South Africa for peaceful purposes." (10)

He ends off with a summary:-

"The trip was successful. The IUEF can count on money well spent. Not only was my research surprisingly productive but I was able to do a number of useful things in South Africa and gained great insight into the present situation there. Many thanks for your support."

Apart from this letter, there is no direct evidence of the exact nature of the association of the accused at any time, with the IUEF.

The accused did not deal with this letter in his statement and although Captain Williamson was in 1978 working for the IUEF he did not in his evidence give any background to the letter. As indicated earlier herein, he handed a copy of the letter to Ginwala of the ANC at a time when collaboration between the ANC and the IUEF was being discussed but as far as I can recall that is as much as he says about the letter.

The question is whether the only reasonable inference from the terms of the letter is that the accused had conspired with the IUEF to obtain and supply it with information to further its objectives. The difficulty in the way of drawing such an inference is that it does seem that the accused was engaged in an academic exercise and the possibility does exist that the IUEF had agreed to finance that. The first paragraph of the letter appears to be related to the work

being/..

Collection Number: AD2021

SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS, Security trials 1958-1982

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand

Location:- Johannesburg

©2012

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 the collection records and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a private collection deposited with Historical Papers at The University of the Witwatersrand.