

it came to Cape Town, Mr. Vigne O.K. it, Mr. Daniels saw it and as I recall he approved it, yes.

It was Vigne who said this document is an excellent document?--- Yes.

And no real discussion of this thing took place? --- No, not in Cape Town.

Not in Cape Town. But Vigne's influence was such that what he said went? --- Yes, I don't think that puts it correctly in relation to the particular pamphlet. I
 10 don't think that when the pamphlet was shown to, say Mr. Daniels, I don't recall him saying "did Mr. Vigne approve of it, if so, I approve." I don't recall that. But Mr. Vigne did approve it, yes.

Mr. Vigne did approve it. You are aware - Miss van der Riet has already told us - that Daniels made certain efforts to withdraw from this organization? --- I don't know about withdrawing from the organization, he did at one stage indicate a desire briefly to withdraw from the Planning Committee.

20 HIS LORDSHIP: Before you answer that question - have you checked that Mr. Gibson? I don't remember that she ever said that Daniels wished to withdraw, she said the only person she knew who wished to withdraw was Miss McConkey. She knew that Schneider withdrew for a time but I think the question put to this witness, unless my memory fails me, ...

MR. GIBSON: This certainly sticks in my mind, my memory being intimately concerned of course.

HIS LORDSHIP: Well, if it makes your memory better than mine I am prepared to defer.

30 MR. SNITCHER: I think my recollection is, with respect, My Lord, she said that there was some attempt by him to form another, to hide off, I think that was what she said.

HIS LORDSHIP: Oh that she did say, she said he wanted to hide(?) off on his own. That is quite a different proposition that she did say.

MR. GIBSON: She said that inter alia. She said more than that, My Lord. May I quote: page 79. I will read the whole piece: A question by me. "Are you aware of the fact that accused No.1 made several attempts to withdraw from the activity of the organization? To the best of my knowledge the accused wanted to split, he wanted to work separately
10 from the organization. He wanted to withdraw from the organization, you are aware of that? Yes, I am not quite certain to which extent he wished to withdraw, whether he wished to work separately or whether he wished to withdraw completely." The question to the point is, My Lord, that Miss van der Riet did say that she was aware there was some suggestion that he might withdraw.

HIS LORDSHIP: You put it to the witness "withdrawing from the activities, withdrawing from the company he was in.

MR. GIBSON: Withdrawing from the organization, My Lord.

20 Let me put it to you again. Are you aware of occasions on which accused No.1 Daniels, wished to withdraw from the organization? --- As I said I don't recall occasions when he wished to withdraw from the organization, I do recall an occasion when he wished to withdraw from the Planning Committee.

Let me try to refresh your memory. Do you remember the conversation you had with him at Athlone Bridge about 18 months ago, when you and van der Riet and Daniels were in your car? --- Please go on, I am not fully with you.

And Daniels said to you, inter alia, because of your tactics in the committees and the fact that he was always out-voted in the activities of the organisation, he wished to withdraw working with you, and that you dissuaded him and asked him to continue to do so? ---- I think this is the occasion that I am referring to, the planning committee, yes.

Are you saying that as far as your recollection is concerned his only wish was to withdraw from the planning committee? ---- Yes.

10 You've no recollection that he wanted to withdraw further? ---- No.

And what about an occasion at Rondebosch fountain about nine to eleven months ago. I am afraid I cannot give you the specific dates; at Rondebosch fountain at night when he spoke to you alone and said that he wished to withdraw from the organisation altogether? ---- (Silence).

It was an occasion when you were supposed to be going to Vigne's house and Vigne wasn't present? ---- Yes, I think I recall that conversation.

20 That was before the name of the organisation was changed to the African Resistance Movement and before the attack on the pylons at Bellville and Stellenbosh, Lynedoch and these places? ---- I don't recall the date. My recollection of that conversation was that it was very recently; much more recently than nine to eleven months ago. But it was shortly after, possibly before these attacks. As I recall we had a difference of opinion over, I think it concerned the manufacture of the timing device. We talked about it; he said he was going to bring it up on the Regional Committee
30 but he said if we talked about it and came to an agreement about the problem - I forget specifically - the matter would be dropped and he did not bring it up at the Regional Committee.

Did he ever request the Regional Committee that he should be allowed to go to Johannesburg in order to argue against continuing sabotage activities? ---- Yes.

You remember that? ---- Yes.

He definitely wanted to argue against continuing? ---- Yes.

When was that? ---- This was the meeting I had referred to earlier, in Johannesburg early this year.

HIS LORDSHIP: That was the view of everybody in Cape Town, 10 wasn't it? ---- Well, (The Court intervenes).

That was the Cape Town view? ---- At one stage, as I mentioned yesterday, there was an informal discussion between Mr. De Keller, Mr. Schneider and myself. I recall it was at Kirstenbosch and we felt that way strongly then.

But Vigne thought you should carry on? ---- No, Vigne tended to agree with us I think. And then there was a period of doubt. We all chopped and changed. Mr. Daniels I remember was against.

Carrying on? ---- Yes. Then we went to the meeting in 20 Johannesburg where the argument was, as I recall, strongly pushed by Mr. Higgs and that was the decision and we came back and the three latest jobs were prepared.

MR. GIBSON: Did you speak in favour of continuing sabotage on that occasion in Johannesburg? ---- I was in two minds. I accepted a great deal of Mr. Daniels's argument and accepted also much of what Mr. Higgs had said. The final decision as I recall, arose at that meeting. Yes.

Yes, and you voted in favour of continuing sabotage? ---- 30 There wasn't really a voting system but I think I agreed with them, yes.

You agreed with them. Daniels was against it? --- Prior to the decision, yes.

He took no part in the decision? ---- He was present at the meeting.

He was present at the meeting; he took no part in the decision? ---- If there are four or five people who come to a decision, he took the part of an individual in the discussions.

Yes, there was no formal resolution, shall we put it that way. Daniels spoke against it; you and Higgs spoke in favour of sabotage continuing and there was no formal resolution taken? ---- Higgs spoke in favour; I think I was in two minds still at that stage but was persuaded by the argument which was put up.

Now in fact when was that meeting? ---- As I recall it was early this year.

Early this year, that was before the blowing up of the three pylons at the - in the country? ---- Yes.

Now in fact, since November of last year Daniels played no active part in acts of sabotage at all? Let's put it this way: He played no part in the acts of placing explosives on railway cables. He played no part in the acts (The Court intervenes).

HIS LORDSHIP: Wait a minute, that is not the evidence. The evidence is he was on standby. The evidence is that he was the man who was on standby in case of injury? ---- Not on the railway cables.

MR. GIBSON: The pylons, My Lord, as far as I recall.

HIS LORDSHIP: Railway cables. I raise it so that I can be corrected if I am wrong.

MR. GIBSON: That was my impression but let me then continue, My Lord. He played no part in an act of sabotage as far as the railway cables were concerned? ---- Correct.

He played no part in placing charges on any of the

pylons - I am talking now after the Muldersvlei one - I am talking about after November, the three in the country? ---- No, he was not on the jobs.

There was some evidence that he was on so-called standby. Now what would that mean? ---- That would mean that he was - in fact he was at Miss van der Riet's flat. I think Miss McConkey was also present and they were there on standby which I think explains itself.

You mean they were there to arrange medical attention
10 or escape or that sort of thing? ---- Yes.

Medical attention? ---- Yes.

So you will agree with me when I say that after November at any rate - the Muldersvlei thing - he was fairly out of the activities of the organisation. He was connected in certain ways but he wasn't in any way any kind of driving force? ---- I find it difficult to answer that. I would say that the driving force from the commencement of the jobs on the three pylons was Mr. Schneider who was preparing them and 'rece-ing' them. Mr. Schneider was at that stage the
20 driving force on the planning committee.

Yes, and Daniels was a cipher then? ---- I beg your pardon?

From that time on, I am talking now after the Muldersvlei job, he was a cipher in the organisation; Schneider was running it? ---- I think the emphasis is not correct.

What is the correct emphasis? ---- As I tried to explain earlier, at various stages on the planning committee individuals who were more intimately concerned with a given job would be in charge. And at this period Mr. Daniels was
30 certainly not involved in any deep way.

Well, you knew he was reluctant to carry on; he had these discussions with you expressing his reluctance? ---- I

was not aware that he was reluctant after the Johannesburg meeting.

Do you remember the pylon effort, the three pylons where one didn't go up? ---- Yes.

When it didn't go up, you discussed it with two other members of the planning committee, as I recall? ---- Yes.

You didn't discuss it with Daniels at all? ---- No, I tried to get in touch with him but couldn't.

And you three of the planning committee - that is you, 10 Schneider and Van der Riet - went back to finish off the job? ---- That is correct.

And Daniels played no part in it? ---- That is correct.

Are you aware of the fact that Watson on occasion might have applied emotional blackmail to persons who were - I believe that was the expression used - emotional blackmail to persons who might wish to withdraw from the organisation? ---- Oh yes.

Such a person withdrawing would be considered a security risk by the others? ---- Yes. Yes, depending on the person.

20 So you wouldn't wish anybody to withdraw and remain in the country of course? ---- Well, no, we wouldn't.

So what was the nature of this emotional blackmail that was applied by Watson? ---- Well, I think it was only effective during the period when he was plausible to us; applied when he literally dictated the activities of the organisation.

HIS LORDSHIP: But Mr. Gibson, I thought by the time your client wanted to withdraw, Watson was out of the picture already?

30 MR. GIBSON: He was, My Lord.

HIS LORDSHIP: Well, what has his emotional blackmail got to do with it?

MR. GIBSON: Because it might, My Lord, relate to a general tendency this way amongst other persons.

HIS LORDSHIP: To put it bluntly, what stopped any man who wanted to get out, from getting out? ---- I think after Mr. Watson left nothing really.

At the stage when you came back from Johannesburg, if anybody wanted to get out what would have stopped him from getting out? ---- Only, I think, a personal reluctance of the others, disappointment but nothing else.

10 MR. GIBSON: And you would have done your utmost to persuade him to stay in? ---- I don't think I would have myself, no.

Others might have? ---- Yes.

Such as? What about Vigne, for example? ---- No, I don't think Vigne would have. In fact I don't think after Watson left anybody would have purposely gone out to prevent a person from leaving the organisation.

Did you yourself dissuade Daniels from leaving the planning committee - on the Athlone Bridge occasion? ---- I don't recall that it was a question of dissuading - well, I
20 asked him not to, if that is ... (Mr. Gibson intervenes).

You asked him not to? ---- Yes.

Now the effect of leadership of this organisation, how was the leadership in Cape Town, the effective part? Vigne, Ruben, Watson, Schneider are overseas, are they not?
---- I think so.

You have an indemnity, an immunity? ---- Yes.

Van der Riet, also an indemnity but perhaps you don't know about that. I am just assuming. It is rather like the story of the Ten Little Nigger Boys, or perhaps I should use
30 the term African Boys in this context? Everybody escaping, apart from two accused in this box and certain others - three whose pleas have been accepted in another trial. ---- Yes.

Are you happy with that situation? ---- Of course not.
Why did you do it? ---- Do you wish me to explain?
Yes. ---- Then I will explain fully.

HIS LORDSHIP: What is the relevance of this witness' happiness or otherwise?

MR. GIBSON: It might be relevant to the extent - I don't know to what extent.

HIS LORDSHIP: Well, tell me whether it is relevant and I will admit it if you tell me it is relevant

10 MR. GIBSON: It would be and that is the point.

HIS LORDSHIP: If you say that is the point, then surely I am entitled to ask what relevancy evidence has before it is led.

MR. GIBSON: It is a question of the weight to be attached to
.... (The Court intervenes).

HIS LORDSHIP: To what?

MR. GIBSON: For example, there is a dispute between us as to the withdrawal or attempted withdrawal of Daniels from the organisation. There is a dispute between us as to the amount or part Daniels played in the organisation. The
20 weight, therefore, of his evidence might become important. He is clearly an accomplice, he required corroboration - there is of course certain corroboration I am aware but he is an accomplice.

HIS LORDSHIP: But now you are asking him what were his motives for giving evidence.

MR. GIBSON: No, My Lord, was there any motive to give incorrect evidence, for example, on any of the issues on which I have (The Court intervenes).

HIS LORDSHIP: It would probably be quicker if I listen to
30 it rather than interrupt.

MR. GIBSON: Why are you giving evidence in this case? Do you feel unhappy about giving a statement of that kind? ----

No, I do not. I was asked by the security police after about seventy days whether I was prepared to give evidence. At that stage I refused. Shortly before the others were charged I was asked again to give evidence. I endeavoured to enquire who else was giving evidence. I established that there were four other people who were giving evidence and I realised from what I was aware of the organisation, I realised from what these people knew of the organisation and who they knew that their evidence, with respect to the Court,
10 as I understood it seemed in my mind to be very damning evidence against Daniels, Mr. De Keller and - yes, specifically against Mr. Daniels and Mr. De Keller.

Possibly against you too? ---- Yes, I am coming to this point. I realised too that - I believed that what we did was in itself futile and stupid but I don't believe that the ideals which underlay it and the personal frustration which we felt prior to it is stupid or futile. It remained valid to me. However, I realised that in fact, what we had done, looked at as objectively as I could, was futile and stupid
20 and I realised my futility and my stupidity by the very fact that I was deeply involved in this organisation. To add to the situation, that I was in an exceptionally serious position. It so happened that the files of the organisation were kept by me, the writing; many of the documents; much of the evidence. And I've known that in other sabotage trials the sentences have been exceptionally severe. The Law is severe on this question. And I believed that from the evidence, and that is what ultimately counts, the case against me was a very substantial one. I do not know what
30 possible sentences are available. I was told on a number of occasions, in fact when I was initially arrested I was told "We've got enough to hang you" and I realised that a life

sentence was not out of the question with this thing. I could not give evidence; I was not in a position to give evidence against the man I knew as Roy, apart from saying that there was a man called Roy, which left two people. These people had played an exceptionally minor role in the organisation. I think there have been names, Kemp and Mr. Brooks who in fact, left the organisation. That left the possibility and well, as I was - I am sorry, I am confused. I realised that there was evidence, having explained that, 10 sufficient to connect myself, Mr. Daniels, Mr. De Keller, I believe possibly this man I know as Roy, and I did not know the nature of the evidence against or could not assess the nature of the evidence against Miss Kemp and Mr. Brooks. But it is not an easy thing and if it is your intention to make me break down in this Court, I may do so.

No, I don't wish to do so. ---- It is not an easy thing and you've succeeded. (At this stage the witness is emotionally distressed).

My Lord, if the witness? (Witness intervenes) ----

20 No, I can continue.

HIS LORDSHIP: I don't know whether you want all this. It is not helping me at all.

---- It is not an easy thing to give evidence against people whom you love, who have been your friends but if I stood to get five, seven or ten years I would not give it, not under any circumstances. I loathe, God I loathe apartheid and all that it means. This treachery here I place at the door of the system - that is neither here nor there. I am twentyfour years old. I have been stupid; I think we've 30 all been stupid and I think we all realise we've been stupid and that we have indirectly and not intentionally endangered human life. I don't think any of us wished to do that. You

asked me to explain why I am giving evidence. I am giving evidence very simply: (a) Because I realised that the case against Eric, the case against Spike were hopeless anyway. I may have been wrong. I realised that I was not in a position to give evidence against the man called Roy. As far as Miss Kemp and Mr. Brooks are concerned, I believed that they stood to get a very light sentence. If I stood to get five, six, seven, eight, ten years, I would not give evidence, not against people I am close to. But I believe, I don't know, 10 that if they were in my position with Schneider gone, Watson gone, Vigne gone, Higgs gone, and the evidence that stood against me, they stood to come out possibly when they were fortynine, fifty years old, they would have, and I would have welcomed them to do the same. However, I have been sworn here to tell the truth and I have endeavoured to tell the truth. Hard as it is, and as much as I loathe it and as much as I have no doubt, that a seed of great bitterness, possibly a form of what the psychologists call displacement activity, a seed of great bitterness is sown in me. I certainly hope 20 that there will be a time when, if these people who I am giving evidence against, can forgive me and understand that I do not move one jot from my ideas and if they can forgive me that there will be a time, I hope so, when this country sees a lot better situation where the sort of very simple things - the very simple things, in a sense selfish things that I want for myself but I don't want for myself if they can't be for fifteen other million people - well, I just hope that when that day comes, that we will all be together again. And that is why I have given evidence.

30 My Lord, the witness is obviously distressed and of course, I asked him to give this explanation. I wonder if it is not perhaps a convenient time to adjourn.

AT THIS STAGE MR. BEUKES REQUESTS THE COURT'S PERMISSION TO CALL ONE FURTHER WITNESS.

PERMISSION GRANTED.

THE WITNESS STANDS DOWN.

WILLEM HERMANUS BRITS: (Beëdigd verklaar).

ONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. BRITS: U is 'n Majoor in die Suid-Afrikaanse Spoorweë en Hawenspolisie? ---- Dit is korrek.

10 Gestasioneer te Johannesburg? ---- Dit is korrek.

Ken u die persoon met die naam van Hirson? ---- Ek ken so'n persoon.

Waar woon hy? ---- Hy woon in Johannesburg. Sy volle name is Bertram Martin Hirson.

Wat werk hy daar? ---- Hy is senior lektor aan die Witwatersrandse Universiteit.

Sal u net kyk na hierdie foto BEWYSSTUK A.48 en sê of dit hy is daardie? ---- Dit is hy hierdie.

GEEN KRUIS-ONDERVRAGING DEUR VERDEDIGING.

HOF VERDAAG TOT OM 10 VM. OP DIE 5de NOVEMBER, 1964.

Known Spike about 2 1/2 years. Met him at a social gathering. A short time thereafter met him again.
March April 1962

Joined L.P. probably 1959. Introd. Spike as a member. Joined N.C.L. early part of 1962. Spike did not come into N.C.L. ~~but~~ ^{Sept} 1962. I don't think but wasn't object.

I was one who interested him in joining
I introd. him to persons that he in org.

No constitution as far as Spike concerned.

Had no long term aims. Was an org. of people of varying political attitudes and affiliations. They were not members of any particular party.

Its basis - group which would perform acts which would arouse public protest.

It had no mass basis.

end of 1963 - general doubting whether thing should continue. The attitude when No 2 - I shalled was that sabotage should be dropped. We shared this view for several months.

No work from that date until the June efforts save political intelligence unit. C6 + C7 own personal thoughts

Early part of June to Jhb. ~~Canadian~~ pylon attacks

Opinion amongst student.
Feeling running very high about political matters
1962-3 - New meetings
Spike prominently at them - Tremendous feeling of frustration & impatience
By

Heard Lehn discuss political warfare with v.d. Pitt at the Planning Com.
This was rejected.

Atmosphere that something had to be done

PS

Socialist stuff + violence stuff
not approved by rank + file

Drawn up in Jhb.
Certain people would have seen it.

intk
Reorg Feb. March
6h

Collection Number: AD1901

**SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS, Security trials Court
Records 1958-1978**

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.