

HUHUDI (Vryburg)

The further particulars to the indictment as amended (p.79) allege that since February 1985 Huhudi Civic Association (HUCA), Huhudi Youth Organisation (HUYO), GAWU, UDF, COSAS and AZASO organised and intimidation, violence and riots occurred. On 1 July 1984 accused No 20 addressed a mass meeting of HUYO and incited the people to violence.

Huhudi had a real and long-standing problem. It was for a long time government policy to move its inhabitants to Pudimoe in Bophuthatswana for purely ideological reasons. The proposed removal did not make sense. The result would be costly and inconvenient to all concerned. The inhabitants and all their leaders were adamantly opposed to it. As a result of this governmental policy there had for a long time not been any improvement of the amenities in Huhudi and there was a serious housing shortage resulting in overcrowding. The community council was perceived as powerless in this situation.

Before August 1982 the whole community was in favour of participation in the community council except one Kgotso Crutse. The total activity was to fight against the removal of the community. The South African government announced on 15 October 1984 that the removal was off.

In the beginning of 1983 the Huhudi Civic Association (HUCA) was founded. There was a cordial relationship between the councillors and HUCA till June/July 1983 when the leadership of HUCA took up the attitude that they would have nothing to do with any body on which a councillor served. (It should be remembered that this is the time when the UDF was started). HUCA opposed the community council elections in November 1983 and endeavoured to effect a boycott thereof.

HUCA started to undermine the town council, directly dealing with the Northern Cape Development Board and accusing the council of furthering the government's plans to move the community to Pudimoe. Exh AAQ.35. This accusation was false. It was not only made in a letter to the regional manager of the Development Board, but also publicly at a meeting on 1 July 1984. Exh V.12 pp:3 and 44.

At a meeting of HUCA in February 1984 the chairman of that organisation, Hoffman Galeng, said that the people should not pay their rent, and if they had to they should only pay R15 per month. The rent was R25 and R34 respectively. Galeng said the councillors were puppets of the government and had to be rejected. Frank Chikane of the UDF was a speaker. (We bear in mind that in September 1984 HUCA obtained counsel's opinion to the effect that the people were only liable for the charges as fixed in 1982, and not for an increase thereof.) Since this call by Galeng until this evidence was heard in court some inhabitants paid no rent at all and others paid only R15.

After the election of Mr Matloko vice-chairman of the Huhudi Community Council in August 1982 Hoffman Galeng and Jomo Khasu of the Huhudi Civic Association warned him that he would be stoned by children and that he should resign. Dr Motlana of the Soweto Civic Association had said so, they said. Matloko did not regard this as a threat. In cross-examination this version of the conversation was disputed and it was put that Galeng would give evidence to contradict it. He was never called by the defence. However, it is an incident that occurred long before the UDF was formed and at most can illustrate that there was general talk of stone-throwing in opposition to the Black local authorities as early as 1982. It does not advance the state's case.

HUCA, HUYO and UDF pamphlets were distributed which described councillors as puppets, sell-outs and simpletons. This was the position in 1983. After the meetings of these organisations there were attacks upon the councillors' houses or businesses. These continued since May/June 1983. Freedom songs were sung and slogans shouted. A whistle was blown and then the stoning started.

On 14 October 1984 and thereafter many meetings were held. Some of the UDF but mostly of HUCA and HUYO. Regularly after such meetings youths would march singing freedom songs and attack the houses of councillors with stones. These attacks continued till 24 November 1985. On 15 October 1984 an attempt was made to burn down the house of

councillor Dikhole. This was in the early hours of the morning after a HUCA meeting, in the form of a night vigil.

In February 1985 the council held a public meeting in Huhudi. Its purpose was to inform the community about improvements the council wanted to bring about. It ended in chaos brought about by members of HUYO. It was clear that HUCA and HUYO refused to co-operate in any way with the council. The leader of HUYO wore a UDF T-shirt.

On 23 February 1985 a hand-grenade was thrown through the window of councillor Dikhole's house. His wife was injured and had to spend 13 days in hospital. On the same date other hand-grenades were thrown in Huhudi, one at the house of the vice-chairman of the council and one at the house of a policeman of the special branch. Within two months the vice-chairman resigned from the council giving as reason the intimidation. It is common cause that the houses of the police official and of three councillors were damaged by hand-grenades. AAS.3 para 13.

On 16 June 1985 the shop and butchery of an ex-councillor and the house of a councillor were attacked after a commemorative service in Huhudi.

Huhudi Youth Organisation and the Huhudi Civic Association were affiliated to the UDF. Jomo Khasu (whose real name was Johnson Khasu according to London) and Khotso Crutse, leaders of the Huhudi Civic Association, were important office-bearers of the UDF in the Northern Cape. Jomo Khasu was the UDF organiser. He was also a member of the NEC of the UDF and on its national secretariat.

Apart from the meetings where UDF office-bearers spoke the UDF had a further direct and day to day link with the area through the chairman of HUCA, Hoffman Galeng, who served on the executives of the UDF Transvaal and Northern Cape and also sat on the general council of the UDF national. Other members of HUCA represented it on the general council of the Transvaal UDF. After the founding of the UDF Northern Cape region, the UDF shared offices and a chairman with HUCA. GAWU was affiliated to the UDF since mid 1984 and shared offices with it in Vryburg. Important personages of the UDF spoke at meetings in the Northern Cape: Albertina Sisulu, Frank Chikane, accused No 19, accused No 20, Aubrey Mokoena, Curtis Nkondo, Professor Mohammed and Mewa Ramgobin.

There can therefore be no doubt that policy and tactics of the UDF were executed at the local level in Huhudi. HUCA and HUYO identified unequivocally with the UDF. Exhs AM.14, AM.20, AM.52 and AM.56. Notes found in possession of Jomo (Johnson) Khasu evidence considerable activity of the UDF in the Northern Cape (including

Vryburg) at the time of the Coloured and Indian elections and thereafter. Exhs AM.17 and AM.18.

HUCA advocated civil disobedience, described the Black local authorities as undemocratic and unrepresentative and as part of the enemy. It conducted house to house visits where particular success was attained with the youth and it strove to "quench the expectations of the youth". Exh AM.20. HUYO attacked the local authority and falsely accused the councillors of public theft - through the high rents - and of planning forced removal to Pudimoe. Exh AM.50. HUYO also issued a pamphlet in remembrance of June 16 in emotional language. Exh AM.51. Its approach is the same as that of the UDF. To organise, educate (ie agitate), politicise, conscientise and unite the people and "disorganise the enemy camp". Only the oppressed masses can bring about change. Exh AM.52.

At the meetings of HUCA and HUYO the people were told that the council system was forced upon the Blacks by the Whites without consultation to oppress and exploit them and should not be accepted. The struggle of the masses was to bring about a government of the masses. Councillors were puppets of the government and sell-outs oppressing the people of Huhudi by unnecessary rent increases and exploiting them by using their rent to build houses in Pudimoe conspiring with the government to remove the people there. In meetings and pamphlets the people were told to unite in action against the community council, the police and the government. They were also told

that the chairman and vice-chairman of the council removed people in trucks to Pudimoe. This is the evidence of defence witnesses.

A pamphlet issued by the Huhudi Youth Organisation (exh AM.53) stated that the community councillors endangered the life of the people and increased the rent as they planned to move the community to Pudimoe where there would be hunger, thirst, loneliness and suffering. The same false statement is to be found in exh AM.54. A notice of a meeting by Huhudi Youth Organisation for 6 November 1983 states that the community council is a council founded by the "boere" to continue to oppress the people. Exh AM.55.

In Huhudi placards issued by UDF Northern Cape were put up during 1985 headed "Guns for Reform or for Repression?" Exh AM.56. It states inter alia:

" In July 1984 the unarmed community of Tumahole peacefully demonstrated their inability to pay higher rents. The response of this government was violent.

In September 1984 the peace-loving people of the Vaal Triangle expressed their inability to pay high rents, they met with violence from the South African police.

In February 1985 when the community of Crossroads demonstrated their opposition to forced removal to Khayelitsha, 18 people were brutally mowed down by the police. ... We think P W

" Botha and his colleagues deserve to be charged with treason. By throttling attempts to liberate ourselves is an act of treason in itself. "

Under the heading "Apartheid is Violence" the following is set out:

" On 21 March 1985 unarmed people of Uitenhage (Langa and Kwanobuhle) were massacred when they peacefully demonstrated against the high cost of living.

The violence unleashed against the peace-loving community of Uitenhage is the justification of the violent nature of apartheid.

This government has clearly proven to all in South Africa and abroad that it is maintaining its power through violence.

In 1960 it was Sharpeville, in 1976 Soweto, in 1984 Sebokeng and now in 1985 Uitenhage.

How long shall this brutal murder go on? How long? Just how long???

Stop this violence. We must stop this violence. "

The UDF Northern Cape distributed pamphlets exhorting people not to vote in the August 1984 elections for the Tri-cameral parliament.

Exh AL.100.



The defence submits that no inference can be drawn from these facts that the UDF or any of its affiliates was responsible for the violence in Huhudi. The causes can be the general feeling of discontent with councillors related to the removal issue or the ANC presence in the area. It is argued that there is no evidence of advocacy of violence at any meeting and that defence witnesses had denied it.

The defence version initially was that the violence in Huhudi started with and was caused by a motor accident on 16 June 1985. It was put that a child was either intentionally or recklessly run down by councillor Matloko outside the community hall. This caused violence to erupt for the first time in Huhudi. Later the version changed. The driver and place became totally different. The defence called a witness who said she had seen the accident and two peripheral witnesses. These witnesses, Mosiapo, London and Moketsi, we found to be wholly unreliable. We refer to annexure Z in this respect. In any event the state case that the violence started long before 16 June 1985 was supported by defence witness Thebe who testified that a lot of youths had been detained during riots in 1984. His reference to vigilantes in re-examination is not understood and conflicts with the defence case.

It should be borne in mind that the removal issue was satisfactorily resolved by 15 October 1984. It could not thereafter be a factor in Huhudi. Yet there were many meetings of HUCA and HUYO after that date followed by the singing of freedom songs and attacks on councillors' houses. The hand-grenade attacks were since February 1985.

It is possible that the hand-grenade attacks were the work of ANC members and there can be no finding that UDF, HUCA or HUYO were responsible. What can be found as proven is that since the inception of the UDF its local arms used local grievances to cause discontent amongst the people of Huhudi against the Black local authority, with a view to its demise. The pattern was the same as elsewhere in South Africa. The HUYO meeting of 1 July 1984 of which we have a tape (exh 11) and transcript (exh V.12) is an example, though it was a Freedom Charter day commemoration. Subtly a revolutionary climate was created. The history of the ANC was related, the Freedom Charter was popularised, revolutionary songs were sung and the community councillors were described as sell-outs. Though this was possibly a special occasion there is no reason to think that the tone of other HUYO meetings would have been different. Its hatred for the community council and its members is evident from its pamphlets.

The defence cannot rely on general discontent with the councillors as a cause of and excuse for the violence that occurred.

That discontent was intentionally fostered by the local affiliates of the UDF led by UDF leaders.

It is true that there is no evidence before court that there was any call for direct violence at any meeting in Huhudi. That is a weakness in the state case. There is evidence that London, an official of HUCA, on 16 June 1985 stopped youngsters who were throwing stones at councillor Matloko. There is also evidence that Galeng, the chairman of HUCA, told Matloko that he disapproved of stone-throwing and would speak to the youngsters who were stubborn. This was however in mid 1983 and probably was just talk, as the stone-throwing continued.

The defence submitted that only one proved incident namely the hand-grenade attack on 25 February 1985 falls within the confines of the indictment. It will be recalled that the further particulars state that since February 1985 the organisations were active and violence occurred.

The evidence of incidents prior to that date was led without objection and detailed cross-examination and rebutting evidence by the defence followed. The matter has been properly ventilated and the point fails. The evidence is in any event relevant as historical background and to show a pattern. It is incorrect to say that only one incident falls within the period. The attacks of stone-throwing continued till November 1985.

The defence argues that the attack on councillor Matloko's house in May 1983 shows that violence occurred prior to the launch of the UDF, which was in August 1983 and that therefore it cannot be related to the UDF. This submission ignores the fact that the Transvaal UDF (on the REC of which Galeng served) was launched in May 1983.

We conclude as follows in respect of Huhudi:

1. There is no evidence which organisation or individuals organised the violence in Huhudi.

2. The UDF was directly involved with Huhudi through its office-bearers and officials and would at all relevant times have been aware of what happened there.

3. It has not been proved that at any meeting in Huhudi there was a call for violence. Neither is there any evidence that anybody called on the youth to stop their violence after the meetings.

4. The speakers at the meetings and the pamphlets of the affiliates of the UDF set out to discredit the council and councillors in the eyes of the people of Huhudi and cause hatred towards them. They did this using false propaganda in the process.

5. At least at the HUYO meeting of 1 July 1984 UDF speakers (including accused No 20) fostered a revolutionary climate in Huhudi.

6. The violence in Huhudi was at least partly caused by the political climate in that township which was created by the UDF and its affiliates.

## **DELMAS TREASON TRIAL 1985-1989**

### **PUBLISHER:**

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

*Location:*- Johannesburg

©2009

### **LEGAL NOTICES:**

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

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

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

### **DOCUMENT DETAILS:**

*Document ID:*- **AK2117-K2117-L9-9**

*Document Title:*- **Huhudi (Vryburg) 588-600**