

THE COMMISSION RESUMES 11 JUNE 1990.

CHAIRMAN: I would just like to point out that due to other official commitments I cannot sit this afternoon.

JAN CAREL COETZEE nog onder eed:

VOORSITTER: Ja, mnr. Maritz?

MNR. MARITZ: Mnr. die Voorsitter, ons het geen verdere vrae aan hierdie getuie nie, baie dankie.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE

MR McNALLY: Mr Chairman, I understand that the witness Joe (10)
Mamasela is on his way to the Commission. He is not here at the
moment. We do have a next witness, but it might be best to ...
(intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: Who is our next witness?

MR McNALLY: Brigadier Schoon.

THE COMMISSION ADJOURNS. THE COMMISSION RESUMES.

JOSEPH TSEPO MAMASELA still under oath:

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR PRETORIUS: Mr Mamasela, were you
out on duty all Friday? -- Yes, I was on duty.

Where? Were you out of town as it were or were you here in (20)
.. (intervenes). -- I was out of Pretoria.

And since Friday who have you spoken to? -- To my wife, to
my family, to my friends.

No, no, let me just complete the question. Who have you spoken,
which policemen have you spoken to? -- Oh no, I did not speak to
any policemen.

You have not spoken to any police? --No.

When were you told that you had to come and give evidence
at the Commission? -- When?

Were you told that you had to come and give evidence here (30)
at .. (intervenes). -- Well, I just received the report that

Brigadier/..

Brigadier Van Rensburg wanted to see me half past - I think about 07h30 to 08h00 this morning at his office.

And have you read any newspapers over the weekend? -- Yes, I do read some newspapers.

Which newspapers did you read? -- City Press which is my favourite newspaper and that is all.

Which other ones? -- I read City Press most of the time.

Do you know why you are here this morning? -- Yes, Brigadier Van Rensburg told me this morning why I am supposed to take a restander. (10)

What did he tell you? -- He told me that - he showed me some, he actually, he confronted me with some other documents that are purported to come from Botswana, Botswana government and then he said why did I lie to him by saying I have never been to Botswana on that particular day, on the 26th then I told him no - I said no, I want to see it, I want proof of what he tells me and then he produced some forms of papers that come from Botswana and then that says I was in Botswana and I was involved in some shooting incident of some sort. (20)

Yes? -- And when I looked at the document they looked to be authentic. I accept that. When I take a closer look I found that there were some genuine flaws in the whole thing.

Yes? -- I then said I will come and set the record straight to the Commission.

Did you discuss anything else? -- No, basically it was that because the time was very short and I had to come here.

Do you have that document still with you or was it just shown to you? -- No, it was just shown to me and then I left it there.

Well, would you just take a look at this document, please/.. (30)

please. It is EXHIBIT 141 now and that is an arrival card with your name on. That is your name. -- Yes, I do admit it is my name.

And that is not your date of birth, is it? -- Correct. It is not my date of birth.

Now we know, according to the record and certain documents that have already been handed in that the correct date of your birth is 2 June 1953, is that correct? -- Absolutely.

Your service record shows it is 2 June 1955. -- Yes, I pointed out that difference.

And the travel document handed in earlier and that is before this Commission shows that it is 2 July 1955. -- Yes, I can account for that. (10)

And this Botswana document now, if the information here was taken from another travel document, it shows your date of birth as 6 June 1955. -- Ja, my purported date of birth, yes of course.

So it seems to us that no document, whether genuine or not, handed in before this Commission does in fact show your correct date of birth. -- I can prove my genuine date of birth if the Commission allows.

No, if you just listen to the question, Mr Mamasela, no official document, your service record, your travel document that is already before this Commission has in fact honoured your correct date of birth. -- On that basis you are correct. (20)

Now, I want to - I am not a handwriting expert, but I think it is fair to you to put a document to you which is EXHIBIT B19 and that is an affidavit that you signed in October of last year.

It is not a very good copy, I am

afraid/..

afraid. Now, the only thing I want you to look at in that signature

is the last two letters. Do you see how the last A is tucked into the last L? -- Ja.

Do you see that? -- Very much. I am aware of it.

And do you see in your affidavit, EXHIBIT B132 - could you return that document to me? Please look at B132. Do you see there too the last A is tucked into the L? -- Ja, but not as that other one. It is not tucked in the same way as that one.

But it is quite close and tucked into the foot of the L. -- Yes, there is that possibility.

And would you look at the signature then on the arrival card in EXHIBIT 141. -- Ja, I see it. (10)

The same thing? -- The last two numbers are almost identical but not the rest of the signature.

What do you say about your signature and printing there, is that your signature or not? -- It looks very much similar to mine, but I can state in front of this Commission that it is not my signature. Whoever forged it really did a good job.

Are you saying that this document was forged? -- Yes, it is the mind of a genius who is very sick in his mind. I can assure you that because I was not on that day in Botswana with any kind of a travel document whatsoever. (20)

Now, the details of the travel document on this arrival card, the number for example, do not coincide with the travel document that you handed in to this Commission, you can accept that as a fact. -- That is obvious.

So, if indeed you did present yourself at the border post with a travel document it would have been a different travel document/..

C88.8

- 2478 -

MAMASELA
(30)

document. -- On that particular day?

Yes. -- It would not have been different because I had one

travel document which is in the possession of this Commission.

No, but do you accept - well, you deny that you were there at all? -- I deny I was there at all.

Well, let me put it this way, the person who presented himself at the border post, whether it was you or anyone else, presented a different travel document from that one that the Commission has. -- That is absolutely correct.

Now, do you know the car registration number FZR593T? -- It is the first time I saw this thing in the morning. It is the first time I see this ... (intervenes)

Do you recognise that registration number at all? -- I do not know it at all. (10)

I might as well for the record just inform the Commission that we have made a search and have ..(intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have got a computer print-out.

MR PRETORIUS: Do ours coincide, Mr Chairman, that is the question?

CHAIRMAN: Well, it is a Ford Cortina motorcar, white/cream coloured belonging to the security police. It was a new vehicle first registered in 1981. Is that what yours also say?

MR PRETORIUS: Well, I think it is a different print-out but our document says that that car that they have alleged to have gone through the border was indeed registered in the name of the security branch, Pretoria, Wacht Huis. Now, let me just understand, you are adamant it appears to me, from what you have said already, that you did not go through the border post. -- Correct. (20)

And what/..

C88.9

- 2479 -

MAMASELA

And what you are saying is that someone else went through. -- It is possible.

A genius. -- It is possible. I said this is the work of a genius with a sick mind because really if you look at this thing (30)

it looks so convincing, but if you look at it thoroughly you can see that there are flaws, there are genuine flaws.

All right, let us go through them. This person, this genius with the sick mind who went ..(intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt you. You say there are genuine flaws, now what do you say are the genuine flaws? -- The pass- port - my passport number is 617575 and that is the only authentic passport that I have that I used to travel with, that is here in this Commission.

MR PRETORIUS: Did you ever have an unauthentic passport? -- I (10) never had any unauthentic passport. Hence I use the word authentic passport that is here, presented in this Commission.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, what else? -- And the age in the passport is not my age and this 25 Rockville, Soweto, I have never heard of such an address and I have never made use of this address in any way whatsoever in my life. In 37 years, it is the first time that I meet this address in this Commission.

Yes, what else? -- And the signature here admittedly the last "la" is similar to my handwriting, but the rest is not similar, admittedly.

(20) What other problems? -- And when I studied this document, when I was given this document to look at it, I saw that it is purported that myself, Gumede, I do not even know who is this Gumede, and Dirk Coetzee entered simultaneously. We were driving in one car, all of us, and when I looked at the way the serial number stands in this purported arrival document

I find/..

C88.10

- 2480 -

MAMASELA

I find that in mine, the one that is purported to be mine, it was (30) 123 - 116123 and that of Dirk Coetzee it is 116134 and that of Gumede, who is purported to be Almond Nofemela by documents here,

is 135. It shows that these two, 134/135, they went in together, not 123. It indicates that 123 should have gone in before the others.

Yes, what else?

MR PRETORIUS: Mr Chairman, may I just - well, perhaps the list ought to be finished and then I will come back to it.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, let us get it. -- And Mr Chairman, really, when I look at the immigration stamp that was used on that particular day that it was purported that I was in there, I found that in my name here, in this document that is supposedly mine, the stamp is not the same, it is not identical to the other people's stamps. (10)

It is obvious. It is an obvious - distant. It is not the same.

Yes, it is different. -- Though I contest that the signature of that immigration officer is the same. What is common is the signature that is the same but the stamps are not the same.

The serial numbers are not the same. Really this made me to seriously question the authenticity of this document and referring back to paragraph 6 of the same document ... (intervenes)

Of the statement, yes? -- Ja, it is clear that three men came into the country driving a vehicle with registration number FZR593T. Number seven, paragraph 7, on the same day, 25 November 1981 ..(intervenes) (20)

26 November. -- Yes, at about 17h50. Immigration departure card shows Messrs Dirk Coetzee .. (intervenes)

Came back. -- And Gumede to have come back, to have

crossed/..

C88.11

- 2481 -

MAMASELA

crossed back to South Africa. Now, this purported Mr Mamasela is still inside Botswana. He has never come back and there is no departure form whatsoever in his name. Although he can contest that, the arrival form is there in his name, but the departure (30)

form is not there in his name. It is clear. Now, in paragraph 8 - Mr Chairman, I am sorry to take your time, on the very same day at about 19h55, two hours five minutes exactly, the same vehicle, FZR593T, re-entered Botswana now driven by Mr Mamasela.

It does not make any logic - this is devoid of any form of truth.

I mean it is common sense that can tell one it is - just cannot happen. It is impossible that the people leave me in Botswana, they cross back into South Africa then suddenly I come back with that car, two hours five minutes later, I come with the same car, I cross into the same border. It does not make any sense as far as I am concerned. (10)

Yes, just a moment. Mr Pretorius, I am not quite sure, do we have confirmation of the second entry by Mr Mamasela into Botswana?

MR PRETORIUS: No documentary confirmation.

CHAIRMAN: On what is the statement based, do we know?

MR PRETORIUS: We have not yet been able to establish that, Mr Chairman, but it seems to me that there was a record of the vehicle coming in and the explanation was that explanation given there but I cannot (intervenes). (20)

CHAIRMAN: But we have not got any ... (intervenes)

MR PRETORIUS: I cannot put a definite version of the explanation because that is an inference.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

Are there any other problems you have before Mr Pretorius proceeds/..

C88.12

- 2482 -

MAMASELA

proceeds? -- I would like to read to this court paragraph 9 because if you look at the arrival card itself it does not say much, but if you look at the statement of the Botswana police you can see the disparities, the discrepancies that I am talking about clearly. (30)

Paragraph 9: "In spite of exhaustive enquiries made through our borders there was no information whatsoever regarding the departure of Mamasela as well as the said vehicle FZR593 .." in other words I am still in Botswana. I will be happy if those people can discover me and introduce me ... (intervenes)

No, but they say "some of our borders did not .. " (intervenes). -- Some of our borders did not keep registers for entering particulars of the vehicles entering and leaving the country. Some of the borders did not have the facilities for entering particulars of vehicles, but what about me, what about my passport? They should have taken the particulars of myself, even if they did not have the facilities for particulars for registration of vehicles, but of myself. There is no border in the country, in the world that can allow people to flow in and out without taking their particulars. It is impossible in respect of ... (intervenes) (10)

Yes. No, no, I think the suggestion was that you may or may not have crossed or re-crossed the border illegally, so I do not think that that necessarily goes as far as you wish the point to go. Is there any other point you want to make? -- No, the other point is this of Anderson Gumede, that is paragraph 11. "We have no record of Almond Nofemela and we completely know nothing about him unless he at some stage called himself Anderson Pule Gumede". In all my life I have not met any person by the name of Anderson Pule Gumede, but I know of (20)

Gumede/..

C88.14

- 2483 -

MAMASELA

Gumede, Greencopper Gumede, Joseph Greencopper Gumede, a former South African light weight and feather weight champion who was my close friend. (30)

Yes, fine. -- And there is something that has worried me all

along that - there is something that is worrying me, even up to now, Mr Chairman, you know lies - if you talk lies and the truth, the two do not mix. It is like mixing water with paraffin and this clearly is proved here. On 28 July 1981 some ANC cadres picked up Chief Montampede, that is true, that is my friend, and shot him dead and burned him along Lobatsi Road by the roadside. Joseph Mamasela reported the matter to the police and gave a statement and was a vital witness in the murder charge against the ANC cadres.

That is absolutely correct. It is unfortunate, this is what is destroying me, really, if people can go so low as to ...

(intervenes)

(10)

Just give the facts. -- It is unfortunate that the docket which had contained his statement was destroyed with other documents, but these ones, these purported ones of the departure and the arrival of 1981 of the same year, they decided to keep them, but the most important document of the murder is destroyed with other documents. I just do not believe that one.

Yes, but Mr Dirk Coetzee had similar problems about other documents. So, it is different departments dealing with different documents. -- Yes. Now, the other one, the last one, apparently is "During the inquiry Mamasela was found in possession of Makarov pistol no. AP5965 for which he was not charged as he was going to be used as a (laughs) witness in the murder charge". It is ridiculous, it is preposterous, that is why I am laughing, Mr Chairman. Here is a complete

stranger/..

C88.17

- 2484 -

MAMASELA

stranger in a country who has(?) an unlicensed firearm which he did not declare at the border gate. He is found .. (intervenes).

(30)

No, this was not declared at the - they do not say at the border gate. -- Yes, but purportedly I went in and I had no licence

for that gun, that is why they found it in my person, that is why they confiscated it and then they leave me because I happened to be a vital witness in their case, but they do not confiscate my passport. Common sense tells me they could have confiscated my passport to make sure that I do not leave their country and run back to my country.

Yes, all right, but that does not deal with the present point. The present point is .. (intervenes). -- Yes.

Mr Pretorius is not concerned about this part. Mr Pretorius is concerned about the questions you raise about the correctness of the arrival card. Have you mentioned all your problems you have? -- Yes, thank you very much. (10)

MR PRETORIUS: Mr Mamasela, what time did you arrive at work this morning? -- Approximately 08h00.

08h00? -- Yes.

And until that time you had not seen these documents or spoken to any other police officer in respect of them? -- I have already stated in front of this Commission that Brigadier Van Rensburg confronted me with this document and said you told us lies, tell us the truth, because here is the document that says you were there. I have explained that I have seen this document today. (20)

Mr Mamasela, if you would just listen to the question and try to answer it, we might get a lot further much quicker. By 08h00 this morning when you arrived at work, you had not seen this document/..

C88.18

- 2485 -

MAMASELA

this document nor spoken to any police officer in respect of what happened on Friday in this Commission is that correct? -- That is correct. (30)

And at what time then were these documents shown to you this morning approximately? - Unfortunately I did not check my time,

but they were one way or the other shown to me.

Was it immediately on your arrival? -- Shortly after my arrival.

And for how long did you and - was it Brigadier Engelbrecht - discuss these documents? -- Not Engelbrecht, please.

Van Rensburg. -- Van Rensburg, yes. He confronted me with this document. He confronted me with them and then I do guess the time how long the consultation took place but I stood my grounds, I explained to him the way I am explaining to this Commission.

Now, I want an estimate of how long you spent with him, it was only this morning. -- It could ... (intervenues) (10)

CHAIRMAN: Were you there until you were called here, were you with him? -- I was with him and he confronted me with this and ... (intervenues)

No, did you directly from him come to the Commission? -- I beg your pardon?

In other words - you were called to come down here. -- Yes.

Just after 10h00. Were you still with him when you were called? -- No.

MR PRETORIUS: I would like you to try and remember again how long did you spend with him looking at these documents. Was it five minutes, ten minutes, was it an hour, half an hour? -- (20)

Between/..

C88.19

- 2486 -

MAMASELA

Between five and ten minutes.

Five and ten minutes? -- Ja, between five and ten minutes.

Did he take the documents away or did he leave them with you?

-- No, I left them there.

So, you had five or ten minutes to look at these documents. (30)

-- Yes.

And in that time it appears to us you made a very close analysis of the contents of these documents. -- Of course if allegations are levelled at you and you can see these people, you have got to scrutinise them to clear up your name.

And you say you had five or ten minutes with documents ... (intervenes) -- Yes, yes.

To make the analysis you have given to the court now. -- Definitely.

Were you assisted at all or did you just do it on your own? -- No, I did it on my own. I pointed certain differences at him and then I read the whole thing and the whole thing did not make any sense to me. (10)

Now, where do you get, from these arrival cards, that they all went in at the same time on the 26th? First of all did you get these - were you told that that was what the evidence was or what was put on Friday or did you get it yourself from these cards? -- I got the whole thing myself from this card.

Now where did you get from these cards that they all arrived at the same time? -- I have stated in front of this Commission that paragraph 6 says "These three men came into the country driving a vehicle with registration number .. - these three men came into the country driving vehicle number (20)

so and so/..

C88.20

- 2487 -

MAMASELA

so and so, registration."

Yes, but where does it say that it happened at the same time? -- No, here is .. (intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: Well, he said they entered the country at 16h35. I thought that was the whole gist ... (intervenes). -- Ja, it was the same. (30)

That is how I understood the allegation.

MR PRETORIUS: Yes, it does seem that that is an inference from the cards.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I do not know whether it is an inference from the cards, but I think that was the suggestion.

MR PRETORIUS: You see because it may be that these people did not enter it the same time, that you entered alone in this car or that the person who used your name entered alone. -- I have pointed that possibility in front of this Commission. I even said that according to the serial number this purported Joe Mamasela went in first, according to the serial numbers. I have pointed that to this - but what was confusing me was that chapter 6 that (10) says these people got in.

Now, let us first take the supposition that that person came in alone at a different time as the sequence numbers you argue show, but we will deal with that at the appropriate time, this person who came in, this genius with the sick mind as you describe him, would first of all have to have known your name. -- That is correct.

Now, that must have been someone that knew you or are you saying that there are plenty of Joe Tsepo Mamaselas about? --It (20) might have been - the possibility is it might have been somebody who knew me very well.

Well, like who? -- Like the ANC, like the Botswana

police/..

C88.21

- 2488 -

MAMASELA

police, like Dirk Coetzee and there are a lot of people who knew me. I mean the possibility is very wide.

Dirk Coetzee included. Was he someone who knew you at the time? -- No, he purported to have known me, then I - the possibility (30) is there that he might have come across my name .. (intervenes)

Where? -- He was working at the security branch, at the head

office. The possibility is that he might have come across my name there as a .. (intervenes)

Well, let us deal with that possibility. -- Yes, it is a possibility. I mean, it is a possibility. It is not .. (intervenes).

We have it on oath from a senior officer that your name is never on a record, you are always referred to as a number. -- Then .. (intervenes)

So, that we can cut that out. -- We can cut him out along that basis then.

Well, we remain with the supposition on your argument that someone who went through in a police vehicle on the same day as other policemen and perhaps even at the same time, knew your name. -- Possibly, yes.

Now, do you accept that it would be highly unlikely that someone would have made up that name and just by coincidence got it right? - No, no, no, not by coincidence. It must have been somebody who knew me very well.

Now who was that who knew you? You say someone from the Botswana police. -- Yes, or someone from the ANC itself.

Someone from the ANC. -- Definitely.

So, are you saying that Dirk Coetzee went across the border in the company of an ANC person who knew you? Is that what your/..

C88.22

- 2489 -

MAMASELA

what your version comes out to? -- Ja, I mean I have got my own speculations and suspicions. My suspicions are that Dirk Coetzee may have been a double agent for all his life in the police force.

It is possible. People can laugh but it is possible. The possibility is there and he may have passed the information about informer number so and so and maybe the ANC in Botswana might have

given him my particulars, that this man is working ... (intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think we are - Mr Pretorius, I think we are getting into hypotheses which will not assist me.

MR PRETORIUS: But it is important I think in the sense that this witness's version does rest on such hypotheses and I want to explore then and argue that ... (intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: No, I think what he says this was forged. Now, whether he is right or wrong is another question and whether it was forged then or afterwards is also another question which I think one can make up one's mind about.

(10)

MR PRETORIUS: Yes, Mr Chairman, but ... (intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: No, carry on, you have my views.

MR PRETORIUS: Are you saying that for your version to work Dirk Coetzee must have had access to secret information and passed it on to the ANC? -- It is possible. If he was a double agent he could have done that. It is possible.

That is one of the only explanations. How else would he have got your name? -- The other explanation is as I have pointed out to this Commission that the ANC itself - look, they have got my particulars.

(20)

Now, let us just deal with one. Do not go too far too fast, Mr Mamasela, you are making it very difficult. Now, someone must have, against police regulations, given that

information/..

C88.23

- 2490 -

MAMASELA

information to Dirk Coetzee that you were in fact an informer and that this was your name and these were your details? -- I do not know about that one, but all I know is even policemen have been arrested for working for the ANC.

(30)

No, I am saying that .. (intervenes) -- It is a fact.

The problem with your version is that if Dirk Coetzee was

a double agent .. (intervenes). -- It is possible. I said it is possible.

He must have got that information from perhaps another double agent, General Jan or Colonel Jan Coetzee. Are you saying that he was a double agent as well? -- No, I do not say Colonel Jan is a double agent. I said it is possible that Dirk Coetzee could have got the information.

But where does he get it from, this is the point. -- The information of the security branch is always taken to the headoffice. It is 'phoned to the headoffice and Dirk Coet- zee .. (intervenes) (10)

No, no, we have already established, Mr Mamasela, the only information that is taken into the archives or into the documentation is a number. The only person who knows who that number represents is your handler or are your handlers. Now, are you saying that your handlers secretly gave that informa- tion to Dirk Coetzee? -- No, you are understanding me out of context.

As an informer, if I receive remuneration I have to sign my signature there, my name in block letters and my sig- nature. So that is not only the number. It is not a question of the number only that exists in those documents. (20)

And that is kept only, I presume, according to evidence given before this Commission, by Colonel Coetzee. Are you aware of that? -- I do not know whether he keeps that to himself/..

C88.23

- 2491 -

MAMASELA

himself or he takes them to the headoffice. I do not know about that one.

So, you are saying for some reason or the other Dirk Coetzee went along and stole this information and handed it over to the ANC? -- The possibility is there, that is if he was a double agent. (30)

Any other possibility to explain .. (intervenes). -- I want to explain about other possibilities when you stopped me.

All right, explain. -- Other possibilities are that the ANC itself, they knew about my particulars, they knew me and they could have forged this. Since it is common cause and it is common knowledge that the ANC insurgents have fled this country without any documents, most of them, but when they came back they came with genuine, authentic travel documents which the naked eye cannot see but if you put it in the computer, only a computer can dispute that. They came in on many occasions and when we arrest them we find these documents and when we look at them they look genuine, (10) but if you computerise it you find that no, the computer rejects that document, it is false.

All right, let us ... (intervenes) -- So, these people can do that. It is easy for people to do this again against me to specifically implicate me in these things.

Are you saying that according to your explanation now that it is possible that the ANC forged these documents? -- It could be possible.

Forged your signature. -- Yes.

(20)

And then somehow slipped it into the Botswana archives.

-- They could have forged these documents in their own document and travel with it so that the Botswana police, after that period/..

C88.28

- 2492 -

MAMASELA

that period the Botswana police could say - in that time the Botswana police can say no, this man has crossed here, Mamase-la, we want him, so that the ANC could get me. It is another possibility.

And they would have travelled in this police vehicle? This ANC person would have travelled in this police vehicle with Dirk (30) Coetzee? -- To answer that one I will refer back to what Mr Chairman

has read out in this Commission that according to the computerised form that he has, that vehicle is a private vehicle, white in colour .. (intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: No, it is not, it is a police vehicle. -- It is a police vehicle, white in colour and according to the forms, these forms here, wait a minute - I will show you something. According to these forms here they said departure card of Dirk Coetzee, the time what, what, what, and they said 1977 Cortina bakkie. So, it goes without saying, it was a forged registration.

MR PRETORIUS: What goes without saying? -- I beg your pardon? (10)
What goes without saying? -- That goes without saying, it is forged.

CHAIRMAN: I think what he tries to - as I understand the answer he says the computer says it was a new motorcar not a bakkie. -- Not a bakkie.

And the form says it was a 1977 .. (intervenes) -- Cortina bakkie and then the form says 1981.

Cortina bakkie and therefore the form was forged. I mean whether it is - I think that is what the witness tries to say.

MR PRETORIUS: May I see that computer .. (intervenes) (20)

CHAIRMAN: We have checked whether "soort motorkar nr. 9" means bakkie or not and it means "motorkar" and not "bakkie".

MR PRETORIUS/..

C88.28

- 2493 -

MAMASELA

MR PRETORIUS: You see, Mr Chairman, our information differs from the information obtained by you. The code used in respect of the vehicle here is code 11.

CHAIRMAN: Well, I got that computer print-out on Friday morning just shortly after the adjournment.

MR PRETORIUS: And we also got this on Friday. The engine .. (30)
(intervenes).

CHAIRMAN: Is the engine number the same?

MR PRETORIUS: The engine capacity is the same and the engine number is the same. So it may be that the code here is incorrect and that ... (intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, but I understand that the 9 does not refer - I have made enquiries but they tell me that the 9 does not refer to the type of vehicle. So, I do not know what it means.

MR PRETORIUS: Well, they seem to be the same motorvehicle and this is code 11 and that is a code 9, so perhaps we could clear that up in time.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, you can. I shall in the meantime, just for purposes, mark this computer print-out B143. If you have something further or additional we can hand it in in due .. (intervenes).

MR PRETORIUS: Perhaps if this could be B143A, not giving all the same number. In any event, Mr Mamasela, on your explanation of events either Dirk Coetzee was a double agent or the ANC, an ANC operative, went through the border with your personal particulars. -- And with a forged police vehicle, registration.

And with a forged .. (intervention) -- Police vehicle registration.

It is just coincidence that Dirk - would this person have gone through/..

C88.30 - 2494 - MAMASELA
gone through on your version with or without Dirk Coetzee? -- I am not able to answer that one.

It is just coincidence, would it be, that he would have used the same forged vehicle registration number as Dirk Coetzee actually used on that day? -- I am not able to answer that one.

I put it to you, Mr Mamasela, that your explanations are so farfetched that they cannot be regarded by this Commission as even

possible let alone probable. -- Much of the allegations that is put in front of this Commission is farfetched.

Well, we will come to that in a moment. Now, part of your defence to the allegations contained in these documents was that there was no evidence at the border post showing that you have left Botswana. -- Definitely. It is obvious.

Yes, but you were used to going across the border illegally, aren't you? -- I cannot get in legally and come out illegally?

Why not? -- It just does not make any sense. With my right particulars go in and jump out illegally. It does not ..

(intervenes)

(10)

It is precisely what Dirk Coetzee in evidence said you did on that particular night. -- It is lies. They are lying again.

All right, I just want to briefly look at your evidence, Mr Mamasela. Now, in your affidavit - do you have your affidavit before you? -- I do not have it with me.

Firstly let me just establish, you know that you are not supposed to lie on oath. -- Yes, I know that.

And you know that is a crime. -- Yes, I know that.

And you know it is a breach of the police regulations. --

Yes, I/..

(20)

C88.31

- 2495 -

MAMASELA

Yes, I know that.

I presume you would never do such a thing. -- Yes.

Well, would you? -- No, I would not.

All right, in your affidavit, page 5, paragraph 8 you say that you never returned to Botswana because of your fear with regard to your personal safety after about August 1981. Do you remember saying that? -- Yes, I said that.

(30)

You see that there? -- Ja.

And then in your evidence at page 2 184 you said that you

often went back but illegally. -- Yes, yes, yes, you are right.

You know what - you even asked me did you stay for a day, two days or a week, then I specifically informed this commission that I only went, slipped in to siphon information from my source and quickly out because obviously I feared for my life. Should the Botswana police detect me, they will arrest me, should the ANC detect me, they will kill me, but that does not mean I was lying to this court, to this Commission. I was telling the Commission the truth.

What appears in your affidavit at paragraph 8 on page 5 is
(10)
a lie. -- It is not a lie, it is a fact.

Is it a fact? -- It is the truth, ja.

That you never returned to Botswana since August 1981. --
Yes.

Is that the truth? -- Yes, that is the truth.

Then how can you reconcile that with your evidence which says that you did return? -- You asked me a question, this paper did not ask me any question. I was just writing it. You posed a question to me in front of the Commission and then in accordance to your question I answered you that I did occasionally sneak
(20)
in and out.

But then/..

C88.32

- 2496 -

MAMASELA

But then this is not true then? You have returned to Botswana since 1981? -- This is an affidavit. I could not put in the affidavit - I do not know how to put it. I could not presupposes your mind and put it in this affidavit. This affidavit reflects my sole - truth and my sole mind and then you came with your mind which is not aligned to my mind. You ask me a question and I
(30)
answered you in that line.

All right, now let us just take it step by step. I want you

please, because we are taking an unnecessarily long time about this cross-examination and I want you please to listen to the question. -- Yes.

You said in your affidavit that after August 1981 you have never returned to Botswana. -- Right.

Now, the truth is, is it not, that which you said in evidence before this commission that in fact you did return to Botswana - you had returned to Botswana since that date, is that not so? -- That was in answering your question.

Well, did you lie in answer to the question? -- You asked me did you, besides 1981, the last time you went to Botswana with your passport did you - the question is really - you put the question that way, you said besides 1981, August, the last time you went to Botswana, did you further go to Botswana then I explained and said yes, I did. (10)

All right. -- Then you said by means of a passport, I said no, I occasionally, we jumped the border just to get the information and come out quickly. It is then that you put the question did you not fear that the ANC would kill you then I told you - the point that I made was it was in accordance of that fear that I had to jump secretly in the evening, see the source and come out quickly. (20)

All right/..

C88.34

- 2497 -

MAMASELA

All right, Mr Mamasela, let me put it to you this way, perhaps this will assist you: You made a statement on oath, on affidavit where you said that since August 1981 you did not return to Botswana and you say that is the truth. -- Yes.

You also say in evidence before this Commission that since then you did go to Botswana on these little skirmishes as you call them. -- No .. (intervention) (30)

Was that not true? -- The thing is not the way you put it. You asked me a question - Mr Chairman, he said after August 1981, he said besides August 1981 did you go into Botswana, that was a direct question that Mr Pretorius asked me and I answered him positively.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, all right, I have the answer. Thank you. Any other questions?

MR PRETORIUS: And I take it they are both true? -- Yes, they are both true.

CHAIRMAN: Anything else, Mr Pretorius?

MR PRETORIUS: I want to put it to you that you lied in your affidavit because you wanted to protect your identity as an informer. -- (10)
I am not a liar. That is why I took the opportunity to come to this Commission. People who lie are the people who purported to tell the truth and run away thousands of kilometres away to tell the truth there. I am prepared to put my head on a guillotine. I am prepared to suffer the dire consequences of the truth. That is why I am here. That is why I make myself available. I have no justification whatsoever, no ground whatsoever for me to lie. If I wanted to lie I would have joined all those who ran away from the truth. I am sticking to my truth through thick and thin and ... (intervenes) (20)

Yes/..

C88.37

- 2498 -

MAMASELA

Yes, Mr Mamasela .. (intervenes) -- And I will die for the truth I am standing for.

CHAIRMAN: All right, all right.

MR PRETORIUS: Mr Mamasela, you are sticking to both truths. The one ... (intervenes) -- To my truth, yes. (30)

CHAIRMAN: Yes, all right, Mr Pretorius.

MR PRETORIUS: Mr Chairman, I have to take it further unfortu-

nately.

CHAIRMAN: But unfortunately, you know, the witness was cross-examined, he was recalled on one point and I think you have made your point and I cannot - it is not fair to have a witness recalled to be re-cross-examined on things which could have been put to him in the first instance.

MR PRETORIUS: But is it clear that he is lying?

CHAIRMAN: No, but that is something different.

MR PRETORIUS: You also said in your evidence that after 1981 August you never crossed the border legally, in other words you never went through the border post, do you remember saying that in your evidence? -- Definitely. (10)

So, if these documents are correct that would be another lie, wouldn't it? -- Ja, if they are correct that would be another lie.

And you know of course that it is an offence to go through the border post illegally, don't you? (Intervenues)

CHAIRMAN: Through the fence?

MR PRETORIUS: An offence to go through a border post over the fence.

CHAIRMAN: No, no, no. -- I do not understand that question. (20)

MR PRETORIUS: You know that is a crime to cross over the fence and not to go through a border post? -- In the line of my duty..

C88.38

- 2499 -

MAMASELA

my duty I did not see it as a crime. I saw it as a duty.

So you broke the law in the course of your duties. -- Of course.

And you felt that because you are an informer doing special work you were entitled to go above the law. -- Not entitled, but I was doing - on the line of my duty I will have to do it. (30)

You were duty bound .. (intervenues) -- I was compelled, I was duty bound to do it and I did it.

And you also said in your evidence that you never went into Gaborone. -- Yes.

And you know .. (intervenes) -- After 1981 August I never went to ... (intervenes)

After August 1981. -- Yes, I never went there.

And you know you were identified by Joyce Dipale in a statement made as one of the attackers on that night of 26 November. -- Those are lies.

But if they are true that would be another lie on your part? -- No, it is lies. There is no way it can be true, if I was not there. (10)

You also in your evidence denied any knowledge of police raids into Botswana. -- Of police raids into Botswana?

Yes. -- Yes, I deny that.

Now, if these documents are correct and the inferences drawn from them are correct that would be another lie, would it? -- If these documents are correct?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. -- Then that will be true.

MR PRETORIUS: And it would seem that if these documents are correct you and Coetzee used the same vehicle that night. -- I have never known Coetzee in .. (intervenes) (20)

That would/..

C88.39

- 2500 -

MAMASELA

That would be another lie, wouldn't it? -- I have never known him.

Another thing, if you did indeed go on the Botswana raid with Coetzee, you would have been following orders, wouldn't you? -- I do not understand the logic behind your questions.

If you had gone on the Botswana raid with a senior officer you would have been under the command of that senior officer .. (intervenes). -- I have never gone anywhere with Coetzee. (30)

That would be another lie in fact. -- I have never gone with Coetzee anywhere.

That you would accept an unlawful order. -- I have never gone with Coetzee anywhere and that is a fact.

CHAIRMAN: Well, that presupposed that he was a policeman in 1981.

MR PRETORIUS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I mean his willingness to do it is something different from obeying orders to do it.

MR PRETORIUS: It seems to me, and in view of your what can only be termed as an obstructive attitude in answering questions, that you came to this Commission and you told a pack of lies. -- I came to this Commission to tell the truth, to clear up my name which was dragged into the mud of other liars, killers, self-confessed thieves. (10)

And if these documents are correct you told not only one or two lies but you told a whole pack of lies, do you accept that? -- There is no way the document can be correct because I know I was not there. I am not involved in those raids.

Now, I want to give you an opportunity to answer some questions because we are going to argue that you had the opportunity/.. (20)

C88.40 - 2501 - MAMASELA
opportunity and I presume you will refuse to answer them in any constructive way. When did you first meet Dirk Coetzee? -- I saw him somewhere in the middle of '82, I think March/April '82.

Almond Nofemela? -- Nofemela, I saw him on February '82.

Do you agree that according to your evidence and the evidence of Colonel Coetzee that only Colonel Coetzee could have introduced you and Dirk Coetzee?

CHAIRMAN: No, when? (30)

MR PRETORIUS: Any time.

CHAIRMAN: No why.

MR PRETORIUS: Well, before 1982.

CHAIRMAN: That is .. (intervenes) --Yes, that is right.

MR PRETORIUS: You accept that? -- I accept that.

He was the only one who had sufficient knowledge of you to introduce you to another policeman. -- That is hundred percent correct.

And it would have been the same that only Colonel Jan Coetzee could have introduced you to Almond Nofemela? The same logic applies. -- Yes.

Have you ever hidden anything from your superiors? -- Hidden? (10)

Yes. -- In what sense?

About any of your activities during 1981. -- No ways.

Have you been completely honest? -- I have been completely honest and I reported everything that I was supposed to do.

You were never involved in any illegal activity in 1981. -- No ways.

And if you had would you have told your handler? -- Yes, I would/..

C88.40 - 2502 - (20) MAMASELA

I would have.

And you say you never hid anything from your handlers. -- No.

About your activities in 1981. -- No.

Thank you, I have no further questions.

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MARITZ: Mr Mamasela, you said that you had proof of your date of birth. -- Yes.

And nobody was interested. What is the proof that you are offering of your date of birth? -- My original application for my original reference book. The records are still with the Commissioner of Black Affairs. (30)

You do not have it available? -- I can have them available if the Commission wishes.

Okay, will you try and get it for us then if we do not get it ourselves. -- Thank you.

Secondly, in these documents which has been placed before the Commission now which come ostensibly from the Botswana police. -- Yes.

Mention is made of the fact that when your friend was killed in Botswana you were found in possession of a firearm being a Makarov pistol. -- Yes.

(10)

Did you read that? -- I read that.

Were you in fact found in possession of a pistol? -- That is an absolute lie. What happened is the ANC people, when they kidnapped me, they took my clothing, my suitcase which was packed with my clothing with them and I escaped in the bus and I reported the matter to the Botswana police and the following day, in the morning, they arrested the ANC and then they asked me whether I had any possessions of mine with the incident then, I said no, they took my luggage there, it was

packed/..

(20)

C88.43

- 2503 -

MAMASELA

packed with my clothes, and they gave me back my luggage and when I arrived where I stayed I opened to check my clothing, whether they were correct, I found this Makarov pistol in my clothing.

I was alone, the police were not there, then I did not touch it, then I closed the suitcase, I went back to the police to report that look, these people have hidden something in my clothing, they are trying to plant me, then the police said no ways, we are going to get these people and then after

(30)

two days they came back to me and said one Chief Thwala, George Thwala, has made an affidavit, he made a statement that he is the

one who put that Makarov in my suitcase. Now, suddenly the whole thing changed, now it was me who was in possession of that gun and then suddenly those important documents have been destroyed with other documents, so it makes me think really.

Now, when you took your suitcase with the pistol to the police and you showed it to him, what happened to the pistol? -- The police took the pistol and said no, they - no, they took the suitcase with the pistol, they said I must leave it as it is and they took it back to the bus of the ANC, the ANC were driving, and then they said they will make a search there, conduct a search, so that it must be known that I have brought this thing back to them and the following day they made that and when they opened the suitcase they found the gun there, they said no, whose gun is this, who put this gun in, then George Thwala confessed to being the owner of the gun and he put it in and they came back to me and said here we have him, he admitted. Now suddenly those documents are missing. (10)

Will you please look at the passport which is before the Commission, your passport. Can you state the date on which that/.. (20)

C88.45 - 2504 - MAMASELA
that passport was issued to you as appears from the passport. -- Yes. It was issued to me on 1981-09-30.

Is that the date of issue or ... (intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: I think the witness is .. No, the passport was issued on 30 September 1980. It was supposed to expire on 30 September 1981 and it was extended to 4 December 1982.

MR MARTIZ: Mr Chairman, I am just not sure when the passport was renewed again.

CHAIRMAN: It was renewed on 4 December 1981 so it appears it was not in force during November 1981. (30)

MR MARITZ: So, now it appears that if that were the case, Mr Mamasela, you could not have travelled with that document ... (intervenes)

CHAIRMAN: Well, there is also no stamp in that document relating to this period.

MR MARITZ: Ja, between 30 September and 4 December you could in any event not have travelled with that document because it was not in force, was it? -- Yes, I could not have travelled with it.

And you say you had no other travel document? -- Absolutely correct.

(10)

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

RE-EXAMINATION BY MR McNALLY: Before Colonel Coetzee, is it correct that you had another handler? Speaking from memory I think his name was given as Wessels? -- No, it was Major Kruger. By then he was a lieutenant.

So, you had only two handlers, Kruger and Colonel Coetzee? -- Yes, and then at a later stage, I think 1981, Major Kruger was sent to Durban and a Captain Blignaut, if I remember well, joined Colonel Coetzee.

Coming/..

(20)

C88.49

- 2505 -

MAMASELA

Coming back to EXHIBIT B141 it is stated in paragraph 13 of the report on page 4 that efforts were made to get you, that is Mamasela, to come and give evidence from South Africa and the response we got from the South Africans was that he was refusing to come to Botswana in fear of being killed by the ANC cadres.

Is that part of the report correct? -- That one is absolutely correct, yes. Absolutely correct.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS

(30)

CHAIRMAN: I will take the adjournment. Could I have in due course the passport and EXHIBIT 133B. Mr Pretorius, you have got 133B.

MR PRETORIUS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Would you let me have a copy of that in due course before you forget?

THE COMMISSION ADJOURNS FOR TEA. THE COMMISSION RESUMES.

MR McNALLY: Mr Chairman, there is going to be an application to recall Mr Mamasela for one or two further questions. He is still here.

MR KUNY: Mr Chairman, it is I who want to ask that he be called back. There is something that occurred during the course of the cross-examination relating to the passport that I would like to put to him. I think it is fair that he should be given the opportunity of dealing with it while he is still here and I think it arises out of my cross-examination of him. (10)

JOSEPH TSEPO MAMASELA still under oath:

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR KUNY: Mr Mamasela, you will remember that I cross-examined you last week initially and I asked you about your training in Botswana at the hands of the ANC and you told the commissioner about the fact that you were trained, went to a sort of crash course and then you went back for/..

C88.50 - 2506 - MAMASELA (20)
for refresher courses. Now, do you remember when that was that you underwent that training? I think you said initially that it was in about 1979 or the beginning of 1980. -- Ja, it was 1980, somewhere there. I cannot recall very much.

Well, think carefully. I was under the impression but I would like to get clarity on this, that it was in 1979 and the beginning of 1980. -- No, it was the beginning of 1980.

Oh, the beginning of 1980. -- Yes, it was in 1980 if I am not mistaken.

The beginning of 1980? -- Ja, most probably. (30)

Was that the initial training? -- That was the initial

training.

And then when did you go back for refresher courses? -- I think about, probably three weeks or a month after that.

So that would have been the early part of 1980. -- Yes.

Now, at that stage you were not working under cover in Botswana, you were entering and leaving Botswana legitimately I take it. -- Definitely.

Through the border post. --Yes.

And there was nothing underhand about the way you went in and came out? -- Yes.

And you would have used your travel document then? -- Yes, I have made use of my travel document extensively. (10)

But now you told the commissioner last week, I think also when I was questioning you, that you had only ever possessed one travel document.-- Yes.

And that is the one before the Commission. -- Yes.

And we know from this travel document that it was only issued on 1980-09-30. -- Yes.

But you were already entering and leaving Botswana you

say/.. (20)

C88.52

- 2507 -

MAMASELA

say legitimately with a travel document in the early part of 1980. -- Ja, I might have made a mistake but it was that passport that I was using. I cannot recollect. It is a long time, 1980.

Mr Mamasela, you have been very clear both today and in your evidence last week and in your affidavit in paragraph 7 on page 4 - sorry, paragraph 6 on page 4 as to the time that you went through this training course in Botswana, late 1979, early 1980. -- Ja, but it was between - you know, I first went to the police in 1979.

Yes. -- Now, I could not at the same time go to Botswana. (30)

So, I had .. (intervenes)

Why not? -- I had no passport in 1979. That is the reason, so when I say early 1980 I might probably have said August or when, but I am not certain because it is a long time ago. I must confess to this court.

Mr Mamasela, you are a very intelligent man. You appear to have a good memory and you do not make mistakes about early and late 1980. If you say early 1980 you mean early 1980. -- No, I according to my passport. My passport will tell me. If I can have my passport and see the stamps, the dates there then I will definitely say for definite sure I was there on such a day, but now it is 1980 and now it is 1990, it is a decade. It is almost a decade, I must think. (10)

Mr Mamasela, you had this passport when this affidavit was drawn in April of this year. You had the passport at your disposal, you were casting your mind back to what you were doing at that time. -- No.

You were very precise about dates and events in that affidavit. -- Mr Chairman, I wish to point out to this

Commission/..

C88.54

- 2508 -

(20)
MAMASELA

Commission that during the time I made my affidavit my pass- port was not in my possession.

Well .. (intervenes) -- It was not in my possession.

When you gave evidence last week and again today and you spoke about early 1980 your passport was available to you and you knew what was in it and now that you are caught out you are trying to switch your evidence. -- No, there is nobody who caught me out.

There is the valid document that I travelled with in Botswana.

I can even point out the dates there if they correspond with my undergoing the training there. (30)

Mr Mamasela, I do not think we need argue this. We will argue

in due course, but I want to put this to you so that you can give the commissioner an explanation. On page 2 175 of the record, Mr Commissioner, you were being cross-examined by me last week and the following is said by you: Question, in the middle of the page:

"How long did you undergo training? -- Three weeks and thereafter I went on refresher courses.

When did you go on refresher courses? -- I cannot remember.

What years? -- It is 1980, it was just 1980, between (10)
January and May 1980.

And was Keith Makwape the person who trained you? --

No Keith Makwape was not there at the time."

So you even remember that. Your bad memory tells you that. -- Ja, maar the dates. I mean the dates - I mean my passport is there and I cannot lie and paint the passport in to dispute my lies.

We will argue that you are lying, but I am not going to argue that with you. I want to put the facts to you. You

then/..

C88.57

- 2509 -

(20)

MAMASELA

then said, and it was asked of you:

"When did you come to know Keith Makwape in that capacity? -- I started to know Keith Makwape in 1979 when I went to the ANC."

Presumably that was in Botswana you went to the ANC, isn't it?

-- No, there is a mix up of dates somewhere.

Mr Mamasela, did you go to the ANC in Botswana in 1979? -- 1979 I had no travel document. So, it is impossible I could have gone there.

(30)

Mr Mamasela, when you say here that you went to the ANC, does that mean to the ANC in Botswana? -- Ja, probably - the only ANC

that I knew at that time was in Botswana.

All right. So, your evidence is "I started to know Keith Makwape in 1979 when I went to the ANC, to the residence of the ANC", that is in Botswana. -- Yes.

"That is 2067/1968 Buntling". I do not know .. -- Boentling.

"That is the head-quarters of the ANC. He was there, he was stationed there as the caretaker of that headquarters", that is in Gaborone. -- That is in Gaborone, yes.

Gaborone, Botswana. Now, there is no doubt from that evidence that I have just read to you that you said that in 1979, beginning of 1980 you went to the ANC, you underwent training, you underwent refresher courses. Isn't that so? -- That is so. (10)

And you committed yourself to that? -- Yes, I committed myself to the training.

And you did not say as far as I can remember or I am not sure or it may have been the end of 1980, you were very clear about that? -- At one stage I said I am not sure, I want to think/..

C88.58

- 2510 -

MAMASELA
(20)

think about it, then you forced me to think about it, you knew this, you knew that, think about it, so you compelled me.

I compelled you to think. -- Yes, yes, to think quickly.

That is good, and having thought you gave the answer. Now, all I am putting to you is that your other answer was "I have only in my life had one travel document". -- That is true.

And that is this one .. (intervenes). -- That is the one, yes.

And this one was issued on 30 September 1980. -- Right.

And this one would not therefore have been a travel document which would have enabled you to enter Botswana in 1979, in the beginning of 1980. -- No, Mr Chairman, I wish to point out clearly (30)

to this court that it might have been a slip of the tongue which is not a mistake of mentality. This pass- port is valid, it can tell me where I was. You know, if I had this passport with me I will clearly point out no, this shows I entered, this shows I did not enter, but if you ask me through my head about my passport that I had ten years ago it is difficult to be specific. I mean I cannot lie about obvious things like that. That document is an obvious document. If I want to lie I could have studied that document and formulated my lies.

You see, Mr Mamasela, even before these documents came to light from Botswana on Friday of last week, it had already been put to you, and you had denied it, that you had any other passport than this onen before the Commission ever. -- I said it I still have this passport. Hence I say if I had my pass- port available at the time I was doing all these things if I wanted to lie I could have studied my passport and lied

according/..

C88.59

- 2511 -

MAMASELA

according to the stamps there, now this clearly shows that I did not lie or I was just writing my affidavit.

Anyway, I am just putting it to you that you are lying when you say you never had another passport, that you must have had or you are lying when you are saying that you entered the border through the border post legally at the beginning of 1980. -- No, it is lies. I cannot have two passports at the same time. You cannot have two passports at the same time. It is impossible. It is a fact.

Well, it may be that through the police you could have, Mr Mamasela. -- No, I did not have one.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS

WILLEM FREDERICK SCHOON v.o.e.:

(30)

MNR. McNALLY: Hierdie getuie het 'n verklaring gemaak wat ek voor u wil plaas as BEWYSSTUK B144. Brigadier, die prosedure is ietwat anders in 'n kommissie as wat dit is in 'n verhoor. 'n Mens mag die verklaring voorlees. Sal u asseblief begin met paragraaf 1 en dit aan die kommissaris hardop lees. -- "Ek is 'n volwasse man, tans pensionaris, voorheen in diens van die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie. Ek is 'n brigadier en was verbonde aan die veiligheidtak-hoofkantoor, Pretoria. Vanaf Desember 1980 tot en met my aftrede gedurende Oktober 1989 was ek die hoof van seksie C1. Die inhoud van hierdie verklaring val binne my persoonlike kennis en is waar en is korrek en ek is behoorlik gemagtig en in staat om hierdie verklaring af te lê. Ek is volledig geadviseer en het insae gehad in die bewerings wat gemaak is teen my in die getuienis wat voor die Kommissie afgelewer is. Ek is ook bewus van die bewerings wat gemaak is ten aansien van my in 'n verskeidenheid van eedsverklarings en persberigte en wens as volg daarop te

antwoord/..

K88.62

- 2512 -

SCHOON

(20)

antwoord. Wat bewerings betref wat my impliseer by optredes buite die grense van die Republiek van Suid-Afrika is ek geadviseer dat dit nie nodig is om op hierdie bewerings te antwoord vir doeleindes van hierdie verklaring nie en handel gevolglik nie daarmee nie. Hierdie verklaring moet saamgelees word met die verklaring wat ek op 26 Oktober 1989 gemaak het in die teenwoordigheid van adv. McNally, Prokureur-generaal van die Oranje-Vrystaat en dien as aanvulling daartoe."

Brigadier, kan ons net 'n bietjie stilstaan by daardie punt.

Sal u asseblief kyk na BEWYSSTUK B13 wat voor hierdie Kommissie is en daardie verklaring nou in die rekord inlees.

(30)

-- "Willem Frederick Schoon verklaar, op 26 Oktober 1989 om 18h45

verskyn ek in die teenwoordigheid van adv. McNally, Prokureur-generaal van die Oranje Vrystaat asook luitenant-generaal Conradie, speurhoof van die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie. Al wat ek van Mxenge se moord is wat ek in die koerante gelees het. Ek ontken die bewering dat ek gedurende 1981 vir Nofemela sou opdrag gegee het om Mxenge te elimineer. Ek ontken dat ek 'n radio-kassetspeler wat uit die kar van Mxenge sou gekom het ontvang het en in my amptelike voertuig sou ge- installeer het. My amptelike voertuig het reeds 'n radio ten tyde van die Mxenge-moord ingehad. Ek ontken dat ek enige kennis dra dat enige lid wat onder my bevel gedoen het betrok- ke was by enige (10) sluipmoorde of moorde of ontvoerings binne of buite die grense van die RSA. Eksel self het nooit vir Nofemela in die tronk besoek nie en/of enige boodskappe aan hom gestuur nie. Dit was egter na majoor De Kock verwys om na Nofemela se behoeftes om te sien. Ek is vertrouwd met die inhoud van hier- die verklaring en begryp dit. Ek het geen beswaar teen die aflegging van die voorgeskrewe eed nie. Ek beskou die

voorgeskrewe/..

K88.65

- 2513 -

(20)
SCHOON

voorgeskrewe eed as bindend vir my gewete." Onderteken.

Brigadier, ek verstaan dat die aantying ten opsigte van die radio-kassetspeler sedertdien weggeval het, maar ons laat dit daar. Sal u voortgaan, asseblief, met paragraaf 5 van u nuwe verklaring, BEWYSSTUK B144. -- "Soos voorheen vermeld dra ek geen kennis van die moord op prokureur Mxenge in Durban gedurende 1981 nie. My kennis in verband met daardie voorval spruit uit wat ek in die koerante gelees het en uit mondelinge mededelings wat aan my gemaak is sedertdien. Ek het geen per- soonlike kennis van die hele aangeleentheid nie en was op geen wyse daarby betrokke (30) nie. In besonder ontken ek die bewerings dat ek instruksies sou

gegee het dat Dirk Coetzee of Spyker Tshikalange of Almond Nofemela spesiaal na Durban moes reis vir doeleindes van die moord. Die bewering dat na die moord ek die hele Vlakplaas-groep terugontbied het na Pretoria en daarna vir Dirk Coetzee versoek het om die Mxenge-voertuig te gaan verbrand en dat ek op 'n latere stadium fondse beskikbaar sou gestel het vir betaling aan die swart lede wat na bewering die moord sou uitgevoer het. Die getuienis van Spyker Tshika- lange (Londen-oorkonde volume 1 bladsy 45) dat ek hom sou wou doodmaak is nie waar nie. Ek weet nie waar hy aan daardie storie kom nie en dra geen kennis van enige beplanning of op- trede teen hom nie. Ek dra geen kennis van die beweerde diefstal van 'n wit en rooi Kombi by die Johannesburger Hotel in Johannesburg nie. Ek ontken spesifiek dat ek opdrag gegee het aan Dirk Coetzee om brigadier Nic van Rensburg in Port Elizabeth aangaande die hele insident te skakel; dat ek op 'n stadium toestemming sou verleen het dat gemelde Kombi in Swa- ziland verkoop kan word; dat die beweerde opbrengs van die Kombi by my by veiligheidshoofkantoor gehou is en later saam

met 'n/..

K88.68

- 2514 -

(20)
SCHOON

met 'n ene kolonel Erasmus na Lady Grey gestuur is waar dit aan brigadier Nic van Rensburg oorhandig is en enige ander suggestie dat ek betrokke was of kennis gedra het van sodanige insident.

Ek dra ook geen kennis van die beweerde moord op Vusi en 'n Peter nie. Ek kan nie eens die betrokke persone onthou nie en alhoewel dit goed moontlik was dat hulle op een of ander stadium 'n draai gemaak het op Vlakplaas, kan ek hulle nie vandag spesifiek onthou nie. Ek ontken egter spesifiek dat ek op enige stadium aan Dirk Coetzee opdrag gegee het om Vusi en Peter te laat doodmaak. Ek ontken ook dat ek op enige stadium gereël het dat Dirk Coetzee gif by generaal Lothar Neethling kan afhaal vir die doeleindes

vir die eliminering van gemelde persone. Ek ontken ook dat ek op enige stadium Dirk Coetzee versoek het om 'n vals verklaring oor Vusi se bedrywighede en sy daaropvolgende beweerde verdwyning te maak. Ek is ook geadviseer dat Dirk Coetzee getuig het dat ek verlof gegee het aan majoor J.S. Vermeulen om 'n persoon met die naam Ace Moema dood te maak (Londen-oorkonde volume 4 bladsy 346). Alhoewel ek bewus was dat Dirk Coetzee of van sy lede op 'n stadium betrokke was in 'n skietery op 'n voertuig, dra ek nie enige persoonlike kennis daarvan nie. Ek ontken in besonder dat ek en Dirk Coetzee saamgespan het om 'n valse verklaring oor die (10) gebeure op te stel of dat ek instruksies gegee het dat Almond Nofemela 'n valse verklaring moet opstel om 'n beweerde beriggewerde betrokkeheid te versteek. Ek kan geen besonderhede van die betrokke aangeleentheid onthou nie. Ek ontken dat daar op enige stadium deur kaptein Paul van Dyk aan my 'n versoek gerig is dat ek moet probeer om Nofemela van die galg te red aangesien laasgenoemde moeilikheid vir die mag kan veroorsaak.

Dit is/..

K88.70

- 2515 -

SCHOON
(20)

Dit is wel moontlik dat kaptein Van Dyk of van die ander lede in die mag my kon versoek het om te kyk of ek kan help in die geval van Nofemela omdat dit 'n kollega is van hulle, maar in so 'n geval sou ek pertinent aan hulle gesê het dat die gereg sy gang moet gaan aangesien Nofemela hom skuldig gemaak het aan 'n ernstige misdaad en 'n regverdige verhoor gehad het. Ek ontken ten sterkste enige suggestie dat ek op enige stadium bekommerd was dat Nofemela enige inligting kan openbaar wat die polisie of in besonder die veiligheidstak in 'n verleentheid kan stel. Alhoewel Dirk Coetzee se bewering dat ek 'n vals bron geregistreer het om op daardie wyse 'n ekstra inkomste aan my sekretaresse te betaal (30) nie val binne die raamwerk van hierdie Kommissie nie, wens ek graag

daarop te antwoord aangesien dit op my geloofwaardigheid kan slaan.

Ek ontken ten sterkste dat daar ooit enige sodanige insident was.

Behalwe vir die berigte wat ek in die koerante gelees het oor die verrigtinge van hierdie Kommissie dra ek nie enige kennis van die beweerde moord van 'n diamanthandelaar in Lindley nie. In besonder ontken ek dat die radio van gemelde handelaar in my voertuig geïnstalleer is. Die voertuie wat ek op daardie stadium gery het, het albei radio's ingehad. Dirk Coetzee se bewering dat die arsenaal wat hy in sy voertuig mee rondgery het deur my vir hom gereël is, is ook nie die waarheid nie. Ek het op geen stadium gereël dat daar wapens aan Dirk Coetzee beskikbaar gestel word vir hom om met hom saam te ry soos deur hom beweer nie. Ek ontken dat ek ooit aan maj. Eugene de Kock opdrag gegee het om aan Almond Nofemela 'n boodskap in die gevangenis oor te dra dat hy moet stilbly. Dirk Coetzee se bewering (Londen-oorkonde volume 6 paragraaf 512(?)) dat ek baie vertroue in hom gehad het, is verkeerd. Ek het Dirk

Coetzee/..

K88.72

- 2516 -

SCHOON
(20)

Coetzee eers gedurende die tweede helfte van 1980 leer ken nadat hy na veiligheidshoofkantoor, Pretoria oorgeplaas is. Ek het gedurende daardie tweede helfte van 1980 weinig met Dirk Coetzee te doene gehad en kon allermens in daardie periode vertroue in hom opgebou het. Nadat Dirk Coetzee betrokke was by die Joe Pillay-aangeleentheid was ek baie woedend oor wat daar gebeur het en het ek inderdaad vanaf daardie stadium vertroue in Dirk Coetzee se oordeel en optrede verloor. Ek het ook toe Dirk Coetzee vanaf Vlakplaas verplaas is aan die einde van 1981 geen beswaar teen sodanige verplasing gehad nie. Ek het die beëdigde verklaring van luitenant-kolonel Jan Coetzee gelees en die uiteensetting wat hy gee van die werksaamhede van die Vlakplaas-eenheid is korrek

en is steeds dieselfde. Ek verwys ook in hierdie verband na die direktief wat ek uit- gereik het wat hierby aangeheg word as aanhangsel WFS1."

Brigadier, is dit korrek dat u daardie omsendbrief opgestel het maar dit het uitgegaan onder die handtekening van brigadier J.A. du Preez? -- Dit is korrek.

Goed, gaan voort. -- "Dit het nooit tot my kennis gekom van die bestaan van 'n sogenaamde moordbende te Vlakplaas nie. Wanneer gevalle van onbehoorlike en/of onregmatige optrede deur lede verbonde aan Vlakplaas tot my kennis gekom het, wat wel in 'n aantal gevalle gebeur het, het ek die gereg sy gang laat gaan en/of dissiplinêre stappe laat neem." (10)

Dankie, brigadier. Dit is al dankie, mnr. die Voorsitter. KRUISONDERVRAGING DEUR MNR. PRETORIUS: Brigadier, gedurende 1981 was u hoof van afdeling C van die veiligheidspolisie, is dit korrek? -- Dit is korrek.

En gedurende dieselfde jaar was Dirk Coetzee in bevel van Vlakplaas/..

K88.76 - 2517 - SCHOON
(20)
Vlakplaas. -- Dit is korrek.

Van C1. -- C1.

En gedurende 1981, generaal Johan Coetzee, watter pos het hy bekleed? -- Hy was op daardie stadium die bevelvoerende offisier van die veiligheidstak van die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie, hoofkantoor.

En in 1981 watter pos het brigadier Van der Hoven bekleed? -- Ek vermoed hy was toe die afdelingsbevelvoerder van die veiligheidstak in Durban.

In November 1981, ek is seker u dra kennis van die feit die Vlakplaas-eenheid was af Durban toe. -- Ek weet net dat hulle Natal toe was. Ek kon nie sê hulle was spesifiek Durban toe nie. (30)

U sou seker reëlings met brigadier Van der Hoven getref het met die uitplasing van die eenheid daarnatoe. -- Nee, ek kan nie onthou dat ek op enige stadium met brigadier Van der Hoven enige reëlings getref het vir die uitplaas van Vlakplaas se lede nie.

En in verband met die terugtrekking? -- Ook nie.

Is dit nie die reël dat sulke terugtrekking en uitplasing in konsultasie met hoofkantoor gedoen moes word nie? -- Die roetine het naderhand geword dat die spanne gaan aan die begin van die maand uit en bly vir ongeveer drie weke in die veld en dan kom hulle - hier na die einde van die maand toe kom hulle weer terug. (10)

So, dit was nie eintlik nodig om te sê julle hoef op daardie datum terug te wees nie. Hulle het hulle dinge ge- reël soos dit hulle gepas het.

So, sê u dat u het geen reëlings wat u betref gemaak in verband met die uitplasing van die eenheid Durban toe of Natal toe en geen reëlings in verband met die terugtrekking van die eenheid/..

K88.79

- 2518 -

SCHOON

eenheid? -- Die prosedure op daardie stadium was dat die be- (20)
velvoerder van die eenheid, in hierdie geval sou dit kaptein Dirk Coetzee gewees het, kom met 'n los blad waar hy sê hier-die en daardie lede gaan uit na hierdie of daardie afdeling toe en dit het dan daar gebly by die kantoor en ek het dit nie nodig geag om enige ander reëlings te tref nie.

Nou, in verband met die eenheid se aktiwiteite in Natal of Oos-Transvaal of waar ook al, wat was die pligte van die bevelvoerder in verband met die afdelingsbevelvoerder? Moes hy gereeld aan hom rapporteer? -- Hy moes in die eerste plek as hy in daardie afdeling aanland, moes hy sy teenwoordigheid by die afdelingsbevelvoerder of sy gevolmagtigde gaan aanmeld en dan sou daardie afdelingsbevelvoerder die groep spesifiek getaak het wat (30)

om te doen.

En ek neem aan dit sou behels 'n gereelde terugrapportering aan hom deur die lede van die eenheid of deur die bevelvoerder? -- Ja, dit was die hele gedagte.

As daar 'n aangeleentheid was waarby u betrokke was en waarby generaal Coetzee ook betrokke was, generaal Coetzee nou, sou hy u geraadpleeg het oor take of aangeleenthede wat onder u bevel sou geval het? -- Kan u miskien net vir my 'n duideliker voorbeeld noem, asseblief.

Sê nou byvoorbeeld iets gebeur in Natal in verband met die Vlakplaas se eenheid en generaal Coetzee reik nou 'n verklaring uit in verband daarmee, sou hy u daarvoor geraadpleeg het? -- Hy sou. (10)

K89 So, enige kennis wat brigadier Coetzee gedra het, sou u ook gedra het? -- Dit is korrek.

Ons sal later daarby kom. Nou, u is verwys alreeds na aanhangsel - die aanhangsel na jou beëdigde verklaring. Ek het dit as/..

k89 - 2519 - SCHOON
(20)
het dit as aanhangsel JC1 .. (tussenbei)

VOORSITTER: Dit is die brief wat u geskryf het.

MNR. PRETORIUS: Dit is die omsendbrief. -- Ja.

U het dit daar voor u. -- Ek het dit ongelukkig nie voor my nie.

Ons sal 'n afskrif probeer kry.

VOORSITTER: Ja, toemaar die getuie het 'n afskrif.

MNR. PRETORIUS: Hierdie is 'n omsendbrief wat gedurende November 1981 uitgestuur is deur u. -- September '81.

O, September '81. Ja, jammer, ek het die verkeerde datum en dit is in verband met die Vlakplaas-eenheid. -- Dit is korrek. (30)

Nou, uit hierdie dokument blyk dit dat die beleid was dat

die uitplasing van spanne deur groep C uit hoofkantoor gekoördineer moet word. -- Dit is korrek.

Asook die onttrekking van spanne uit 'n gebied uit. -- Ja.

Dit was die beleid. -- Ja.

Maar u sê dat al wat tot op daardie stadium gedoen was of gedurende November 1981 gedoen was, dat dit sou deur Coetzee self gereël word en hy sou net die inligting op die lessenaar geplaas het. -- Ek moet dit net hier regstel dat soos u sal sien daar is 'n kolonel Van Rensburg wat daarbo geskryf het, dit is sy handskrif, en hy was eintlik die direkte bevelvoerder van of het die direkte toesig oor C1 gehou. Hy was ook in hoofkantoor. Hy het saam met my daar gesit in 'n aparte kantoor en hy het meeste van die taking het hy op sy skouers geneem om die mense aan die werk te hou. (10)

Ja, maar al wat ek nou wil opklaar, is dat volgens hierdie omsendbrief was daar 'n vaste beleid wat in Septembermaand

ingestel/..

K89.1

- 2520 -

SCHOON

ingestel is. -- Dit is - volgens hierdie omsendbrief is dit so.

Die beleid was dat die uitplasing en die terugtrekking van 'n span in en uit 'n gebied uit moet deur hoofkantoor en die betrokke afdelingsbevelvoerder gereël word. -- Dit is korrek, want ek sal vir u sê hoekom dit gebeur het. Party van die afdelings het sommer 'n konstabeltjie of 'n sersant aan-gesit om van die mense daar te skakel en te sê ons het julle dienste hier nodig en dit het 'n bietjie wrywing begin veroorsaak. (20)

Daar is ook getuienis, en ek dink dit is getuienis eintlik voor hierdie kommissie, dat daar nooit 'n voorval sou kon gewees het dat 'n optrede sou kon plaasgevind het binne 'n gebied sonder die medewete van die afdelingsbevelvoerder. Dit was die beleid in elk geval. -- Ja wel, ek kan nou nie pa staan vir dit wat gebeur het in 'n afdeling waar ek nie by was nie. (30)

Maar die beleid en die reël, brigadier. -- Die reël was dat die mense by die afdelingsbevelvoerder moes aanmeld en hy moes hulle dan die nodige taking gee.

Hulle het geen magtiging gehad om self op te tree nie. Hulle moes met die medewete en toestemming van die afdelingsbevelvoerder optree. -- Dit is baie duidelik volgens hierdie opdrag.

En dit was die eintlike beleid ook wat gevolg is, nie waar nie? -- Dit is die beleid wat gevolg moes gewees het.

Het u enige voorbeeld van 'n aangeleentheid waar dit nie so was nie? (10) Waar daardie beleid nie gevolg was nie? Het dit ooit gebeur? -- Ek kan nie op hierdie oomblik aan enige voorbeeld dink nie.

As dit/..

K89.3

- 2521 -

SCHOON

As dit sou gebeur het, sou daar rekord daarvan gewees het? -- Behalwe as dit telefonies besleg is.

As dit 'n ernstige saak was, sou daar seker 'n departementele ondersoek gewees het. -- Ja, dit hang nou af wat se tipe voorval u in gedagte het. (20)

Sê nou maar die moord van 'n persoon eerstens. Dit is seker, of die ontvoering van 'n persoon, iets van sulke aard. -- 'n Mens sou verwag dat so iets gerapporteer word.

Wat van die steel van 'n motorvoertuig, as so iets gebeur het? Sou departementele tugstappe geneem geword het? -- Dit hang af wie die motor gesteel het.

Sê nou maar 'n lid van Vlakplaas sou 'n motor gesteel het in 'n afdeling sonder die medewete en toestemming van die afdelingsbevelvoerder in daardie ... (tussenbei)

VOORSITTER: Ja, u veronderstel nou die afdelingsbevelvoerder word dan bewus ... (tussenbei)

(30)

MNR. PRETORIUS: Ja-nee, daar is veronderstellings hier. Dit is net 'n sekere lyn wat ek nou volg.

VOORSITTER: Ja, op die oomblik is u veronderstellings 'n bietjie onvolledig.

MNR. PRETORIUS: Brigadier, ek sal dit weer stel, sê nou maar hoofkantoor, u hoofkantoor, leer van 'n geval waar 'n motor gesteel is deur 'n lid van die Vlakplaas-eenheid, ek neem aan dat tugstappe teen daardie lid geneem sou geword het. -- O, baie beslis.

En ek neem aan daar sou nog tot vandag toe rekord daarvan bestaan het. -- Hopelik.

En ek neem aan dat as daar so 'n geval gebeur het en as daar so 'n rekord was sou hierdie rekords uit die aard van die saak voor die Kommissie gewees het. -- Ek glo so.

Ek wil net/..

K89.5

- 2522 -

SCHOON

Ek wil net 'n paar vrae vra, asseblief, oor nog 'n ahangsel, dit is JC2 - jammer, voor ons JC1 los, kan ek net vir u vra, bladsy 2, sub-paragraaf (d). U praat van 'n beleid of 'n reël dat die span uitsluitlik aangewend moet word om met die opsporing, arrestasie en identifikasie van terroriste behulpsaam te wees. U sien dit? -- Ja.

En die woord "uitsluitlik" is beklemtoon. -- Dit is korrek.

Waarom was dit nodig om daardie reël so te beklemtoon? -- Omdat in sekere gevalle die mense aangewend was om onder-vraging te doen en daar het insidente plaasgevind.

Nou, watter insidente het wel plaasgevind? -- Hulle het byvoorbeeld 'n bietjies te hardhandig met die man wat hulle moet ondervra opgetree.

Was daar enige klagte van 'n aanranding? -- Ek weet nie of daar enige sake ondersoek was nie, maar dit het tot my aandag gekom dat van hierdie manne, wat nie opgelei is om ondervraging te doen,

dat hulle wel by ondervraging betrek was en dat dit nie die regte ding was nie.

Kan u vir ons meer besonderhede daaromtrent gee, asse- blief.

Wanneer sou dit plaasgevind het en waar? -- Ek vrees dit is tien jaar gelede en ek kan nie nou aan enige spesifieke voorval dink nie.

Sou daardie klagtes, sou daardie verslae op skrif gestel geword het? -- Dit is moontlik.

En as hulle op skrif oorspronklik gestel was, sou hulle nog bestaan? -- Ek glo so.

Waar sal hierdie dokumente nou te voorskyn kom? -- Wel, as daar is - ek weet nie of die dokumente al vernietig is nie, maar lêers word net 'n sekere aantal jare gehou en dan word

dit vernietig/..

K89.8

- 2523 -

SCHOON

dit vernietig.

Maar as hulle nog bestaan, waar sal hulle wees? -- Dit behoort by veiligheidshoofkantoor te wees.

U sien, want net voor - nee, ek het die datums verkeerd, ek sal dit nie stel nie, maar het u ooit bewus van onreël- matige (20) ondervragings geleer na hierdie omsendbrief uitgeestuur is? -- Nie waarvan ek kan onthou nie.

Sou u noodwendig daarvan kennis .. (tussenbei) -- U bedoel nou spesifiek deur die lede van Vlakplaas?

Ja. --Nee.

U sê .. (tussenbei) -- Ek kan nie enige geval onthou nie.

Sou u noodwendig daarvan gehoor het, as dit sou plaasge- vind het, na 11 September 1981. -- Indien die betrokke persoon dit goed sou gedink het om dit tot my aandag te bring, ja.

Is daar 'n moontlikheid dat - is dit brigadier Van Rens- burg (30) - u nie daarvan sou laat weet het nie? -- Ek glo behalwe as ek

miskien met verlof was of nie beskikbaar was nie, dan sou ek seker nie kennis gedra het daarvan nie.

Behalwe vir die probleme van die ondervraging, die onreëlmatige, soos u dit stel, ondervraging, was daar enige ander probleme teëgekóm het in verband met die aktiwiteite van hierdie Vlakplaas-span? -- Hulle was 'n bietjie ongedissiplineerd en ons moes weer dissipline in hulle kry, byvoorbeeld hulle was geneig gewees om die wapen 'n bietjie gou te gebruik en daar was dan ook 'n paar gevalle gewees waar van hierdie lede die wapen gebruik het en persone gedood het waar daar geregtelike stappe teen hulle geneem is en waar party van hulle vandag nog in die gevangenis sit. (10)

Nou, bestaan daar rekords daarvan? -- Daar bestaan rekords daarvan.

Enige/..

K89.9

- 2524 -

SCHOON

Enige ander probleme? Kyk, ons het nou die onreëlmatige ondervraging, die gebruik van .. (tussenbei)

VOORSITTER: Ja, maar net om duidelikheid te kry, praat u van voor die skrywe van die brief of na die skrywe van die brief of maak dit nie vir u saak nie? (20)

MNR. PRETORIUS: Dit maak op hierdie stadium nie vir my saak nie.

Te eniger tyd, brigadier. -- Soos byvoorbeeld wat het u in gedagte?

Ek het baie in gedagte op die oomblik, maar ek wil dit nie op die oomblik, met respek, aan u voorstel nie, want ek wil hê dat u moet te vore kom met wat ook al u kennis van dra. Dit help nie dat ek dit aan u voorstel nie. Ek het alreeds die geval van moorde en diefstal van 'n motorkar, ensovoorts, maar ek wil net weet van enigiets anders wat miskien ek nie van weet nie. -- Nee, op hierdie stadium - behalwe as u miskien my geheue 'n bietjie kan verfris. U weet, ek is nou al 'n bietjie afgestomp. Ek is (30)

al amper, agt maande wat ek nou uit sirkulasie uit is en hierdie dinge het ook 'n hele klompie jare terug plaasgevind, as dit plaasgevind het.

Net om op te som dan, u het gepraat van onreëlmatighede in verband met ondervraging, u het gepraat van die te goue gebruik van 'n vuurwapen. Ek het aan u gestel diefstalle van motorkarre. U sê u dra geen kennis van so 'n voorval nie. -- Nee, ek dra nie kennis daarvan nie.

Die moord van 'n persoon? -- Ook nie.

Die ontvoering van 'n persoon? -- Ek dra ook nie kennis daarvan nie. (10)

Die aanranding van 'n persoon of waar ook al of onder .. (tussenbei) -- Ja, daar was gevalle waar sake van aanranding teen hulle ondersoek is.

En dit is/..

K89.10

- 2525 -

SCHOON

En dit is gedurende die verloop van hulle dienste? -- Dit was gedurende die loop van hulle diens.

Enigiets anders? -- Nie waarvan ek nou weet nie.

Sal u asseblief kyk na nog 'n dokument, dit is JC2, dit is 'n aanhangsel wat voor die Kommissie geplaas is deur kolonel Coetzee. Het u dit voor u? -- Ja. (20)

Nou, hierdie is 'n omsendbrief wat uitgestuur is om en by 26 Januarie 1982. -- Dit is korre.

Sou u kennis gedra het van hierdie omsendbrief? -- Ek het eers kennis gedra nadat die brief reeds uitgestuur is. Ek het niks te doen gehad met die opstel daarvan nie. Ek het dit eers gesien nadat dit reeds in sirkulasie was.

Sou u kennis gedra het van die beleid wat hierin uiteengesit is? -- Ja. (30)

Die redes vir die opstel van die omsendbrief, al is dit na

die tyd, u sou kennis daarvan gedra het? -- Die redes vir die opstel van hierdie brief moet u vir brigadier Du Preez vra. Ek het hom nie behulpsaam gewees nie.

Wel, hier in paragraaf 2 is melding gemaak van 'n beleid dat "Lede van hoofkantoor se teen-terroriste eenheid moet slegs in noodsaaklike gevalle by intensiewe ondervraging van verdagtes betrek word", is dit waarna u verwys het vroeër in u getuienis? Die probleme in verband met ondervraging? -- Nee, hierdie brief is uitgestuur nadat die ene van 1981 uitgestuur is.

So, die beleid is weer herhaal in hierdie omsendbrief. -- (10)
Nee, ek dink die beleid is hier effe anders gestel, dat hulle moet slegs betrek word in noodsaaklike gevalle by die intensiewe ondervraging. Nou hierdie ander brief sê hulle moet glad nie betrek word nie.

En dit/..

K89.12

- 2526 -

SCHOON

En dit sê ook dat "Sulke ondervragings bly steeds die betrokke afdeling se verantwoordelikheid en moet onder die leiding van 'n ervare lid van die afdeling geskied". Nou, het u kennis gedra (20)
van enige probleme wat tussen September en Januarie opgekom het in verband met ondervraging wat aanleiding sou gegee het tot hierdie reël of die beklemtoning van hierdie reël? -- Ek het persoonlik geen aanduiding gehad waaroor dit gegaan het nie. Wat ek wel gehoor het, is dat 'n lid of lede by brigadier Du Preez gaan kla het oor die behandeling wat hulle gekry het by 'n afdeling.

Want tussen September en Januarie is twee mense, ene Dipale en ene Phoshoko, die lede van die Vlakplaas-eenheid volgens wat hulle gesê het ondervra en ernstig aangerand. -- Ek dra nie kennis (30)
van daardie voorval nie.

Maar as 'n senior offisier in kennis gestel is van beweringe

van aanranding, ernstige aanranding, sou dit 'n rede gewees het vir die uitstuur van hierdie omsendbrief wat hier- die paragraaf betref? -- Ek weet nie.

Nou, in paragraaf 5 sê brigadier Du Preez "Hoewel hoofkantoor begaan is oor die dissipline van die eenheid, moet voorkom word dat junior personeel as storiedraers gebruik word", wat bedoel dit? -- Ek weet nie, ek dink u moet die vraag aan brigadier Du Preez stel.

Dra u geen kennis van die beleid wat hierdie reël onder- skryf nie? -- Nee, ek dra nie kennis nie.

Want dit gaan voort en dit blyk asof wat die reël sê, en ek mag verkeerd wees, maar die laaste sin van die paragraaf lees: "Dus moet voorkom word dat die indruk geskep word dat permanente lede, veral jonges, van die afdeling gestuur word om offisiere se optredes te monitor" en ek weet nie of ek dit

korrek/..

K89.14

- 2527 -

SCHOON

korrek lees of nie, maar blyk dit nie daaruit dat wat hier gesê word dat niemand moes gestuur word om hulle optredes te monitor nie? -- Soos ek reeds gesê het ek het niks te doen gehad met die opstel van hierdie brief nie. Die motiewe was nie aan my bekend nie en ek glo dat die Kommissie gaan baie beter antwoorde uit brigadier Du Preez kry.

Maar u sê, as ek reg verstaan, dat u gehoor het van klagtes wat vanuit die afdelings gekom het in verband met die gedrag van ... (tussenbei)

VOORSITTER: Nee, nee, hy het gesê hy het gehoor dat lede gekla het oor behandeling wat hulle by die afdeling gekry het.

MNR. PRETORIUS: O, is dit wat u - het u die teenoorgestelde ook gehoor of nie? Dat 'n lid van 'n afdeling sou gekla het oor wat enigiemand van 'n eenheid in 'n afdeling sou gedoen het? -- Nie

waarvan ek weet nie.

Maar hierdie klagtes in verband met ondervragings en die te gou gebruik van vuurwapens, het dit nie uit die afdelings uitgekome nie? -- Nee, dit was gemonitor deur die hanteerders van die verskillende eenhede.

Want u sien, brigadier, net om op te volg in verband met die beleid wat ek aan u stel behels is in hierdie paragraaf, toe die voorval by Chesterville gebeur het, ek gaan net een vraag hieroor vra, toe die voorval daar gebeur het, was die hele area ontruim van enige potensiële ooggetuies van afdelings se lede toe die Vlakplaas se eenheid daar ingegaan het. -- Ek was nie teenwoordig nie en ek kan nie 'n antwoord daar gee nie. (10)

Kan u enige .. (tussenbei)

VOORSITTER: Wanneer was Chesterville gewees?

MNR. PRETORIUS: Onlangs, '86. U sien, wat my opval is hier blyk vir my/..

K89.17

- 2528 -

SCHOON

blyk vir my te voorskyn te kom die begin van beleid dat hier- die mense van Vlakplaas alleen gelaat moet word in die afdelings. -- Nee, ek glo nie dit was die beleid nie. Wat in Chesterville gebeur het, was tussen daardie - ek het nou in daardie saak getuienis afgelê en sover ek weet was die beplanning gedoen deur onluste-eenheid en nie deur Vlakplaas se lede nie. Hulle was net gebruik om in te gaan. (20)

En kan u enige verduideliking gee van hoekom die hele area ontruim sou geword het? -- Ek kan geen verduideliking gee nie. Ek was nie daar nie. Ek het absoluut geen deel gehad aan die beplanning nie en ek kan nie vir u 'n antwoord daar gee nie.

Is nie een moontlike verduideliking dat die eenheid nie wou gehad het dat storiedraers saam met hulle sou gegaan het nie? -- Ek kan nie hier spekuleer oor iets wat ek niks van weet nie. (30)

Toe die Vlakplaas-eenheid op die been gebring was, was seker dokumente daarby betrokke in verband met hierdie opdragte van hulle, ensovoorts. Is ek korrek? -- Hoe bedoel u nou? Ek verstaan nie mooi nie.

Toe die Vlakplaas-eenheid op die been gebring is. -- Ja.

Sou daar seker dokumente bestaan het in verband met die aanstelling van die lede, die reëls wat gevolg moet word en sulke soort dinge, die beleid wat gevolg moet word, wat hulle kan en kan nie doen nie? -- Die reëls van enige polisieman word neergelê in die Polisie wet, die polisie regulasies, die polisie staande orders en dan ook periodieke magsorders wat uitkom asook ander sirkulêres en opdragte. (10)

Nou, dit is wat die algemeen betref, die algemene reëls en regulasies. -- Dit is korrek.

Maar wat/..

K89.19

- 2529 -

SCHOON

Maar wat van die spesifieke reëls in verband met die bestaan van Vlakplaas? Die tipe reëls wat te voorskyn kom in die aanhangsels wat nou voor u geplaas is, daardie tipe reëls, dit moes vroeër as September '81 bestaan het. -- Die opset op Vlakplaas is begin hier in 1979 deur nou generaal Johan Viktor en dit was maar eers op 'n baie lukraak wyse hanteer, want van hierdie teruggekeerde terroriste is gearresteer, hulle het hulle samewerking gegee en toe moes daar vir hulle 'n heenkome gevind word en hulle is op Vlakplaas geakkommodeer en later het dit toe begin - is daar begin om hierdie mense aan te wend en so het die ding sy groeistadium gehad tot dit lateraan baie beter beslag gekry het. (20)

Maar wat ek aan u stel is dat daar moes seker dokumente gewees het wat verslae was of opdragte van bo na ondertoe. Sulke dokumente, dit moes bestaan het. -- Ek dink brigadier Viktor (30)

destyds, afgetree as generaal-majoor, hy het 'n memorandum opgestel waar daar goedkeuring gevra is vir hierdie projek en dit is toe op ministeriële vlak goedgekeur en daar is met die ding aangegaan. Daardie dokumente is, glo ek, iewers beskikbaar en dit is die grondslag van die ontstaan van Vlakplaas.

U sou 'n lêer in verband met Vlakplaas gehou het. -- Ek dink daar is nou nog 'n lêer.

In hierdie lêers sou verslae gewees het, opdragte. -- Ek glo net die administratiewe opdragte en korrespondensie is in daardie lêer gehou. Die verslae gaan in verskillende ander lêers in in die funksionele stroom. (10)

En waar sou die lêers geliasseer word? Hoofkantoor? -- Te hoofkantoor.

Daar is getuienis afgelê dat u gereeld gedurende 1981 met kaptein/..

K89.20 - 2530 - SCHOON
met kaptein Dirk Coetzee gepraat het. Hy sê feitlik elke oggend het hy aan u gerapporteer. -- Nee, ek sou nie sê hy het elke oggend aan my gerapporteer nie. (20)

Het hy wel .. (tussenbei) -- Hy het dikwels geskakel en dan met een van die kantoorpersoneel gepraat, maar selde met myself.

En van hierdie terugrapporterings was daar 'n notule gemaak en gehou? --Nee.

Glad nie? -- Nie sover ek weet nie, in elk geval nie deur my nie.

Was enige verslae vanaf Coetzee of enige ander bevelvoerder van Vlakplaas aan u kantoor gestuur? -- Ja, van die bevelvoerders het verslae gestuur.

Was dit van hulle verwag om dit gereeld te doen? -- Dit was verwag om insidente - as daar 'n arrestasie of 'n voorval plaasgevind het, dan was dit sy plig gewees om verslag te doen (30)

daaroor.

Op skrif? -- Op skrif.

En was dit ook hulle plig om aan u te rapporteer as sê nou byvoorbeeld 'n jaar verbygegaan het en niks gebeur het, sou daar nie 'n plig gewees het om ook die negatiewe aspekte te rapporteer nie? -- Nee.

Is daar nie iets soos 'n kwartaallikse verslag of 'n jaarlikse verslag of 'n maandelikse verslag nie? -- Nee.

Is die plig net as iets gebeur? -- Dit is al.

En u sê dat sulke verslae was seker ingestuur na hoof- kantoor
(10)
toe. -- Dit is korrek.

En hulle sou ook te hoofkantoor geliasseer word. -- Ja.

In verband met die gebruik van wapens, is 'n wapenregis- ter
gehou vir Vlakplaas? -- Hoe bedoel u nou, watse
wapenregister/..

K89.21

- 2531 -

SCHOON

wapenregister?

Wel kyk, byvoorbeeld, ek weet dat 'n onluste-eenheid in verband met die wapens wat hulle hou moet wapenregisters ge- hou
(20)
word. Elke wapen wat uitgereik is, is neergeskryf in 'n sekere register en elke koeël feitlik wat gebruik is moet daar gerapporteer word daarvoor en 'n nota word daarvan gemaak. -- Ek weet dat meeste van die lede het hulle persoonlike wapens gehad wat op hulle uitrustingstaat aangeteken is.

En as hulle die wapen gebruik en ammunisie gebruik moet hulle dit ook rapporteer. -- Dit is korrek.

En daar by hoofkantoor is 'n rekord gehou en die ammunisie is weer aangevul en rekord word daarvan gehou? -- Ja, en hulle het ook gereeld geoefen. Daar is ammunisie aan hulle uitgegee
(30)
om mee te oefen.

En soos ek dit verstaan is die bedoeling van die reëls en

regulasies by die polisie dat elke skoot wat gevuur is, sal 'n mens 'n rekord daarvan vind. -- Ja, ek weet nou nie of dit so eng toegepas word nie.

Ek wil nie in te veel besonderhede daaroor ingaan nie, maar soos ek die getuienis wat ek oor die laaste drie jare gehoor het verstaan het, is dit die bedoeling seker om sulke besonderhede op rekord te plaas en te hou. -- Dit is die be- doeling.

So, was enige sulke rekords in verband met Vlakplaas gehou? -- Ek dra nie persoonlik kennis van sodanige rekord nie.

As dit die algemene reël was dat enige eenheid in die polisie (10) sulke rekords moet hou, sou hulle toestemming moes gekry het om daardie reëls te verontagsaam? -- Ek glo dat daar wel rekord gehou is, maar ek het dit persoonlik nie gesien

nie./...

K89.23

- 2532 -

SCHOON

nie.

Maar u het geen bevel uitgereik tot die effek dat hulle nie verplig was om hierdie rekords te hou nie? -- Nee, ek het geen so 'n bevel uitgereik nie.

(20) So, as die algemene beleid van die polisie gevolg was sou daar wapenregisters en ammunisieregisters gehou geword het? -- Ja, daar word deur die storeklerk, in hierdie geval was dit kaptein Rörich gewees, hy het wel sulke registers gehou waarin die aanvraag gedoen is en waar lede dan geteken het vir die wapen, dit is die eiendomsrekening aangeteken, as dit net tydelik aan 'n lid uitgereik word, 'n spesifieke vuurwapen. Waar 'n vuurwapen permanent aan 'n lid uitgereik word, kom dit op sy uitrustingstaat.

En ook vuurwapens wat in die algemeen aan die eenheid as sulks uitgereik is. In teenstelling met die wapen wat per- soonlik (30) uitgereik is, as wapens aan die eenheid uitgereik is, is daar ook rekord daarvan gehou? -- Ek glo dat die store het wel so 'n rekord

gehou en dat indien 'n lid 'n wapen benodig het, het hy na die storeklerk gegaan en hy het daar geteken vir 'n wapen.

Nou, dra u kennis of hierdie rekords bestaan nog in verband met Vlakplaas in 1981 of daarna of laat ek dit so stel, 1981. -- Ek weet nie of daar in 1981 deur hulle persoon-lik so 'n rekord gehou is nie, maar ek weet dat hulle wel by die storeklerk wapens getrek het en dat as daar rekord is moet dit daar wees.

VOORSITTER: Waar is die storeklerk? -- Dit is in hoofkantoor gesetel.

MNR. PRETORIUS: Afgesien van hierdie dokumente waarvan ons nou (10) gepraat het, dra u kennis van enige ander dokument van enige aard/..

K89.24 - 2533 - SCHOON

enige aard wat in verband met Vlakplaas bestaan het, te hoof-kantoor eerstens? -- Daar moet seker nog talle dokumente wees. Dit hang net af watter tipe dokument die advokaat na verwys.

Nee, ek wil hê asseblief u moet ons help. Ek weet nie watter dokumente daar is nie en kan u vir ons sê watter tipe dokumente of watter kategorieë dokumente sou nog bestaan in verband met (20) Vlakplaas. -- Hierdie gewone administratiewe dokumente wat met die onderhoud van so 'n opset gepaard gaan.

Was dit van u verwag as hoof van seksie C om na bo verslag te maak? Was dit verwag van u .. (tussenbei) -- Oor die werksaamhede van die eenheid?

Ja. -- Alleenlik wanneer daar positiewe dinge was om te rapporteer is dit gerapporteer.

En het u wel so 'n verslag gemaak? -- Sulke verslae is wel gedoen.

En ek is seker dié sou nog bestaan ook. -- Ek glo so.

Nou, is daar 'n algemene reël in die polisie dat veilig- (30) heidspolisieremane hoef nie sakboeke te dra nie? Is dit 'n al- gemene

reël? -- Dit is so. Ek weet nie of dit nou verander is nie.

Het die reël in 1981 ook gegeld? -- Dit is korrek.

Was die reël dat hulle nie sakboeke moet dra nie of hulle nie sakboeke moet hou nie? -- Nee, die reël was om nie 'n sakboekie te dra nie.

Was hulle nog verplig om 'n sakboekie te hou? -- Dit was opsioneel gewees of hy 'n sakboek wou hou of nie.

Is dit nou lede van die veiligheidspolisie? -- Dit is lede van die veiligheidspolisie.

Onderoffisiere? -- Onderoffisiere.

(10)

En dit, soos ek dit verstaan, is nie die reël vir die

gewone/..

K89.27

- 2534 -

SCHOON

gewone polisieman nie. Hy moet 'n sakboekie .. (tusenbei) -- Nee, hy moet 'n sakboekie hê.

Hê en dra. -- Ja.

En u sê die reël, as ek dit reg verstaan, is vir die veiligheidspolisie 'n opsie, of hy wil een hou of nie? -- Wel, hy was eintlik gesê gewees om nie 'n sakboekie te hou nie, om watter rede weet ek nie. (20)

Om nie te hou nie of om nie een te dra nie? -- Om nie 'n sakboekie by te hou nie.

Is gereeld vergaderings gehou tussen u en u mede-offisiere in verband met - hoër offisiere, in verband met die aktiwiteite van afdeling C of seksie C? Was daar gereeld sulke vergaderings gehou? -- Nee, eers later van tyd het ons elke oggend bymekaargekom wanneer die offisiere wel beskikbaar was.

Nou, was notule van hierdie vergaderings gehou? -- Geen notule was gehou nie.

(30)

Sou u nie gereeld met u mede-offisiere in ander seksies of met generaal Coetzee byvoorbeeld vergadering gehou het nie in

verband met wat in u seksie aangaan? -- Ons het elke oggend in generaal Coetzee se kantoor byeengekom, die senior offisiere, en dan het hy daar wat ter sprake is of wat van belang was, het hy òf vir ons gevra òf ons getaak en gehoor wat op elkeen se gebied plaasgevind het.

Sou daar notule van hierdie vergaderings gehou word? -- Daar was ook nie notule hiervan gehou nie. Ek dink daar was wel deur hom aantekeninge gemaak van dit wat van belang was.

Seker as opdragte uitgereik is, sou hy daarvan 'n nota gemaak het. -- Ek glo so, ja.

U sien, wat ons vreemd vind is dat ons kan geen dokument

wat op/..

(10)

K89.29

- 2535 -

SCHOON

wat op Vlakplaas gehou is kry van wat daar aangegaan het of wat daar gebeur het nie. Kan u dit miskien vir ons verduidelik, hoekom daar nie op Vlakplaas 'n behoorlike rekord of hoekom daar nie 'n behoorlike rekord gehou was van wat eintlik die eenheid gedoen het nie van dag tot dag. -- Ek kan nie daar 'n antwoord gee nie.

(20)

Is dit nie die algemene beleid van die polisie dat elke eenheid van wat ook al sy aard sulke rekord moet hou, byhou van wat elke dag gebeur nie? -- 'n Mens sou dit verwag, ja.

Maar nie verwag nie, dit is, soos ek die reëls en regulasies van die polisie verstaan, dit is verpligtend dat elke eenheid moet besonderhede hou van elke doen en late van daardie eenheid, elke dag moet rekord bygehou word van daardie eenheid, wat lede van daardie eenheid doen. Is dit nie die vaste beleid van die polisie nie? -- Wel, die beleid wat nou gevolg word, is die manne gaan uit vir drie weke, dan kom hulle terug en hulle dien verslag in oor wat hulle oor daardie tydperk verrig het en dit is op skrif.

(30)

Al het niks gebeur nie? Al het .. (tussenbei) -- Hy sê daar

presies wat hy alles gedoen het in daardie sê drie weke wat hy vir die maand uit was.

En al is niemand .. (tussenbei) -- Daardie verslae glo ek is vandag nog beskikbaar.

En al is iemand gearresteer nie of al is niemand geskiet nie of ammunisie nie gebruik nie, daar behoort nog sulke rekords te bestaan. -- Dit het gebruik geword dat so 'n verslag moet deur elke groep bevelvoerder ingedien word met sy terugkeer na Pretoria.

VOORSITTER: Die probleem is net die volgende u sê dit het die gebruik geword, wanneer het dit die gebruik geword? -- Sedert
(10)
majoor De Kock/..

K89.30

- 2536 -

SCHOON

majoor De Kock die eenheid oorgeneem het.

Want Dirk Coetzee het uitdruklik getuig dat hy nooit so iets .. (tussenbei) -- In Dirk Coetzee se tyd was dit nie so nie.

MNR. PRETORIUS: Nou, was dit nie ook die algemene beleid van die polisie in 1981 dat elke eenheid rekord moet hou van wat plaasvind nie? -- Nee.

Dit was nie beleid nie sê u. Mr Chairman, I am about to go
(20)
to another topic. Would this be a convenient time?

DIE KOMMISSIE VERDAAG TOT 12 JUNIE 1990 OM 10h00.