

containing old things.

You have never seen the European in the electrical shop anywhere in The Greys or at the police? --- I never saw him at The Greys. I have seen this European at the shop, I have never taken notice of him.

Is that still an electrical shop, or has it now been changed? --- I do not know whether it is still so, because I can see as though people are shifting from there.

It looks as if people have been shifting from there, yes. Where did they shift to? --- No.

Not The Greys? --- I do not know.

Tell me, you say you made notes in your pocketbook about your observations at this place on the 22nd November? --- That is correct.

Did you make the notes at the time? --- I did my notes on this day of the duty.

In your pocketbook? --- Yes.

At the time? Whilst you were on duty? --- Yes, at the time, when I see a person, I would write down the name.

So all the notes in this pocketbook were made at the time? ---Yes.

You sure? You didn't make some other notes and destroy them, did you? --- No, when I see the person, I would write down his name.

All your notes regarding your observation duty on this day were recorded in your pocketbook? --- Yes, people that I knew.

Please don't avoid my question. All your notes regarding your observations on the 22nd November that you have testified to, were made in this pocketbook? --- Yes.

You didn't make any notes in regard to this observation on the 22nd November somewhere else and then destroy them? --- No, I do not remember.

What do you mean, you don't remember? --- When I say it, it is because I did not do so.

You did not do so. All your notes you made in regard to your observations are contained in this pocketbook? ---Yes.

You made no notes anywhere else? --- No.

I would like you to read from the last line on page 56 up to the time that you ended your duty? --- 'I took down the names of persons whom I know in my notebook and numbers of the cars'.

Is that so? Which notebook? Which notebook are you referring to? No use looking at that notebook, you won't find any numbers of cars there? Which notebook are you referring to? What notebook are you referring to? I don't get an answer from you? --- I said I wrote down the names in my pocketbook.

What notebook are you referring to in that note which you have just read out? Are you referring to the notebook that is in front of you, yes or no? --- It can happen that this is the one.

So when you have written in your note 'I took down the names of the persons and the numbers of their cars in my notebook', you are referring to that notebook? Are you referring to that notebook? --- It can happen that I meant this notebook...

Are you referring to that notebook or are you not? Don't tell us what can happen? --- I am referring to this notebook.

Then you did take down the names of the persons and the numbers of the cars in that notebook. So why is it necessary to write down that you so took these numbers and names? What is your answer to that one? --- I wrote that I had taken down the names.

Answer my question, please? You have written here on page 56 and page 57, 'I took down the names of persons whom I know in my notebook and the numbers of the cars at the meeting'. Why is it necessary to write that down if you put the names and the numbers in this notebook?--- I just wrote that people came past.

Why don't you answer my question? If you haven't got an answer we can record it as such and we can move on? --- I wrote down the names of persons that I saw.

Let me ask you something else, if you don't want to answer my question. Can you show me where the numbers of the cars are that you say you wrote down in the notebook? --- I did not write down the numbers of the cars.

But you say that you did? You yourself have written down in your own handwriting - it says that you wrote down the numbers of the cars in your notebook? I am asking you where they are? --- I did not write down the numbers of the cars at the time that I wrote down the names.

But you yourself have written there - read it out again, read it out aloud. Read out page 57 aloud? --- "I took down names of persons whom I know in my notebook and the numbers of the cars. The meeting ended 7.45 p.m."

And the numbers of the cars at the meeting. Now where are those numbers that you say you wrote down? --- Perhaps I put that in my report. I do not know.

But you don't say in your report. You say you wrote it in your notebook? --- I did not write the numbers of the cars in my notebook.

So what you wrote down there is a lie, then? Unless you wrote it in another notebook, then it would be true? --- It is not a lie.

But is it true when you say you wrote the numbers of the cars in your notebook? Is that true? --- The numbers are

not here in my notebook.

You don't need to tell me something I spotted half an hour ago. I want to know whether it is true when you wrote in your book that you had put the numbers of the cars in a notebook. Is that true or false? --- They are not in this pocketbook.

Is it true or false is my question? --- What?

When you say that you wrote the numbers of the cars in a notebook? --- It is true. It is possible that I could have written the numbers of the cars in my report.

I said notebook, not report. Don't avoid my question any longer? --- They are not in my notebook.

So therefore it is not true when you say that you wrote them in a notebook?

BY THE COURT :

Perhaps we can.. unless.. are you pursuing this point?

BY MR. BERRANGE :

I just want an answer from this witness. All I want to demonstrate, Sir,...

BY THE COURT :

I would like to put it pointedly to him. Can you explain this wrong entry in your....

BY MR. BERRANGE :

So far he won't admit that it is a wrong entry. That is my difficulty.

BY THE COURT :

It is obviously a wrong entry. It probably means that he didn't deliberately make a false entry...

BY MR. BERRANGE :

I don't think Your Worship is taking my point. It is not necessarily a wrong or a false entry. It may be a perfectly true entry, if he wrote it in another notebook. That

is my point. I want to know from him whether this is a true entry or a false entry.

BY THE COURT :

He says he may have written it in his report.

BY MR. BERRANGE :

That doesn't say report, it says notebook. All I want to know from him is that a true entry or a false entry? If it is a true entry, it means that he used another notebook.

BY THE COURT :

The entry is obviously a wrong entry. Perhaps he can offer an explanation. Can you give any explanation for this entry that you made? It is obviously a wrong entry, you didn't write it in this notebook? You don't say that you wrote it in any other notebook, why did you make such an entry then? --- I wrote it in my notebook. When I see a person I would write down his name.

BY MR. BERRANGE :

We are talking about the numbers of the motor cars, don't worry about the names?

BY THE COURT :

Have you any difficulty in understanding the interpreter? --- No.

Why don't you answer the question then? The witness is obviously not deliberate in his attitude, that is manifest.

BY MR. BERRANGE :

How long you have been in the Police Force? --- Nineteen years.

And during that time you have continually and consistently been giving evidence in Courts? --- Yes.

And you are one of the oldest members of the Special Branch? --- Yes.

And you are educated as one can see from your handwriting in the pocketbook? You write a perfect English I

notice, correct? --- Yes, I do understand how to write.

I put it to you that you write a perfect English in a perfect hand? --- That can happen.

I am asking you one very simple question. I have been asking you this question over and over and over again. His Worship has asked you the question too. Why did you write in this pocketbook that you had written the numbers of the motor cars in your notebook? --- When I am on duty I write down the name of the person and the number of the car. It therefore can happen that I could have written it in another book.

Exactly what I have been trying to get from you for the last half an hour. Then why did you tell me, when I first started cross-examining you that you didn't make any other notes in any other book except this one? --- This shows the work that I did, and that one was only for the rough work that I had done.

I see. So you keep two pocketbooks, two notebooks, simultaneously? --- Yes, it is possible.

I don't want to know whether it is possible, I want to know whether it is true? Do you keep two notebooks simultaneously? --- No, I do not keep two books at the same time. But what can happen is this. Sometimes I get a piece of paper and I write on it.

Nobody asked you about a piece of paper. Your book says that you wrote it in a notebook, not on a piece of paper. It says that you wrote the numbers of the motorcars in your notebook? --- Yes, I said that and it is possible that I could have written in another notebook.

Exactly, and I want to know why do you keep two notebooks simultaneously? --- There is a small book. When you see here is rough work, you just write in that small one, and

question? So the position then is this. The names you write in the pocketbook, and the numbers of the cars you write in another notebook? --- I do not say so.

But you have just said so?

BY THE COURT :

What other explanation can you offer for making an entry like this then, if there are no numbers? ---The other explanation is this. At the time of the observation it is possible that I could have had a piece of paper, another pocketbook or a newspaper in which I wrote this down, and then transferred that into my notebook.

Why do you want to write the names in one book and the numbers on a piece of paper or another book? That seems to be very stupid? Why do you do that? --- I do not say I did so.

Well, what else could have happened? Did you write down the numbers at all? Anywhere? --- It is possible that I could have written that in another pocketbook or a notebook, or a piece of paper, a newspaper, and then I wrote the names in this notebook.

We are just going in circles and circles and getting nowhere.

CASE REMANDED TO 30TH AUGUST, 1957.

COURT RESUMES 30TH AUGUST, 1957.

APPEARANCES AS BEFORE :

MR. COAKER ADDRESSES COURT :

Accused Absent : Same as on 29th August, 1957.
In Addition : No. 116, S. Kalipi.
Back in Court : P.J.S. Manana.

(E. Mazwai Int. Eng./Xosa)

BENEDICT MYEMBANE, duly sworn;

BY MR. BERRANGE : No more questions.

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. COAKER :

Did you make any note of the time at which any of the persons noted by you arrived at this meeting? --- I do not remember whether I did, but one thing I remember is that I did write what time I resumed duties.

What time you went on duty? --- 4.30

And whenever you saw a person known to you enter the premises, you made a note of his name?--- Yes.

In that particular pocketbook, was it? --- I cannot be definite about that. It could be this very notebook or another pocketbook.

I see, if you wrote it in another book, when you must have transferred it to your present book? --- Yes.

Yesterday you were quite certain that you wrote it in this book? --- Yes, after the meeting, I make my entries all the time.

After the meeting you make your entries, do you say? --- Each time I see a person, I write down the name. Then after that I transfer it, making my entry.

Now when do you transfer it to another book?

BY THE COURT :

Where do you write the name on when you see a person?

--- The notebook.

That is in your pocketbook?--- What the Counsel now has is a pocketbook, and then I have a notebook in my pocket.

Do you carry two books? --- Yes, that does happen. Then I write in the one and thereafter transfer it to the other.

What is the purpose of each book? --- That is to do my rough work whilst I am on duty and then thereafter transfer it into another book.

In which book do you do your rough work then? The rough entries? --- At a meeting I take notes into my notebook and the name of the persons, that I all write down in my notebook, and that I do roughly. Then I transfer that into my pocketbook.

After the meeting? --- Immediately after the meeting.

BY MR. COAKER :

Where is that notebook? --- I think I must have destroyed it.

Why? --- I do not know whether I destroyed it or whether I attached it to my report.

You made no note, I assume of the time at which people left the premises? --- I did because I did write when the people left and when I also left.

In this book? --- I wrote that what time I left work because I was on that particular duty, the time I left the duty.

Did you make any note whatsoever of the time of which any single person left the premises, apart from yourself? --- No, I did not.

BY THE COURT :

Did you note the names of persons who left the premises? --- I did not, I only wrote down their names as they entered, but I saw them when they left.

BY MR. COAKER :

So you are not in a position to say today at what time any particular person left the premises? --- I cannot say what time each person left, but I know that they did leave.

Yes, that seems to be self evident.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

NO RE-EXAMINATION.

(J.J. Mollentzie, Int. Eng./Afr.)

GUSTAV BERNARD AUGUST GERDINER, verklaar onder eed;

VERHOOR DEUR DIE P.A. :

U woon te Helderbergstraat 7, Stellenbosch? --- Dit is reg.

Gedurende 1954 was u verbonde aan die Universiteit van Stellenbosch? --- Not in the first place, I was connected with the Theological Seminary and also with the University.

In watter hoedanigheid was u by Stellenbosch Universiteit? --- Ek was Hoofleraar in Teologie.

U verwys nou na bewysstukke G. 1002 en G. 1003? --- Ja, ek sien hulle hier voor my.

Nou het u daardie koevert en daardie brief ontvang? --- Ja.

Kan u onthou wanneer? --- Dit moet aan die end van Januarie of die begin Februarie gewees het.

Watter jaar? --- 1954.

Is daar enige merke waaraan u die bewysstukke herken? --- Ek het after op die koevert aantekeninge gemaak, wat in my handskrif is.

En op die brief self? Dit is bewysstuke G. 1003? --- Op die brief, nie.

Na u die twee bewysstukke ontvang het, wat het u daarmee gedoen? --- Onmiddellik na die ontvangs het ek dit met 'n paar van my vriende bespreek, en die het my die raad gegee

dat ek dit nie moet vernietig soos ek gewoonlik met naamlose geskrifte doen.

Wat het u toe daarmee gedoen? --- Ek het dit oorhandig aan die Staatsinligtingskantoor, Dr. Otto du Plessis se afdeling, in Kaapstad.

Kan u onthou aan watter persoon u dit daar oorhandig het? --- Ek meen dat dit mnr. Badenhorst was, die man het so 'n klein baardjie vir wie ek in Nairobi leer ken het, en wat ek daar in die kantoor ontmoet het, en dit aan hom gegee het.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. BERRANGE :

I take it, Professor, that when you refer to certain notes on the back of the envelope you are referring to the notes in pencil? --- Korrek.

And not to the notes that are written there in ink? --- Nee.

When were you first asked to give evidence in these proceedings? --- Omtrent vier of ses weke gelede.

Until that time, I take it, you had put this matter out of your mind? --- Geheel en al is te sterk, maar grotendeels.

You had handed these exhibits over to Mr. Badenhorst and left them - and left it to him to take the necessary action if any was to be taken? --- Dit is so.

And we all know that you are a very busy gentleman? --- Moet ek antwoord daarop?

I am putting it to you in the form of a question? --- Ja, ek wil nie voorgee dat ek meer besig is as ander mense nie.

Are you a busy gentleman? --- Ja, soos al die ander mense in ons tyd.

I wish it were true, some people I know are not in

the slightest bit busy. And you have had a number of other things to engage your attention over the last three or four years? --- Ja, dit is korrek.

Now prior to this morning, when this letter was produced to you, when did you last see it? --- Ek het dit gesien toe die persoon, ek dink Kaptein Buys is sy naam, dit aan my in my huis kom toon het, vier of ses weke gelede.

And then you recollected having received this letter some four years ago? Three years? --- Ja.

Did you peruse this letter when Captain Buys showed it to you? --- Ek het dit net kursories weer nagesien om seker te maak dat dit dieselfde brief is. Net haastig deurgekyk.

You perused it casually? --- Ja.

You didn't study it? --- Nee.

You didn't endeavour to memorise the contents when the letter was first received by you? --- Nee, ek het net probeer om seker te maak dat dit dieselfde brief is wat ek ontvang het.

When you talk about being sure that it was the same letter that you received in 1954, have you regard to the contents of the letter? --- Yes.

Can you tell us today all the contents of the letter? --- Nee.

You can tell us some of the contents, I am sure? --- Ja, dit kan ek doen.

Could you indicate to us today some of the contents of this letter? --- Dit het n indruk op my gemaak dat die woorde Cheesa-Cheesa gedurig daarin voorkom. Dit het my herinner aan die Mau-Mau van Oos-Afrika.

You say the fact - I don't want to misunderstand you, do I understand you to say that you know that the word Cheesa-Cheesa appeared several times in this letter, and that has reminded you of the Mau-Mau in Kenya? --- Yes.

Do you remember whether there was any reference made in this letter to the Mau-Mau in Kenya? --- Sover ek onthou, nie.

Any reference to Mau-Mau at all in this letter? --- Sover ek onthou, nie.

You see, in fact there is reference to Mau-Mau? --- Dan is ek versterk in my oortuiging.

So far from it reminding you of the Mau-Mau in Kenya, in this letter there is a disclaimer that there are Mau-Mau in this country? --- Ja.

This is what one of the paragraphs in this letter says : "When UNO hears about C.C."- I suppose that means Cheesa-Cheesa - "what will they say? Also the overseas press. This is what they will say, because they are ignorant. Mau-Mau in South Africa. But we are not M.M. " - which I take means Mau-Mau - "We are non-Whites who have suffered oppression at the hands of leading Afrikaners.." and so on and so forth. So you see, there is a repudiation of Mau-Mau in this letter, according to what I have read out? You will concede that, won't you? --- Ja.

Now is there anything else that you can remember today about the contents of this letter? --- Ja, dit sou miskien beter gewees het as ek die brief weer sou kon lees. As u my uitvra oor die inhoud is dit baie vaag, my herrinnerings.

The whole purpose of my questioning is to test your memory. It of course wouldn't help me very much if I gave you the letter to read now? --- My geheue is nie meer so goed nie, maar dit kan ek baie goed onthou, dat of dit gepudieër is, die Mau-Mau dan of dit bevestig is - ek het die twee bewegings met mekaar in verband gebring. Die Mau-Mau was vir my n gevaarlike beweging en derhalwe het ek gevoel ek moet nie die brief vernietig nie. (Getuie herhaal sy antwoord in Engels). My Memory, is certainly not as strong as it used to be when I

was a younger man, but I do remember that the letter made the impression on me that there was some connection - there may be some connection between the Mau-Mau and this movement that was mentioned in the letter.

The Cheesa-Cheesa? --- The Cheesa-Cheesa movement, and that seemed to me to be quite serious because I realised the serious proportions the Mau-Mau was taking on in East Africa, and that was one of the reasons why I thought, after consultation with some of my friends and my good wife too, that I should not destroy the letter, but place it in responsible hands. Whether the Mau-Mau was repudiated or affirmed, did not make much impression on me. There was a comparison between the two movements as you have now indicated, and that made me suspicious.

But when I asked you the question, you were under the impression that there was an association in this letter between the Mau-Mau and the Cheesa-Cheesa? --- Yes, there was some association, even as it now appears, it was repudiated, there was nevertheless a comparison. So far my memory serves me correctly.

Your memory served you correctly only in the sense that you remember reading about the Mau-Mau in this letter and also the Cheesa-Cheesa. You were of the opinion that there was an association between these two organisations, and not a repudiation of the Mau-Mau? --- Even a repudiation also contains a measure of association.

I don't want to play with words, but you remember when I did first ask you this question, you indicated in your evidence that you didn't remember whether the Mau-Mau were mentioned at all in this letter? Is that not so? Your evidence was, as far as I can recall, there was no reference to Mau-Mau at all in this letter? --- At the same time I said that my impression was that there was some connection in my

own mind.

No, if I may correct you, what you did say was, that you remember the word Cheesa-Cheesa appeared recurrently in this letter and that reminded you of the Mau-Mau in East Africa. Then I put the next question to you and asked you whether you could remember whether the Mau-Mau were mentioned at all in this letter. You said to the best of your recollection, the words - the organisation Mau-Mau was not mentioned in the letter? --- That is then where my memory has failed me as far as the words go, but the impression I got still remains.

Now is there anything else about the contents of this letter that you can remember today? --- If I remember correctly, there was something about burning houses.

Yes. Anything else? --- No, I am afraid not.

Now, I don't want to spend any time on this, first of all, may I make it clear that I am not for a moment suggesting that you did not receive a letter, either exactly the same or very similar to the letter that has now been produced in Court and which was shown to you some four or six weeks ago. Nor am I for a moment suggesting that this is not the envelope which you received, because in any event it bears the date stamp on it, the post office date stamp on it is 31.1.54 and it also bears your handwriting on it. But, in January or February, 1954, you received a certain letter dealing with the Cheesa-Cheesa, addressed to you and that letter, after you had perused it, you handed it over to Mr. Badenhorst, as far as you can remember? --- Yes.

Thereafter a letter was shown to you by Captain Buys some four or six weeks ago? --- Yes.

That letter has no markings or identification by you on it at all, has it? --- Not the letter.

I am talking about the letter. Let us forget about

the envelope, because as I have already indicated to you, I have no doubt but that this envelope was received by you. I want to put it to you quite bluntly and quite fairly that all you can say about this letter, Exhibit G. 1003, is that it is a letter similar to the one which you received in 1954, inasmuch as there are no marks of identification by you on this letter, and you could not under oath say that it is the same letter, can you? --- A similar letter.

You can't say it is the identical letter? --- That is right.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

NO RE-EXAMINATION.

(E. Mazwai Int. Eng./Xosa)

GLADWELL NGCAI, duly sworn;

EXAMINED BY THE P.P. :

You have already given evidence? --- I have.

On the 26th August, 1957 were you in the office of Detective Sergeant Diederiks? --- I was.

Was he a witness yesterday? --- Yes.

And did he play a tape recording in your presence?
--- He did.

Who were present when he played it? --- The two of us.

And did you then listen? --- I did.

And did you identify the speakers, or some of the speakers? --- Yes, some of the speakers.

Who was the first - how did you identify the speakers? --- I heard the voices.

Who was the first speaker? --- Mr. Moretsele.

Is he one of the Accused? --- Yes (46.).

Whilst you were listening, did you make notes? ---
Yes.

Are you referring to your notes that you took down? --- Yes.

You have already said that the first speaker was Moretsele. You identified him by his voice, that is what you said? --- Yes.

From which word or words did he commence his speech? Where did he start, in other words? --- "Gentlemen, Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen." Those words he uttered in English.

Yes, read on from your notes? --- And then I heard him say....

In what language? --- English.

Get this clear. He started off with "Gentlemen, Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen". Is that correct? --- Yes.

And then, continue? --- And then he said : "I think you are right."

He started off with those words, "Gentlemen, Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen"? --- Yes.

What language did he speak? --- English. He said that in English.

To what sentence or to what word did he continue in English? --- "I think you are right".

And then after those words? Did he stop speaking there? --- That is correct.

And then, after that? Who spoke? --- Another speaker followed, but I could not identify him.

And then, the next speaker after the unknown speaker? --- Mr. Moretsele.

The same person? --- Yes, but this time he was speaking in Sepedi.

Where did he stop? Can you give the Court an indication? --- The tape then became silent.

And when the tape became silent, was he still speaking? --- Yes.

Now the next speaker? --- Leslie Masina.

Is he one of the Accused? --- Yes. (34).

What language did he speak? --- English. Interpreter was Joe Magoma, speaking in Sechuana.

Just read on from what sentence he commenced with? Leslie Masina? --- "In 1956..."

He started off with the words "In 1956.." to..? --- "I think if we do that the Nationalists will know exactly who we are".

Yes, and after Leslie Masina? The next speaker? --- Mr. Moretsele, speaking in Sepedi. Henry Tshabalala was interpreting for him, into English.

Henry Tshabalala, is he one of the Accused? --- Yes (77).

And from where did he speak the words which he started? --- "It is not going to benefit me.."

And give the last words of his speech? --- "Now I am going to call upon Mr. Nkadimeng to say a few words".

And the next speaker? --- Mr. Nkadimeng.

Is he one of the Accused? --- Yes (54). Tshabalala was interpreting for him into Zulu.

The same Tshabalala? --- Yes.

Did Nkadimeng speak in English? --- Yes.

Now give the first words of his speech? --- "Afrika, Afrika, Mayebuye.."

And the last words? Where he stopped? --- "Freedom in our lifetime".

And then the next speaker? --- Moretsele speaking in Sepedi. Henry Tshabalala interpreting into English.

Again give the first words, from where he started? --- "The one I am going to call now is the Volunteer-in-Chief".

Moretsele speaking in Sepedi, and translated by Henry Tshabalala into English? --- Yes. He said first : "So Mr. Resha, as the Chief Volunteer is going to address you,"

And "He is the last speaker".

Is that where he stopped? --- Yes.

The next speaker? --- Mr. Resha.

One of the Accused? --- Speaking in English.

Is he one of the Accused? --- Joe Magome was interpreting for him into Sechuana.

Is he one of the Accused? --- Yes.

That is Robert Resha, (63). What language did he speak? You have already said? --- English.

Now the first words of where he started? --- "Afrika, Afrika, Mayebuye, Mayebuye".

Give his last words? --- "Our mother country, South Africa".

Yes? --- There was another speaker after that, but I did not know him. I did not recognise his voice.

And the next one? --- Mr. Moretsele, speaking in Sepedi. Tshabalala interpreting for him into English.

Give the first words again of his speech? --- "I would like that each and every Branch should inform our Secretary.."

Give his last words? --- "I will allow each and every person to speak only on this particular matter, i Afrika".

And then the next speaker? --- Lovedale Mfeka.

He spoke in which language? --- English.

Interpreted? --- Henry Tshabalala into Zulu.

Give the first words again, where he started? --- "Mr. Chairman, we are very much pleased to see such a big gathering.."

And his last words? --- "How these things have come around. Afrika".

And then, the next speaker? --- Moretsele speaking in Sepedi. There was no interpreter.

The next speaker? --- Mr. Resha, speaking in English.

Interpreter? --- I have no interpreter, here.

Give his first words? --- "Order, order, this is a meeting of the Volunteers".

And the last words? --- "Thank you, Mr. Chairman".

And then, after that? --- An unknown person.

And after the unknown person? --- Mr. Moretsele speaking in Sepedi, Joe Magome was interpreting into English.

Give the words he started from? --- "Shope's speech is quite right".

And where did he stop? With which words? --- "I will call the Secretary of the Women's League, to give us a report of the incident that occurred in Lichtenburg in brief".

The next speaker? --- June Chabako.

She spoke in which language? --- English.

Interpreted? --- There was an interpreter, but I did not write the name of the interpreter.

Give her first words? --- "I Afrika, i Afrika, Maye-buye".

And the last? --- I am sorry, Joe Magome was interpreting for her, in Sechuana.

Where did she stop? --- "Let us do join".

And then the last speaker was? --- Moretsele.

What language did he speak? --- Sepedi.

Interpreted? --- Joe Magome into English.

Give his first words? --- "Ladies and Gentlemen, you have heard a serious report".

And then he stopped with what words? --- "You will prepare yourself as you heard speakers preparing for you".

Now, Moretsele (46), how long do you know him? --- What do you mean? Speaking, or just knowing him?

Know him? --- From as far back as 1946.

Have you ever spoken to him personally, not at meetings, privately? --- Yes.

And have you heard him at meetings? --- Yes.

Can you give the Court an indication at how many meetings? --- Many.

And Leslie Masina, how long do you know him? --- I think from as far back as 1952.

And have you heard him speak before? --- Yes.

Where? --- At meetings.

More than one occasion? --- Yes, more.

About how many? --- Can be between five and six.

And John Nkadimeng? How long do you know him? --- More than three years, but I cannot say from what years I have known him.

Have you heard him speak before? --- Yes.

Where did he speak when you heard him? --- At a meeting, and the last one, I think it was at Kliptown.

Did you only hear him at meetings, or did you speak to him personally? --- I have never spoken to him, but we do greet each other.

And did you - at how many meetings did you hear him? --- If I am not mistaken, it is three meetings.

And Robert Resha, how long do you know him? --- I have known him for a long time.

And have you ever spoken to him? --- Yes.

And he to you? --- Yes.

And have you heard him address meetings? --- Yes, very much.

That mean many meetings? --- Yes.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. COAKER :

Who was present in Sergeant Diederick's office on the 26th August? --- I was called and when I got into the office, I found him alone.

When was - when the tape was played, who was the next person who arrived? --- No. Until I left, I left him alone.

You mean you were alone with him? --- Only the two of us.

You and..? --- Sergeant Diederiks.

You and Sergeant Diederiks? --- Yes.

And he played you a recording on a tape machine? --- Yes.

He play it at normal speed or did he play it slowly? --- No, the first time for it it was seen, this thing moves slowly. (Witness indicating).

And did the words come out at normal speed or slowly? --- Normal.

Did he reply any portions of the record? --- No, I do not remember.

Do you mean that he didn't or you can't remember if he did? --- I do not know this thing. This thing turns round, I do not know...- it goes around on one side and on the other side. I do not know this thing.

You made some very graphic gestures, but that is not what I am asking you about. Did you hear any portions of the speeches twice or three times? --- No.

It was played straight through from one end to the other? The record of the meeting was played straight through from the beginning to the end? --- That is correct.

And as it went, you wrote your notes? --- That is correct, listening and writing.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

NO RE-EXAMINATION.

(E. Mazwai, Int. Eng./Zulu)

DOUGLAS NDABA, duly sworn;

EXAMINED BY THE P.P. :

You have already given evidence? --- I have.

On the 26th of August, 1957, were you in the office of the witness, Sergeant Diederiks? --- I was.

Were there any other persons except the two of you? --- No.

And what did he do there? --- He took out a machine which has a tape, and then he said to me I should listen. And listen who are the people speaking.

Yes, and you were requested to identify them? --- That is correct.

And did you identify speakers? --- Yes, that I identified by their voices.

Did you make notes of the persons whom you identified? --- I did.

And you have your notes now before you? --- Yes.

When did you make those notes? --- On the 26th.

The same day? --- Yes.

Where, there in the office? --- Yes, in the office.

Who was the first speaker whom you identified? --- Philemon Mathole.

Is he one of the Accused? --- Yes. (37).

Now, in what language did he speak? --- In English.

Was there an interpreter? --- Yes.

Who? --- Henry Tshabalala.

One of the Accused? --- Yes. (77).

And he interpreted into which language? --- Into Zulu.

Now give his first words? --- "At Broadway Cinema in Fordsburg.."

And his last words? --- "I leave it to the Chairman how we are going to get some pennies from you".

And did you identify another speaker? --- Yes, there is another speaker identified.

Who? --- William Shope.

Is he one of the Accused? --- Yes (68).

What language did he speak? --- English.

Was there an interpreter? --- Yes.

Who? --- Joe Magome.

What language did he interpret into? --- Sesothe.

Will you give his first words? --- "Mr. President and fellow delegates.."

To? --- "It is our turn now to answer to our Secretary".

How long do you know Philemon Mathole? --- Quite a number of years.

About how many? --- Could be five years.

Have you ever spoken to him personally? --- On many occasions.

And did you hear him address meetings? --- Yes.

How many meetings? --- I wouldn't be able to say how many, but many.

And William Shope, how long do you know him? --- Quite a number of years. Could be four or five years.

Have you spoken to him personally? --- Yes.

Have you heard him address meetings? --- I have.

How many? --- Many.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. COAKER :

Were these two speeches the only two that were played to you? ---No.

How many speeches were played to you? --- I wouldn't be able to give the number, but they were many.

And why did you make notes of these two only? ---

The reason is this. These are the people that I could identify from their voices.

The only people that you could identify in that whole series of speeches? --- Yes.

Tell, me, were you played the whole meeting from the beginning, where the Chairman said "Ladies and Gentlemen, Gentlemen, Gentlemen"? Is that how is started? --- I do not remember what he said, but it was played to me from the beginning.

Until all the tape had gone from one reel onto another reel? --- I only saw one big roll, and it was a tape.

And it was played to you until the tape on that roll had completely unrolled? --- It was played, but one thing I do not remember whether it was until it got finished. That I do not know, but when they sang Nkosi Sikelele I Afrika, it got as far as that.

I see, it ended off with the singing of Nkosi Sikelele i Afrika.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

NO RE-EXAMINATION.

CASE REMANDED UNTIL 3RD SEPTEMBER, 1957.

COURT RESUMES 3RD SEPTEMBER, 1957.

APPEARANCES AS BEFORE :

MR. COAKER ADDRESSES COURT :

Accused Absent : Same as on 30th August, 1957.
In Addition : No. 13, H. Joseph; 139, Dr.
G. M. Naicker.
Back in Court : S. Kalipi.

IGNATIUS PETRUS VAN ONSELEN, duly sworn;

EXAMINED BY THE P.P. (MR. VAN NIEKERK) :

Are you the Secretary of the Native Resettlement Board, Johannesburg? --- I am.

And was this Board instituted to remove certain Natives from certain areas in Johannesburg district? --- Yes.

What are those areas from which they are to be removed? --- The areas are scheduled in Act 19 of 1954, Sophiatown, Martindale, Newclare and Pageview.

Where will these persons be resettled? --- These Natives living in the areas were to be removed to areas specially set aside by the Native Resettlement Board, Meadowlands and Diepkloof.

When was the first removal to take place? --- On the 4th November, 1954, the Board resolved that the progress of the work was so far and so good that a start would be made with the physical removal on the 12th February, 1955.

And did the first removal take place on the 12th February, 1955? --- About this time the Board had to take knowledge of the fact that there was a big agitation against the removal scheme.

Did you receive in your possession certain pamphlets and a newspaper 'New Age'? --- Yes.

Will you have a look at these? Will you take from the first one and just read them? --- The first one is, the heading "12th February, 1955. What is to happen".

That is a pamphlet, EXHIBIT G. 1092. Will you just read it? --- "On Saturday, 12th February, 1955, Dr. Verwoerd and the police have decided to forcibly remove the people of the Western Areas from their homes and deposit them, like a herd of cattle, at Meadowlands. The people have decided not to move. The people must prepare. From the 1st to the 12th February : 1. No man is going to the Beer Hall. No man must go for pleasures, such as bioscopes, football, parties and nice times. 2. Every man, young and old, must report for duty in his area from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. 3. Every woman, young and old, must work as hard as men and also pray for the success of the struggle."

Now the next one? --- The next one is headed "We want education, not poison. The Strijdom-Swart-Verwoerd clique is determined to poison the minds of the innocent and defenceless African children with Bantu Education. The result of this evil education is cheap labour for the cruel and murderous farmers in Bethal and Rustenburg; to make the African accept that he is not better than a donkey, oxen and tractor; to make the African accept that the European is his 'baas' forever; to make the African accept forcible removal from his home to cheap labour camps such as Meadowlands and Diepkloof; to make the African agree to pay higher rentals much above his income without question. What is Congress reply to this challenge? Come in your thousands to the mass Regional Conference on Sunday, 23rd January, 1955, at the Communal Hall, Western Native Township at 9 a.m." Then there is a few lines in Native language. I am unable to read that.

Does that say by whom that was issued? --- Issued by the African National Congress, Western Area Region.

That will be EXHIBIT G. 1093. The next one? --- It is headed "We shall not move. Ashihambi ha rena ho tsamao".

Is there an English translation to that? --- "Verwoerd says African must get out of the Western Areas and go to Meadowlands and Diepkloof. We say, nothing doing. We shall not move an inch. 1. We don't want to be caged in a Municipal Location with a fence around and a Superintendent to enforce permits and lodgers fees. 2. Moving means screening. The Native Affairs people will reject thousands of not employed in Johannesburg. Idle Natives. Passes out of order and so on. They will endorse these people out into the wilderness. Our own children will be endorsed out if the N.A.D. says they are not old enough to work. 3. Moving means being divided up into tribal areas by the Government, Msutu here, Xosa there, Zulu somewhere else - that is apartheid in action. Dividing the people and setting one group against another. 4. Meadowlands is eleven miles away. The transport is rotten. How shall we get to work? 5. The Government will charge new economic rents. They will find out how much pay you are getting and make you pay higher rates than in Orlando, Jabavu and other towns where the people have refused to pay the new rents. We must not betray our fellow Africans in these townships. The Western Areas Removal Scheme is legalised robbery. The Government is taking away the right of the African people to own land and and trying to make us propertyless self forever. As the African National Congress warned you that this was only the first step towards the wholesale uprooting of Africans all over the country. Now Dr. Eiselen, Secretary for Native Affairs, said that the Government means to kick 178,000 Africans out of the Western Cape Province. War on the Africans. The Government has declared war on the African people. Africans in the Western Areas are in the front line of defence. The whole of South Africa is watching us and supporting us. The whole world has been shocked by the

shocking scandal of the Western Areas Removal. Millions of people overseas have expressed their sympathy. We shall not surrender. The struggle of the Western Areas is the struggle of the African people and of all freedom loving people. Anyone who moves willingly is helping the Government to enslave our people. He is acting as a traitor and bringing shame to the African. Don't fill in the forms, don't get in the lorry to go to Meadowlands. Be ready to obey Congress call. Join the African National Congress and enroll as a volunteer. Resist apartheid. We are not going to move. Bring your forms and report everything to the A.N.C. office, 120b Victoria Road, Sophiatown or Phone 334069." It goes on in Native language.

Does it say by whom it is issued? --- This was issued by the Transvaal Resist Apartheid Committee, Box 9207, Johannesburg.

That will be EXHIBIT G. 1094. Did you also see a report in the New Age? --- Yes.

What date is that? What date of New Age? --- January 20th, 1955.

Would you just read the headline? --- "A.N.C. prepares for action against forced removals."

That will be EXHIBIT G. 1095. As a result of the contents of these pamphlets - I take it these pamphlets came into your possession in your ordinary..? --- In the ordinary course of my duties.

As a result of that, what did the Board decide? --- The Board resolved to anticipate the date of the removal.

Did you at any stage have consultation with the Deputy Commissioner of Police in this regard? --- Yes.

And when was the removal - the first removal to take place? --- The first removal was decided upon on the 9th February, 1955.

Instead of the 12th? --- Yes.

What was the reason for this anticipation? --- The Board wanted the removals to take place peacefully, was afraid that the people in the Western Areas might be influenced by the pamphlets and the agitation against the scheme and it decided to anticipate the date so as to catch the objectors on the wrong foot.

When were the notices served for the first removals? --- The notices for the first removal in terms of the Act must be served at least a clear month, a calendar month prior to the date of removal, so they were served the last few days of December, to be taking place on the 12th February, but a footnote was put on the notices that the Board would be prepared to provide free transport on a date to be advised later. On the afternoon of the 8th February, notices were served on the Natives - to be removed on the 12th February, that on the morning of the 9th February free transport would be provided and they were asked to hold themselves in readiness to move on that day.

Did the first removal take place on the 9th February? --- Yes.

Were there any disturbances? --- From the Board's point of view, no.

Were there police present? --- Yes.

What is the position in Meadowlands? --- The Natives in Meadowlands are very happy. There are over six thousand families resettled.

How many people have been moved to Meadowlands? --- The people were loaded on lorries and removed by the Board's transport.

How many? --- There are over six thousand families at present resettled, approximately thirty thousand.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. SLOVO :

Before you became Secretary of the Native Resettlement Board, what was your occupation? --- I am an officer in the Native Affairs Department.

How long have you been an officer in the Native Affairs Department? --- I have twenty-two years service. At that time - it is about three years ago, more than three years ago - about nineteen years at the time.

Mainly in Johannesburg? --- No. I have had service in Johannesburg, in Pretoria, in the district offices, some twelve years experience....., I was in the head office of the Native Affairs Department in the Urban Area Section.

How long have you been in Johannesburg - at the time when you became Secretary of this Board? How long had you been in Johannesburg? --- I had worked in Johannesburg previously. I was in the head office of the Department when I was appointed Secretary of the Board. I started - from the word go, I was attached to the Board.

But before that, how long had you been in Johannesburg in the Native Affairs Department? --- About a year as Secretary of the Advisory Committee of the Native Affairs Department.

And I take it that during the course of your duties as Secretary of the Board you made a point of acquainting yourself with the history of the area Newclare, Sophiatown, Martindale? --- Yes.

You learnt a bit about it? --- Yes.

It is true is it not that the people who live in a place like Sophiatown have the right to own ground there, or had the right to own ground there? --- Yes, they have the right.

Freehold right? --- Yes.

What was the position - what is the position in Meadowlands? --- It is leasehold.

The land is owned by the Resettlement Board? --- Yes.

Do you know that in Sophiatown there was no - Sophiatown was not a location, was it? --- No, it was a township.

Like any other township in Johannesburg? --- Yes.

It was not a location like the other..? --- It was not proclaimed a location, although it was declared predominantly occupied by Natives, in terms of the Urban Areas Act.

It was not a location in terms of the Urban Areas Act? Now, do you know what the difference is between a location and a place where Africans live which is not a location. What effect that has got on their lives? --- In what respect? I am not quite sure....

Let me put it this way. In a location, I suppose you are aware of this, in 99% of the locations a child for instance who is living with his family can from the age of eighteen be kicked out of the house by the Local Authority, if they refuse to give him a permit to continue living with his parents? You are aware of that? --- It depends on the regulations.

I want to put it to you that 99% of the regulations on the Reef have got that provision? --- I have no knowledge of that.

Have you any knowledge at all of such a provision, anywhere? --- Yes, I know.

So one of the effect at any rate of Africans living in a place which is not a location, is that they can keep their family together without interference from the Local Authority? Correct? --- Yes, it is not controlled to the same extent.

Well that is the sort of difference I want to find

from you. You have been in the Native Affairs Department for twenty-two years. I have given you now an example of what I meant when I asked you that question. Now what other differences are there in the lives of these people as between an ordinary area which is not a location, and a proclaimed location, from the administrative point of view? --- I don't know exactly what...

Let me ask you a further example which will indicate to you what I am driving at - ask you a further question. In an ordinary area I take it there is no restriction against a person who wishes to obtain premises. He hasn't got to get permission from an official for the purpose of residing in the area - that is in an area which is not a location. Is that so, or isn't it so or don't you know? --- I say that any Native over the age of eighteen who wants to remain in Johannesburg....

Please answer my question. I am not talking about - I know there are hundreds and hundreds of other restrictions which I don't want to deal with now, that the African is subjected to in an Urban Area. We know that if we start on them we will be here for a few months. I am not interested in that at the moment. I am just dealing with the differences which exist as between an area which is not a location and an area which is a location in relation to the conditions under which the people can obtain residences, houses, move about and so on. So I'll repeat the question I put to you a moment ago. That is : Is it so - if you don't know you can say so - is it so that in an area like Sophiatown, assuming an African has got his other permission to breath the air of Johannesburg, he doesn't require - he didn't require any special permission from the Local Authority to take up residence? --- Yes.

For an African to take up residence in Meadowlands, what is the procedure? --- He is removed from Sophiatown to

Meadowlands...

We know he is removed, but what formalities has he got to go through before he can get a roof over his head in Meadowlands? --- Meadowlands is a Resettlement Scheme. We only house Natives in Meadowlands that are removed from the Western Areas. It is not a Local Authority Area in the ordinary sense.

But the Resettlement Board, in terms of the Act, is some sort of Local Authority, is it not? ---For the application of the Act.

And before an African can get a roof over his head in Meadowlands, he has to get permission to live there from an official of the authorised officer of the Board? --- He is taken to Meadowlands by the Board.

He has to get a permit. Any African in Johannesburg can't come and move to Meadowlands, can he? --- No. Only those living in the Western Areas.

Of those who are living in the Western Areas, before they can move in, they have to get a permit from the Board? --- They get authority, yes.

They have to get a permit? --- No.

An authority, call it what you like? --- He gets a residential card.

Let us call it a residential card? --- Yes, that the Board took him there.

And once he is moved in there, and assuming he loses his employment in Johannesburg for a period of two or three months, what happens to him? --- The Board is not a Local Authority for the application of Section 10.

And assuming a man leaves Meadowlands for a period of five or six months, can he still continue residing in Meadowlands? --- The man or the family?

The man, the head of the family? --- I don't know.

I know of no cases that have been kicked out of Meadowlands.

What do the regulations say about it? --- He must be employed in the area.

If he is no longer employed in the area he no longer has the right to live in Meadowlands? --- I presume that follows.

So in other words, if a man should be unfortunate enough to live in Meadowlands and loses his employment in the area then he loses his right to a house? --- He can get an opportunity to find other employment.

I am not concerned with that. The point is, assuming he is unfortunate enough not to find other employment, then he hasn't got a house. Which of course you know ~~was~~ not the position in a place like Sophiatown. Being a freehold area, once a man had a house there, it was his house. He could live there irrespective of whether he was unemployed or not unemployed. If you want to add anything, the Prosecutor will give you an opportunity at a later stage. Is there a Superintendent at Meadowlands? --- Yes.

And is it part of the Superintendent's duty to provide permits for all sorts of things in terms of the regulations? --- Yes.

He can provide a Visitor's Permit, a Lodger's Permit, a Residential Permit, all those permits. How many permits are there in terms of the regulations? --- Only two.

What are they? --- A Lodger's Permit and a Visitor's permit. The other document that is given to him proves that he resides there, as protection.

That is a card? --- Yes.

Saying that 'X' whoever the man is that is mentioned on the card, has got the authority to stay in Meadowlands? --- He has got a house.

And when that card is cancelled or when it is taken away like when a man leaves his job, then he no longer has got

the right to live there? --- Yes.

So why are you scared to call that a permit? --- I don't think it is a permit.

We won't argue about that. Now you say that the Superintendent issues a Visitor's Permit? --- Yes.

And a Visitor's Permit is to give a person authority to visit friends, relations? --- Yes.

I want to ask you quite frankly, - where do you live, by the way? --- Linden.

I take it that when your friends and relations want to visit you, there is no question of obtaining a pass for the purpose, a permit? They can visit you in your house whenever they wish to? That is correct? --- Yes.

Now assuming - place yourself in the position - I know it is extremely difficult for you to do so - but place yourself in the position of Parliament passing legislation which provided that in future if you wanted to be visited by your mother or by your sister, or by your brother, or even by your child who is over the age of eighteen....

BY THE P.P. :

I must object to that question. It is not for this witness to criticise or to say what Parliament is doing or what Parliament should do or shouldn't do.

BY MR. SLOVO :

I am not asking him to criticise it. I am just asking him what his reaction would be, and Your Worship might by now have gauged that the whole purport of my cross-examination is to suggest as I did on an earlier occasion with the Bantu Education Act, that the provision itself...

BY THE COURT :

The matter is best left for argument. This witness' opinion may differ from somebody else's. The Court wouldn't be bound by what he feels on the matter.

BY MR. SLOVO :

I may indicate a point too brought to my attention by Mr. Berrange which struck me at the time, is that the witness has already been called upon in the course of his evidence in chief to give an opinion on the fact that the people in Meadowlands are happy where they are. I submit that in view of that witness' expression of opinion whether the Crown directly asked for that answer or not, I am entitled to cross-examine the witness for the purpose of showing that far from the people in the Western Areas being happy at the removal, they all felt extremely perturbed and upset that this major turmoil in their life should be committed against...

COURT OVERRULES THE QUESTION.

BY MR. SLOVO :

You are aware that in a place like Meadowlands, where a resident there who has a mother, a brother a sister or a son over the age of eighteen, he cannot enter without committing an offence unless the Superintendent gives him a Visitor's permit. That is the position. And you think that makes the people there happy? I don't want a long peroration. You can be asked about that in re-examination. I want to ask you whether that is the sort of thing which people like and which makes people happy in Meadowlands. This one particular aspect? --- Compared to what they had in the Western Areas, they are very happy.

I am not asking you generally.

BY THE COURT :

We are concerned merely with this aspect of a Visitor's Permit. Do you know what the people's feeling is about that? Do they object to that? --- No, as far as I know they do not object.

So far/^{as}you know? --- Yes, I refer to Meadowlands.

BY MR. SLOVO :

What - I have given you two illustrations of the sort of differences that exist between a place like Meadowlands being a location, and a freehold area like Sophiatown. Can you yourself think of any other differences between a location and a freehold area like Sophiatown, of the sort that I have just described. The Permit system, the right to own land? --- The one is controlled and the other is not controlled to the same extent. It is difficult to know exactly what....

Is it also true that in a place like Sophiatown, a man could choose his neighbours? If he could get a house he could go and live next to anyone, in Sophiatown? --- Sophiatown was very much overcrowded.....

I am not interested in overcrowding. We will come to that just now, I promise you. Right now I am just asking you whether from your knowledge of Sophiatown, a man who wished to take up residence there, could choose his neighbours? He could go and live in any part of Sophiatown? --- Yes.

Can a man choose his neighbours in Meadowlands? --- Yes and no.

Let us hear about the no. What prevents him from choosing his neighbour? --- Because he is allocated a house in the beginning. If he does not want that house and he comes forward to the Superintendent and suggests that he wants a house in a particular area, that consideration is given.

Is there ethnic grouping in Meadowlands? --- Yes.

So a Zulu who wants to live next to his friend the Basuto, I take it he can't do that? --- No, he can't.

That is going too far. And what happens when a Zulu is married to a Basuto? --- He is given the election in which ethnic grouping he wants to go.

He can either go to the Zulu group or to the Basuto group? --- Yes.

And assuming he wants - assuming a man who is married to a Basuto woman chooses the Basuto group, in Meadowlands, he is a Zulu and then he divorces this woman and thereafter marries a Zulu, has he got to move out of the Basuto group into the Zulu area? --- I don't know. I haven't had any such example, we would have to consider it on its merits.

How far is Meadowlands from town? --- Approximately twelve miles from my office in the centre of town.

And how far is Sophiatown from town? --- Seven miles is it? From our office in the centre of town.

You think seven miles? --- Yes, approximately.

What is the rent which is required to be paid for a house in Meadowlands? --- It varies from £2 to £2 to £4. 4. 6. depending on the size of the house. It includes services, water and rubbish removal.

Tell me, what is the cost to a person who has a house of three bedrooms per month in rental? --- The maximum is £4. 4. 6.

What about children over sixteen? What happens to them? Have you got to pay extra for them? --- Over sixteen, no.

Haven't you...? --- I think you may be referring to eighteen.

Let us say eighttteen? --- Because the Board is not prepared to separate families, children over the age of eighteen have to pay a Lodger's fee.

So in other words, once a child is living with a family and he reaches the age of eighteen, he is as far as the authorities are concerned, the Resettlement Board, a lodger? --- A male child.

But he is a lodger, he has to pay a lodger's fee? --- Yes, females do not.

I am not interested in females. Don't be so sensi-

tive about this. It is correct then that in addition to this rent, if a man has got four or five children over the age of eighteen living with him, he has to pay 7/6d. per month for every such child? --- The lodger pays it.

The child pays it. The total rent is increased by 7/6d. for every child.

BY THE COURT :

Is that a male child only? --- Yes. All unmarried daughters are considered as part of the family.

BY MR. SLOVO :

What happens if a man is living in Meadowlands with his wife and they have got no children and the wife dies? Can the man maintain the house, or has he got to go and live in a hostel? --- I don't think I have had any such examples. We will have to consider it, presumably he will have to go to the hostel.

Presumably, yes. I believe that some people have been forced to go to the hostel. You wouldn't deny that? --- I have no knowledge of it.

Have you got a rented house? This house in which you live in Linden, is it a rented house? --- No.

It is your own house? --- Yes.

Have you ever lived in a rented house? --- Yes.

And I presume the occasion has never arisen, but in your case on failure to pay rent at the end of the month, I take it that you are aware that all that could happen to you is that you could be sued by the person to whom you owed the rent? --- And ejected.

Yes. As far as you know, you wouldn't be sent to gaol for not paying your rent? --- I don't think so.

And as far as you know, in a place like Sophiatown, which is a freehold area, the person who lives there, if he is

Collection: 1956 Treason Trial
Collection number: AD1812

PUBLISHER:

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

Location:- Johannesburg

©2011

LEGAL NOTICES:

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

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

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