

Ismail Jamie

LRC Oral History Project

19<sup>th</sup> August 2008

Int This is an interview with Advocate Ismail Jamie and its Tuesday the 19<sup>th</sup> of August (2008). Ismail, on behalf of the SALS Foundation in the United States, we really want to thank you for agreeing to participate in the LRC Oral History Project.

IJ Pleasure.

Int I was wondering whether we could start the interview...if you could talk about your early childhood memories growing up in South Africa under apartheid, and where you think your sense of social justice and injustice developed?

IJ Ok, you're asking me, sort of, to cast my mind back fairly long ago, given my advanced age.

Int (*Laughs*).

IJ We lived in a fairly middle-class family that to my recollection, or in my recollection, had not been directly affected in my own lifetime, by apartheid, as such, by things like removals, etc. Later on, as I became older, I realised there was obviously history which explained why we lived where we lived, which was in the Cape...on the Cape Flats and not in District Six or Bo-Kaap or where my family had come from; or Mowbray, in my father's case. But my family was very apolitical and in fact was a staunch Muslim family with everything that that entailed, which is, you obey the laws of the country and, you know, get on with your life. So, politics was never an issue in our family. My own political awareness and sense of social justice came about when I was 14 and the 1976 disturbances, or riots, as we call them, broke out, obviously in June 1976. It spread to...it began obviously in Soweto and within a week, I think, or two, had come down to the Cape, I was in standard seven at Belgravia High School, and that was...it was a very clear beginning to political consciousness because suddenly one was engaged in meetings with...I recall the older students, the Matrics and the standard nines had more political awareness and they would address us and we rapidly became a very politicised group of pupils at that age, in my case, 14. And then that...it was driven home the experience, because the police...our school in Belgravia, which was in Athlone, and Alexander Sinton were quite close to each other, and the students...and there were other schools in there, and we would march from one school to the other, and this was obviously against the...so the whole thing was...it was very formative because we were suddenly opposing figures of authority which we'd never dreamt of opposing before, the teachers, and the...our parents and the principal, and the department, let alone the police, we'd never had anything to do with the police, and suddenly there were police vehicles blocking us and eventually the police came onto the school premises and tear-gassed us, that was the...It was also when I decided I wanted to be a lawyer, I thought this is just outrageous that they would be doing this to us and one should be able to protect yourself, and I suppose the way my mind was wired I decided to do that as a lawyer, not as a revolutionary, guerrilla. And that's, I suppose, how it happened.

Int Right. So, you mentioned the 1976 riots as a turning point, how did that then sit in terms of you living in an apolitical family, did that...

IJ ...it led to a lot of friction in my...well, I mean, I was young I suppose they hoped that I would grow out of it, but, I didn't at the time and, ja, it was a period of, as I say, a formative period in my own life because by the time I left school at the end of...in '79 I had begun distancing myself, as it is, from my family, both in regard to values and things like religion, etc, so, it was a...They remained apolitical and I became very politicised and was...in fact, eventually became the chairperson of the SRC at the school in my Matric year or pre-Matric year.

Int Were you in any way ostracised during that period of...

IJ ...by my family or society?

Int ...no at school.

IJ Oh, at school?

Int Authorities, education authorities?

IJ Not really, they tried to work with us. I became chairperson of the SRC in 1978, I think, when I was in standard nine...

Int And the school was?

IJ Belgravia High School, the same school. And we established the SRC, there wasn't one there before. So they looked at us...the school authorities looked to us as providing some sort of leadership because obviously, it was a very tense and traumatic time, because authority had been challenged in a fundamental way, and people, kids were beginning to be far more radicalised. And I think the year that...after I left, there was the whole Committee of Ten, it was...I was no longer at school, I was at university, so, there was obviously a change. But the Committee of Ten, I'm not sure how old you are and where you fit into all of that, but it probably is before your time. But there were very radicalised and fairly sophisticated debates amongst students about politics and social issues and economics and...but by then I had left the school scene and was at university which was a totally different level of...

Int And the Committee of Ten arose when?

IJ About 1980, I think.

Int 1980. Was this part of the school boycott?

IJ It was part of the school boycotts, ja.

Int Right, ok.

IJ And a very, as I say, it was a very intense period of youth militancy and...which characterised that entire period up to and beyond, but certainly up to 1985, which were my university years. And then after '85 there were obviously, things like the Trojan Horse incident, and then for the first time, the community, in the areas that we'd grown up in, Athlone, the ordinary people and the mosques etc, there was then the whole Moslem (Muslim) influence as well. But then I remember very clearly, in fact it was one of the things that I remember about the LRC because...this is all morphing into one long story...but I was at the LRC in 1985 and I'll tell you how I got to there. But I was surrounded by essentially white law staff, there was myself and Wallace Mgoqi, I think, were the only people who were not white there, and I felt very often a sense of alienation. They did not understand because I was going...coming to the office in town and then going back to Athlone, which is where I lived, and the other people there had no idea of what was happening, and no real...they might have read the newspapers but they certainly did not appreciate what was happening in the areas that I came from...or the area I came from, let alone the black areas. And it was in that period after...about '85, '86, I would think, ja, '85, '86, that the community themselves, in certain coloured areas like Athlone, who before had been very apolitical, became far more politicised and the best example of that...It was after the Trojan Horse incident which outraged people, obviously, I remember, I think it was on Wednesday evenings, there would be candlelight vigils in...throughout the area, but particularly in the two main roads, Belgravia and Thornton Roads, people would actually put all the lights off and have candles in their windows, as a sign of protest and solidarity. That happened for a few months and the police were very, you know, aggressive, patrolling the area and so they alienated the community totally, and that was about the same time the UDF began and things began coalescing and basically, of course, by the time (Nelson) Mandela was released, the government had lost the battle for the hearts and minds of the...certainly the coloured population. Ja.

Int So, at the stage that you decided to go to university were you clear about what you wanted to do?

IJ I was very clear about what I wanted to do. I had decided I wanted to be a lawyer. I'm trying to think when did I decide I wanted to be an advocate? I think that came later. But I certainly knew I wanted to be a lawyer.

Int What resulted in that? What were some of the influences?

IJ The main influence was one of...how to describe the thing...a sense of outrage and injustice and the idea that my response to that was going to be that I would fight them

and, as I say, it was...or my conclusion was, it would be fighting them as a lawyer and standing up for my people or community, etc.

Int Did you think, especially under apartheid, that the law could be used as an instrument of social change to challenge the apartheid order?

IJ I didn't think of it in such sophisticated terms, I thought of it merely as representing people, I suppose, because I saw kids being chased and tear-gassed and people being...and we also at that point, as a school...as part of the SRC, so that would have been in the '77, '78, we would, as students, we were involved in...I can't remember what the organisation, or organisations were, but we would go to a place like Crossroads, that was before Khayelitsha had been established, so Crossroads was the most accessible, and we would go there to...don't think we were very effective, but we would go there and try to help out...help people, and that, sort of, made it obviously very right in your face, I was experiencing that directly. At UCT I also worked in the Legal Aid Clinics and we'd also go out to areas like Crossroads and...what's another place they had a Clinic? I forget...Elsies River, I think.

Int What was...?

IJ There you had the direct experience, even as a student, of listening to people and those were the first, sort of, statements that I took or accounts of people's lives that...and it reinforced the idea that...you know? So I always had a, sort of, burning sense of wanting to address social injustice, but certainly not...I can't say it was a very intellectualised idea till well into university, when I began to learn about those ideas and concepts. It was a more straightforward thing that I would be a lawyer and I would be able to prevent police from beating people, etc.

Int Right. When you chose to go to UCT did you then at the Law Clinic, work with UWC and their law clinics?

IJ No, there wasn't much communication between UCT and UWC at that point, in the eighties. I know we'd go to UWC for student meetings on occasion, but I can't...I certainly can't recall...can't recall joint clinics.

Int And did you at university, continue in terms of student politics at all?

IJ Student politics at university?

Int Yes...

IJ I did, um, well, not in the formal sense, I never...because obviously there was the whole total...was we had a contradictory position that we were there as black students under permits, and UCT was a very racially stratified institution. Probably still is, but

certainly then it was. And students didn't mix, and we had a small group of friends who were...or people who hung out together, and there was a bit of racial mixing within that group, but the vast majority of white students were engaged in what university students get up to, which is drinking and carousing, and having fun and studying. And we were there as...and there were all sorts of...and obviously there were different groups of students, and there were all gradations of radical students right across the spectrum from the far left to the loony right to...I forget the name...it was a social democratic party, there was...the Moslem (Muslim) students were there as an influence, there were the Jewish students as Zionists, and the progressive Jews, so it was a total confusion.

Int And so you didn't get involved in NUSAS politics, student politics at all?

IJ No, black students didn't get involved in NUSAS, um...

Int So were you part of SASO at the time?

IJ I was certainly not part of NUSAS, I was part of...I can't...I don't think...and it wasn't as if you were a member of the party but you obviously supported a party, SASO I suppose. But then also there were more ground...ground level organisations that sprung up or that sprung up...groups of students that sprung up in response to situations or issues, and I recall...now that would have been because there were also student boycotts, and I was there from 1980 to '84, so probably in '81, '82 maybe, there were...certainly...because there were also student boycotts in the school system, in the Cape. My future wife was involved in that and didn't write her exams because of that. I...and then students were boycotting at UCT as well, and there was something...some students wanted to compel the other students not to sit for exams and go to lectures, you can imagine all of that? The vast majority of students, the white students, were not interested at all, there was still a lot of tension, there were sit-ins there were demonstrations on...close to the highway, and the police...the normal thing that went on. We had interminable meetings of...the meetings would...I can't remember what the organisations...SASO certainly would have been some, and then there were the black students who saw themselves differently and there were the BC students, of course, who had their own issues, no-one was openly ANC, but clearly that was the sub text; this is all before the UDF by the way.

Int Sure.

IJ Well, I remember interminable meetings where people would have these discussions and...because some group took a particular intellectual line, they'd become totally hostile to some other group where you were all fighting broadly for the same thing, but these intellectual...typical university...almost intense intellectualising, which drove me insane, I couldn't stand the incessant, interminable meetings discussing theory. I remember getting onto a stage once, when we were having a mass meeting at Jammie, and saying we should march to town, that's what I thought, it was a very unintellectual response and it was Tony Weaver came to tell me how that wasn't a good idea, he was one of the NUSAS leaders, and we'd probably be hurt if we

marched off campus, because the police...there was a tacit understanding the police would not come onto campus, unless we broke the law. So, we would stay on campus and they would stay just below campus watching us when we wouldn't...The one time we tried to march down to Rondebosch, we were tear-gassed and baton-charged, including the white students, and we all retreated in confusion to UCT, back to the campus. So that was, ja, those were the student years, which were fairly politicised.

Int So, you did an LLB?

IJ I did.

Int Right. And what made you decide then to become a Fellow at the Legal Resources in 1985?

IJ I...I actually didn't...I did quite well at 'varsity and probably graduated in the top ten percent of my class, but could not get Articles. I applied to all the large, obviously white firms, in town and didn't get an offer from any of them. Then began, sort of, looking at other firms and...sorry, let me just think of this...was that the first...ja. I'm trying to...I don't actually recall how I got onto the LRC, whether it was an advert. They had just established the Cape Town office, Geoff Budlender and Lee Bozalek and William Kerfoot, and...and Shehnaz Meer, of course. And myself, Henk Smith and Wallace (Mgoqi) were the first Fellows in Cape Town certainly; I think there may have been Fellows a year before in Johannesburg. But I can't recall whether they advertised in the newspaper...how I came to know them...maybe I was referred to them. Then I went for an interview...there is just one correct...I think that may have been also fairly early, because I certainly started at the beginning of the year, so...I'm just trying to recall when I would have gone for that interview, probably toward the end of '84. But by then I had...I definitely had sent out applications, because I obviously wanted to do my Articles and then go into practice. But when I went for the interview, I knew nothing about the LRC, at the time I went for the interview. Hearing what they did, it struck a chord with me and I decided that was something that I would really enjoy, even though it did not count toward Articles at that point. But I also felt an affinity for the people who interviewed me, I think I was interviewed by, not by Geoff (Budlender), but by the other three and I thought I could work here, and I was offered the job, so that was very...I was very glad about that and...ja.

Int Those were heady times because, the LRC had started in 1979 and then quite early on they had the major test case victories, Rikhoto and Komani...

IJ Rikhoto...that's correct.

Int ...and when you were a Fellow, did you feel empowered by those victories, did you feel that the kind of work you were doing would...?

IJ Oh, absolutely, a lot of the work I did was Pass Law work in the Cape Town office, a big part of the work was Pass Law work.

Int I wonder whether you could talk a bit about that?

IJ We dealt with a law firm which acted for the Western Cape Development Board; the cases we were doing...obviously the LRC was impact litigation, I didn't quite understand back then the strategy and the thinking behind it, now, I suppose, I've got a better idea. But the one thing was that we did not do...we weren't focusing on individual cases, the idea was to have cases that had the most effect on as broad a range of people as possible. Particular cases I was involved in, were Pass Law cases on the one hand, and then Labour on the other, which I also knew nothing about. And Labour was obviously developing then into a major area of tradi...not traditional activism but just an area which had not been explored before, and which offered a lot of opportunity to improve people's lives in one of the most fundamental ways that they interacted with the state and the powers that be. So that was very interesting, I did a lot of Labour and we would usually act for trade unions, SACAWU and other progressive unions that were trying to advance worker rights. That was a big part of my work and that was a learning curve because I had never...I hadn't done Labour Law at 'varsity, knew nothing about it, it was a new area, Industrial Courts were reasonably new then, I think. And we did a lot of...I did a lot of that, and then the other thing was the Pass Law work which...I always got...I mean, with the Pass Law work, the Rikhoto and other cases had been won by then, so, you had the ground work but it was a daily attritional battle because we were fighting the department and their lawyers and they were, I mean, there's some of them still in practice today. They were determined to peg back as much as possible and you had to fight every inch trying to prove someone's status, and gathering documents and doing leg work, trying to show that this person was entitled and interpreting what the law allowed, pushing...trying to push the boundaries as much as possible, kids and wives and dependents and...It was frustrating, the Pass work, because definitely the system did not want these people there, and they were trying to roll it back as much as possible.

Int Right. Given that under apartheid, parliament was supreme, what do you think were the reasons that those legal victories that were garnered by the...

IJ Were not set...set aside. It's very interesting. I've thought about that on occasion. I think it is because they realised that they could not turn back the tide, that these people were, in effect, going to be...they had established permanent...a permanent presence in so-called 'white' South Africa and that was the reality of the situation. They could continue denying them political rights, but couldn't deny them the actual realisation of their physical presence here, and that they should deal with it rather than, you know, continue applying grand apartheid. And I suppose there was a sense of realism; they could achieve their objectives without the...all the apparatus of grand apartheid which meant that black people were not to be given longer than whatever it was...seventy-two hours. And together with that obviously came things like, even though it was very late and never very well done, but the realisation that they would then have to build schools, and houses and...so that began, but...and I suppose it was a sense that they could not undo what had already been done.

Int When I interview people, you always get this feedback, I would call it, about the strange anomaly, a kind of reverence for the rule of law...

IJ On the part of the Nats?

Int Yes, what's your sense of what was going on at the time?

IJ I don't know about reverence about the rule of law...um...

Int (*Laughs*). It's perhaps an obduracy, maybe that's a correct...

IJ I think...I think it's...I wouldn't say to their credit, but, firstly they had obviously a very positive...positivist view of the law, and being an adherent to the rule of law isn't in itself a virtue because it depends on the laws; we all know the Nazis...it was entirely legal the way they came into power. And the gulags, I think, were, in terms of Soviet Law and people are executed in terms of Chinese Law, so...the law is the law...the law is the law is not the entire picture. I think Afrikaners, I mean, this is now my own view, untested or anything, I think as a nation, are quite conservative and rigid both by religious indoctrination and just by their nature, and they need rules, or as a people who were running the country they wanted rules, they wanted to have institutions that had at least the semblance of order. Which would also, of course, explain why the military never staged a coup at the time that de Klerk was handing over power, you know. In fact, the one thing that never, sort of, arose here, was the spectre of the apartheid military saying: well, bugger this, we're going to take over, we're not going to allow you to do this, which is, sort of, almost a default position in South America and Asia, etc, the military...

Int ...intervenes...

IJ ...would almost certainly have stepped...have stepped in when the civilians looked as if they were about to relent. That never happened here because, as a society, we seem to be hidebound by rules, which is why, I think, it's another...it's still demonstrated now, we generate, you know, we seem to think that the best way...or our leaders...our rulers think the best way of dealing with all our crises is to generate more and more laws and rules and norms etc, but no-one applies them. So Parliament churns them out and we think it's fine that we have a wonderful Constitution and piece of legislation in place, but we all drive like maniacs, including people in law get drunk and drive and etc, so no-one actually internalises the rule of law, but you externalise it, and you feel comfortable that there are rules. I'm not a psychologist, that's my idea. (*Laughter*). (*You're sure I can't get you coffee or tea?*)

Int (*I'm ok, thank you*).

IJ (*Do you want to take a break; I just want to order something.*)



*(Interruption).*

Int (Sure.)

*(Interview resumes after a break)*

Int And, so...what you said earlier about being at the LRC, in terms of people in the office not really understanding where you came from and your world, do you think that translated to other aspects of being at the office in terms of an organisation?

IJ I think so, the LRC was, I mean, the LRC did incredibly important work back in the 80s, I think, and...but, the extent to which that work was...the best, sort of, interventions that could have taken place is debatable and if you talk to someone from the BLA or other perspective, they would have a different view, I'm sure. And, you know, I was not privy to the strategic thinking and the manner in which cases were chosen, at the LRC, back then. And since then I think there have been...there have been issues and I'm not sure to what extent the LRC is entire...I still it still has an aura of being a largely white organisation, with...staffed by white lawyers, and that might be unfortunate, it might even be untrue, but one of the issues is the extent to which the LRC has, and I can only speak of the Cape Town office, I don't know about the others, has used black advocates to do their work here in the Cape, and it hasn't been very much at all. So, you know, there are those nagging issues and I recall there were some instances where I just felt they were entirely out of touch and...

Int Whilst you were a Fellow?

IJ While I was a Fellow, well, I was, sort of, young and angry and obviously being affected by what was happening in the townships, and half of them were largely unaware of it, or, not attuned to it. Of course, it begs the question: what could they have done about it? But...

Int The Cape Town office has always been regarded as somewhat unique...it has a composition of people who have stayed on for a very long period of time, and still are there, but the other offices are different. And I'm wondering, when you were a Fellow...there must have been AGMs, etc, what was your level of interaction with other offices and, for example, with someone such as Arthur Chaskalson, did you get much interaction with Mahomed Navsa...they were doing good labour work in Johannesburg, there was Karel Tip, Charles Nupen, Paul Pretorius...?

IJ I didn't get a lot of...I didn't have a lot of interaction with them, we did not...we... certainly, I think that went for all of us, Henk (Smith), as well at that point. We did not...we weren't moved around from office to office and we weren't working on cases that were national cases, so, we were in our own offices, we interacted with them when we were at...we had, sort of, one AGM which...and there I met Arthur (Chaskalson) and Sydney Kentridge and...

*(interruption, interview resumes soon thereafter.)*

Int So, you were saying, you met others at the AGM...?

IJ But, but, but it was essentially at the...ja, at a formal occasion, there weren't conferences or, you know, work conferences as such, it was the AGM, which obviously was dealing with...

Int Right. the LRC even though it did take Labour cases and Charles (Nupen) did Labour cases in Johannesburg, there was a sense that there was a reluctance to take Labour cases?

IJ That's correct, that was conveyed to me as well, but, notwithstanding that, a large part of my work...a large part of the work that we did in the office was Labour. But they certainly tried to, you know, take on cases that had, as I was saying, either where unions were involved, or where a principle was involved. So, the one case was someone wearing a UDF insignia, or something, those cases were taken on. But, Labour certainly played a large role; I know we used to churn out Unfair Dismissal applications, very often, obviously in the context of strikes and that sort of thing.

Int In terms of working with people in the office...did you get a sense that there were racial dynamics, quite apart from what you've mentioned earlier in terms of not understanding the world, but actual racial tensions, gender tensions...?

IJ Within the office?

Int Yes, exactly.

IJ Gender tensions?

Int Mm.

IJ Um, I know Shehnaz Meer was pregnant when I was there, I was not aware of gender tensions within the office, I always...their interactions between themselves and with us, you know, they were in charge and, you know, she certainly didn't seem to defer to anyone, Shehnaz (Meer), Lee (Bozalek) was in charge the year that I was there, and he had a certain...I probably felt closer to William Kerfoot whom I worked with more, and then I think Matthew Walton came there towards the end of my year in '85 and Matthew (Walton) was very approachable too. Lee (Bozalek), sort of, was in charge so he had a bit more distance, but he and I have become friends subsequently, so that's interesting. Racial politics...racial tensions I didn't experience in the office, no, except for the sense of, you know, they weren't quite in tune with what was happening, because Shehnaz (Meer) didn't live in the townships either, she lived in Woodstock with Joel then, so...well, not Woodstock, in town.

Int Right, ok. So, after your Fellowship, where did you go to then?

IJ I then continued to try and get Articles with equal spectacular lack of success, till I managed to get Articles at a firm run by somebody called Ben van der Ross who was more a businessman, even then he subsequently went to the IDC and to...he's done all sorts of other things, and he had a small firm that had offices in Cape Town and in Mitchell's Plain and I eventually ended up in the Mitchell's Plain office, which is where I did Articles for two years.

Int Right, this may seem kind of a naive question but what do you think was your sense of...

*(Interruption, interview resumes soon thereafter)*

IJ *(Which one is the...sorry, which one is the decaf?)*

Int *(Decaf, ok, thank you.)*

IJ My sense of?

Int ...the difficulties of getting Articles at that time, what would you attribute that to?

IJ Because my marks, or my, ja, my marks were very good, well, certainly, I mean, I may not have got any class prizes, but I had passed everything and people who got Articles, you know, people whom I knew from my class got Articles and they certainly were not as...had not done as well as me, at university. I'd also just come from a year's Fellowship at the LRC, but that also didn't count for much and...So, I think it was...I attribute it largely to a race thing...

Int Ok.

IJ ...go on...

Int So, you get Articles and the type of work that you do in Articles, is it primarily commercial or...?

IJ No, it wasn't commercial at all, I did...the Articles that I got was useful in one sense because I literally...I virtually was running my own practice. I was given cases and these were my cases, I had to go and do them, and I did a lot of Criminal Law which I had not had any experience with at all then, obviously you don't do that at the LRC, and I was appearing in court every day, and then...for most of those two years and so I learnt to speak Afrikaans, which I couldn't do before then, because I had to, and I learnt to cross examine and to lead witnesses and to fight with prosecutors, so it was

intensive, and then also I was coming back and having...So each day I would leave home and not go to the office, I never went to the office, I would go to a court to go and do a case or two or two courts, and then I'd get back to the office mid morning or lunch time and I would then sit with...the secretary would have taken out the files that had been...because we had a system where you worked on a file, you answered correspondence or something, and then you diarised it for two weeks hence, so, matters were coming up, sort of, very...ja, so once every two weeks you'd look at a file unless something happened to have the file brought to you before then. And it was having to deal with case management, dealing with attorneys, writing letters, you know, the way you would as running your own practice.

Int It's ironic, in a way, because, clearly you couldn't get Articles at the top law firms, , based on race, but it seems to me that you were thrown in the deep end and probably did well because of that...

IJ I was thrown in the deep end and probably did very well because of that experience. I did so well in the sense that my services were so well regarded at the firm, that by the time my Articles ended, they really wanted me to stay, but by then I'd decided, during Articles, because then I had come across advocates, and experienced advocates, so, there was no doubt I was going to be an advocate. I sat for the attorneys admissions, and passed it. Articles was two years and my two years were coming up, I think the end of December, or something, in 1987, would have been then for two years, but I was so determined to go to the Bar and I mean, it was something...I tell people...it's quite bizarre, I'd never advise anyone to do, but I did not complete the Articles, I...because I was determined I was going to have a holiday, I'd worked now for three years without a break and I thought I deserved a holiday so I managed to get some...save some money and I was going to go to Europe for my big adventure and my booking was...I forget whatever date in December, it was two weeks short of my finishing Articles. And the option was to not go on holiday or to finish Articles, and I said: bummer this, I'm going on holiday and I'm going to the Bar. And they said: but you can't do that, you've done your exam, all you must do is finish your Articles. I said: no, I don't intend staying here, I'm going to the Bar. And they offered me...by the time I finished my Articles, I was earning more than lots of guys earn in white firms, because they wanted to keep me, and etc, so, from that point of view it all worked out very well because I left, went on holiday, came back and came to the Bar, which is where I've been ever since.

Int Right. So that brings me back to the current post-apartheid context. What have been some of the lack of transformation, the difficulties in the Cape Town Bar, and the judiciary more generally that you perceive as problems and that may have led, in fact, to the current crisis?

IJ To the current crisis? Um, the law is naturally conservative, I suppose, and lawyers, and to a large extent it's changing and it's probably changed in the last five, ten years, but for the majority of the time I've been at the Bar, and certainly, I mean, in my own case the...my career, I think, is a reflection of this. Initially I got work, firstly I struggled to get work initially, so it was very...it started off slowly. I then began to get work, but all the work I did, the vast majority of work...well, firstly I got work from

virtually no white firms, it was all black firms, coloured firms, but then it was in the mid 80s leading up to, obviously, the 90s, and a lot of work then was political work, so, and there were lots of black advocates who were doing public violence cases, we were doing terrorism cases, we were doing...and we were going all over, we were briefed by a number of firms and some of those were white firms, like Mallinicks did that sort of work as well, so, we'd get briefed by them but only for that work, the commercial department would never brief you. That was the case with all those firms, you'd never get work that wasn't political work, but I was going all over...not all over the country, but certainly all over the Cape and the Eastern Cape and...

Int ...doing political work?

IJ ...doing political work...

Int Interesting...

IJ ...going to Worcester, driving up...

Int Did you do any major political cases, at the time?

IJ Not major, my cases were in the Magistrates and Regional Courts, I never did a major case...I never did a case in the High Court, in fact my criminal career in the then Supreme Court, was spectacular and brief. I did one case and my client turned out to be absolutely insane, and that was the end of it. So, I only ever did one...one murder case, only ever did one criminal case in the High Court. All the other cases were Regional Courts, but they were also very intensive because you always...there was absolute legal warfare, you were fighting the State, the State and the Prosecutor and the Magistrates were together and you had to stand against this and...ja. Those were very intense because there was no question about what was going on there, it was war. That went on for three, four years, and then I...my practice hadn't taken off after about five years, I was still doing that sort of work, that work was tailing off but I was still mainly acting for...was doing a lot of legal aid work, a lot of...again almost exclusively if not exclusively, for black law firms, and I decided this was just not what I wanted to do, so I then applied for a Fellowship...a scholarship...sorry, Fellowship, and got a Fulbright Scholarship to go to the States and ended up at Temple University which was not my first choice, I wanted to go to Columbia. And that was also a good experience; despite being at a university I wouldn't have chosen.

Int Did you do a LLM?

IJ I did an LLM.

Int Right. Was that in a particular aspect of law?

IJ It was International Law, Constitutional Law, because that was '92 and '93 so it was quite a propitious time to be learning something about Constitutional Law, that was very...it was actually a very useful exercise, because when I came back I knew something about Constitutional Law.

Int Sure, right. And so when you came back, did you find that things had changed since then?

IJ My practice took off.

Int Right.

IJ I got a major brief, my first major brief was to act for the City Council in respect of the...there was a big dispute about the cableway, which had nothing to do with politics, it was a pure Administrative, Commercial Law dispute involving a lot of money. I was briefed there and my practice took off from there. And I've had a decent practice ever since, totally different to the practice I had before, like chalk and cheese.

Int So have you been briefed frequently at all by the LRC and if, when and for what case?

IJ I haven't been briefed frequently by the LRC...

Int Right, what do you think...

IJ ...I was briefed once by...I was briefed...I'm trying to think whether they briefed me in the TRC matter, I don't think so. No, I haven't been briefed very much by the LRC at all. The one big brief I had in the year...in all the years I've been at the Bar, was the Richtersveld brief from Henk (Smith)...

Int Could you talk a bit about that, what aspect thereof...?

IJ It was a case...look, I mean, I can't take any credit for the case, I was brought in right at the end, they had already won the Constitutional Court case that established the right to restitution, so the only question was the form of it, and the amounts of it, and that's where I was brought in as one of the counsel. Henk (Smith), whom I like a lot, tells me...but he's being very dear and not very honest when he says that I was the first choice and Gerrit Grobbelaar who was against us, was like, third choice, or something, to be brought in to assist Wim (Tregove) and Pete and Geoff Budlender. But it was nice working with all of them, all people I respect a lot, and...but we worked on...it was a very technical part of the case, it had no greater, sort of, what is the word I'm looking for...it wasn't a very strategic intervention and the work I was doing was not anything that was ground-breaking in the sense...well, it was, but it was ground-breaking in the technical sense that we were looking for compensation also in

relation to mineral...not the rights so much as the value of the minerals and diamonds that were taken out during those seventy years they were running the mines, and we thought that the community should be entitled to some compensation in that regard too. And that...but the problem that arose, and I'm sure you've heard this from other people who have been involved in the case, the dynamics of that case were quite complicated. I don't know when they started because I only became involved then, but eventually, as you probably know, the dynamics led to LRC and the claimants parting ways and in fact, you know...

Int That's been fairly recent though?

IJ That was recent, we were not involved then, that's because, in part, I think, and this happens, I've got a good friend who does this sort of litigation in the States and ja the expectations between the lawyers, the lawyers sometimes have their own...I'm not saying that's the case with the LRC but, from the LRC's point of view there were certain things that they wanted to achieve, and they largely achieved them arguably in the Constitutional Court case which confirmed the SCA case. Thereafter, I think the LRC lawyers were looking to see what could be legally achieved using, again, the available resources to maximum effect whereas the community, I think, had something else in mind, or just didn't fully understand where the LRC was coming from. The community eventually began, or parts of the community began talking to government and the lawyers themselves, and they then became...and government played a very...less than honourable role in all of this, Alec Erwin, etc, etc, eventually they cut a deal, cutting out the lawyers.

Int Right...

IJ And hopefully the community is going to, you know, do well and prosper under what they now have, I sincerely hope so.

Int What do you think are the reasons for the LRC not briefing you more frequently, is it the nature of your practice or what other factors would be...?

IJ I don't know, um, it could be...aspects of it could be pers...no, sorry, that's not...they did brief me, there was a guy there called Kobus...

Int Pienaar?

IJ Ja, Kobus Pienaar would brief me on occasion. But I certainly have never been regularly briefed by the LRC. Maybe I wasn't regarded as being socially sufficiently in tune with...or sufficiently progressive. I've also ended up, I must confess, acting for government very often.

Int Really?

- IJ Ja. A large part of my practice is now government, but I mean, that's not by choice, it's the way, I mean, as you know, the way lawyers, the way advocates work. My...the case I'm proudest of is the Grootboom case, but also saddest about because, as you know, we didn't ultimately assist Irene Grootboom herself, who died recently, I mean, in poverty.
- Int Now LRC was Amicus in that case?
- IJ They were Amicus, that's correct.
- Int So what was your role in the Grootboom case?
- IJ I acted for Irene Grootboom, we brought the case, initially.
- Int Ok. Can you talk a bit about that, given...your close involvement?
- IJ The case...my involvement in the case began with attorney Julian Appolis who was one of my attorneys in other matters, and Julian had a one-man practice, I think, at that point, and he happened to be in court when the community was appearing in court without lawyers, and the magistrate to his or her credit, said: no, you people need lawyers, so Appolis, you are in court, you're a lawyer, I think you should assist these people. And Julian (Appolis) had no background in this sort of litigation at all, because he and I worked together, he came...he first went somewhere else, got advice and was told: no, there's no hope, you can't, you know, these people have...Because really what they'd done is, they had moved onto land without permission, so it was, sort of, almost a form of land invasion, albeit that they'd been evicted from other land before that. And when he...and the situation, when he came to me, and I must say when we looked at it...we looked at it from the point of view of the position that they were in at the moment, which was, it was winter, they were a large community, lots of kids and so we went out and looked at the situation. And without much legal analysis, I must confess, decided that, look here, there is a Constitution, it does have these rights. I mean, this is simply intolerable, you can't have this situation with...And we then began the correspondence to all three levels of government saying, you know, we're not too concerned about who does what, but something has to be done and whatever...at the most basic level, you need to do something, you can't ignore the situation. And government was caught...it was the first time that a right to shelter had been asserted in legal papers, or in a court, and they were caught certainly on the back foot. And initially the correspondence, as I recall it, was very...well, no, you know, first they pointed fingers at each other and said: there's nothing we can do, you know, we're not in the business of making emergency accommodation. And we said: you have to have an emergency component to your plans, it's not good enough that you just have these...and that ultimately, obviously, is what the Grootboom case established, that there has to be...although not everyone is entitled to even emergency accommodation on demand, the plan must have the component that provides for emergency reactions and for crisis situations, you can't just have your long-term roll out. So it was a worthwhile case from that point of view and hopefully it will be built on, and can still be built on, while realising that people are going to fall through the



cracks like, Irene Grootboom did, which is tragic, given the fact that she was instrumental in the case. But it...but it, ja, it was a case that...it was very intense and it was certainly the highlight of my professional life, winning that case.

Int Interesting...

IJ But that being said, and I've told him before, Geoff Budlender was absolutely superb. The arguments as articulated by the Amicus through Geoff (Budlender) were far better developed than our arguments. I did not argue the case but...which was...also I didn't feel, at that point, able to argue a case of that magnitude, but the LRC, the Amicus' case was brilliantly argued by Geoff (Budlender).

Int In terms of the current crisis in the judiciary... just to get your sense in terms of rule of law in the post apartheid context, the attacks on the Constitutional Courts and judges, etc, what are some of your concerns, a, and b, how do Public Interest Law organisations then function in that milieu, given that their mandate is partly to take on government where necessary?

IJ I think it's essential that we respect the judiciary and...for their position is...is independent and is not threatened. But that being said, the problem is that there are these racial schisms and divides, and they come up, I mean, I haven't read it but I see there's a BLA response to Traverso DJP's recent ruling in respect of the Road Accident Fund, which you may or may not know about. It's got a whole lot of racial undertones there. Because the government's trying to reform the Road Accident Fund system where they'll now make direct payments to the claimants not to the lawyers and the lawyers took them on and Traverso dismissed or punished the RAF with attorney/client cost orders, there's a whole lot of...and I see the BLA...and obviously it's politicised...the BLA has come to the party. The point about that is that we must recognise, as public interest, both organisations and lawyers, the sensitivities that surround issues like the Hlophe thing. The Constitutional Courts did not cover itself in glory in the way it went about the...from the moment that they issued the statement, I thought but this is totally strange, you can't...you know, if you're not the people who were...

Int ...approached.

IJ ...suborned or approached, whatever, how can you be making a complaint on behalf of other people, you just can't, I mean, for one you're cancelling...and that's what they've done. The whole Constitutional Court has recused itself from any consideration of the (John) Hlophe saga and unless they play it properly, which I think they can do, they also imperilled their decisions in the (Jacob) Zuma case, so...That to me was just incredibly short-sighted and very bad...badly thought out intervention by them, it should have been done, what's her name, um, Kate...

Int ...O'Regan.

IJ ...O'Regan should never have been involved because she was not one of the persons approached, it should have been done through the Chief Justice or the Deputy Chief Justice.

Int He was away at the time...

IJ He was away at the time? Therefore it should have been then, whoever, so if O'Regan was then in charge, fair enough, then it should have been done through her, but it should have been the two judges and her, making a complaint and it should have been given to (John) Hlophe beforehand, not the way it was done. Because of the way it was done, it adds grist to the mill of those who say this is all a conspiracy...which obviously is absolute rubbish; this is not part of the (Jacob) Zuma...anti Zuma conspiracy. But what it is getting morphed into and becoming part of, is the wider debate, which is largely polarised along racial lines in this country, and it's about judicial transformation, which is part of an even broader debate about general transformation, which I don't need to tell you about. And on that score, the fact of the matter is, those people in my position, I have a successful practice, but even in my own position I can see that there is still a division in the way work is dished out, in the way people get work, in the way companies give lawyers work and, you know, you can see the influence of those who used to be in charge largely...

Int ...exist.

IJ ...continues to exist. We can all be very nice to each other, etc, but, at the end of the day when you speak to colleagues, you know, subliminal and very often overt, racism comes to the fore so...I've been with people who would say: well, ok, who's the judge? X is the judge. Oh, god, like, you know, no, we've got to think of changing the judge, or something like that. I've told some of them, you...totally...you're being totally racist. No, we're not being racist we're just, you know, he or she is incompetent, or something, but I mean, it would never have been dreamt of before that you would go and try and change the judge. Too often, I think, we do play the race card on both sides of the divide. The Hlophe thing began, and the tragedy is that someone like (John) Hlophe and his supporters genuinely believe that what he's doing, well, certainly his supporters, I don't know whether he does, because of course he has problems which we know about, but I believe a lot of his supporters actually believe that he is the victim of a racial conspiracy. And the problem is that, to some extent, he is the victim of a racial conspiracy, in this sense that, a lot of the more established people at this Bar and in other parts of society think that someone like him should not be the Judge President down here. He...even before, lots of his corruption-related charges came about, with regard to his pushing for transformation, people took umbrage at that, and regarded that as being something which he should not be doing. And now of course, because he's become a lightning rod for both transformation and anti-corruption or corruption, the two are now almost equated, so now...and that's the tragedy that the real need for transformation, which I think any sensible person would realise, is not being addressed because it's being personalised and becoming part of this 'we must protect Hlophe against his detractors', and his detractors, my point is, if I make any sense in this confusion, is, his detractors are very often not motivated by the noble ideals that they claim. His defenders are themselves not standing up for the

noble ideals they claim because they're protecting someone who actually has major problems, and has not satisfactorily explained his own flaws and his involvement in things he shouldn't have been involved in, so...And transformation ultimately is suffering, our judicial system...I've just spoken to someone I know, today, who was charged...arrested for drunken driving over the weekend, went to court yesterday and was told to come back in December. Now that is the way our system works. I've just been a victim of crime myself and I lodged a complaint and I'm still trying to find out who the detective is who is going to be dealing with the case. So, on that level, where ordinary people are interacting with the judicial or police system, it doesn't work. And that's where we should be focusing our attentions, making the system, you know, more gender sensitive, more efficient, just, more child sensitive. Training people, making the judiciary not some, you know, retirement sinecure but actually making it...training people to want to be judicial officers across the board, rationalising our system so that you can progress from being a magistrate to a judge.

Int But in that vein, wouldn't you say the transformation may have been ratcheted up too quickly, because there are people being placed as judges, purely on the basis of colour, who may in fact not be ready, they may be good lawyers but not ready to be judges, which is a different...

IJ Absolutely, but it's part of, you see, we unfortunately are the victims of our own past, in the sense that a transparent meritorious system is not the way we've chosen judges in the past, it's been on this basis of...

Int Of course.

IJ ...you become a senior advocate because your peers regard you as being, you know, sufficiently qualified and then we'll take our judges from them, from the senior advocates. So, it's always been a non-transparent process, you know, somebody, sort of, touched...you'll become a judge, you'll become a judge. And now that method of non-transparency comes through still, just the colour of the people are now different. Whereas really what we need is, I agree with you, is a training process and a mind-set that you understand you're a judge in a constitutional state and you have certain constitutional values that you must advance in every decision, in every decision you make. Whether you're postponing a matter, you do so in a manner that, you know, is dignified for the people involved, etc, you don't mistreat people or whatever it is, you've got to infuse the entire system, so, there are a lot of judges, untransformed judges, so, not only the new guys, the problem is across the board in the sense that the older people, the older judges they are not judges who are attuned to a constitutional state, and you see that on occasion in the cases you appear in. They just have no idea what a constitutional state requires, and then you get the problem you've mentioned, people are not ready.

Int I'm curious, you have a Public Interest Law background and given the nature of your practice, as you say, you then take cases for government...

IJ Sorry?

- Int So in that context, given that there...it seems to me that for example if you take the LRC, it has garnered victories against government but those legal victories aren't in fact obeyed, so then you have a slew of contempt orders, how does that work in a constitutional democracy?
- IJ I'm not sure that is...you're saying that as a general proposition...I know there's cases in the Eastern Cape, the pension cases, etc.
- Int Yes...Eastern Cape...exactly...that's the one I'm referring to...those are the ones.
- IJ Ja, sure. I certainly don't think it's a case where government, as a general rule, ignores court...I would hope not, and I haven't come across that.
- Int But I'm speaking specifically of the LRC's victories in the Eastern Cape.
- IJ About the LRC's victories in the Eastern Cape, pension cases?
- Int Yes
- IJ Those, I think, I would hope are not the norm, and they must be dealt with, you cannot have them in a constitutional state, clearly. My own experience is that where government loses a case, they comply with the cases...they comply with the orders.
- Int Ok.
- IJ Of course, there...you know, there are degrees of compliance where the order's not specific so if it's a structural interdict, like there, there are all sorts of housing cases at the moment, which is one of the most problematic in the sense of people's access to housing, and is government doing enough? The problem is, the legal process should be used, in my own view, as...you know, you can't...judges can't re-order society, they can't be social engineers, legal victories are important, but they are symbolic, they spur people on, they give you inspiration, and they may unblock, sort of, particular bottlenecks on occasion, very specific sort of things like Grootboom in the sense that it now says: oh, you have to do this, now it's for government to go and do it. It's very difficult to then monitor always, and that's where we as Public Interest lawyers, I think, need maybe more training, more experience, more commitment, more, you know, it needs to be identified at a level where you can use maximum...the resources. And that perhaps is where, I mean, something that's begging for the LRC to take up, in my view, is the post-Grootboom type monitoring to see whether regular audits and if not...because the Constitutional Court has left that open, it says that if government does not comply with that obligation, you know, you must come back to court. So, you know, and no-one's done that as far as I'm aware, to look to see, ok, how many houses has government built, what is your programme, you know, how are you advancing on this, because at the moment it's been left up to them to do, they can

decide at their own pace, and fifteen...what is it now...fifteen years down the line almost...

Int Sure.

IJ ...fourteen years down the line, it's...it's a crime that in the twenty-first century we have people living in...and each year...another thing is, I mean, I'm aware of this from other cases, each year with monotonous regularity in the same areas, there's flooding, winter flooding in Cape Town. Now, you know, no-one can protect the population against unexpected natural disaster, but if you know, as a fact that there is going to be flooding each and every year, and you do nothing about it, year after year...

Int Contingency plans...?

IJ ...that to my mind is just a failure on the part of government, and that's an example, there are lots of others, so, there definitely is a need for ongoing Public Interest litigation which is designed to spur government on.

Int Right, well, one last question, the LRC's suffered huge funding crisis post '94, but it...they say that it's difficult to attract young lawyers, particularly young black lawyers because in part they're snapped up...

IJ Too many opportunities.

Int ...exactly, by Commercial Law firms to do Articles, etc. What do you do then and does...how do you then transform an organisation that has a perception of being predominantly white?

IJ That question is almost premised on the idea that black lawyers should be prepared...I'm not criticising...

Int No, sure.

IJ ...but, I mean, just...my response is...it's almost premised on the idea that young black lawyers should be looking after the broader interest of society as opposed to their own?

Int Not necessarily, I'm just wondering.

IJ There's no reason why they should.

Int Right.

IJ If you think about it, so, and that perhaps...perhaps it's both a good sign and a bad sign, in a sense that the fact that there are those opportunities available for young black lawyers, is a sign of course, that things are changing from the time that I was going through that process, and that's good.

Int Absolutely.

IJ And that, there's no doubt is good, and they operate once they qualify, you know, they operate in those firms as milieus, and race is no longer an issue, that has both pros and cons itself because it means you're having a privileged group which now is mixed but, you know, it's still privileged. I think, ultimately, those...the LRC must make its work sufficiently attractive, and positions at the LRC, sufficiently attractive that it attracts those who, not because of skin colour but because of predisposition, belief, etc, want to work in that sort of milieu. The fact that, if you use a comparison, I mean I don't know what the employment...I have not been involved with them administratively since leaving, I don't know how they go about...what...where they recruit from, etc, but the Constitutional Court, to the best of my knowledge, has no difficulty attracting the brightest and the best to be their interns...and they get paid less, I think than the LRC does...

Int Fair enough.

IJ You know, it's because they want to work there...

Int Right.

IJ ...and...

Int ...

IJ ...I don't know, but I would think the LRC...and then obviously they could try, I suppose, to get funding to make it more attractive. But you can't keep someone there doing good work, merely because, because they know it's just a step to a career elsewhere, usually.

Int I've asked you a range of questions, I'm wondering whether there's something I've neglected to ask you which you feel ought to be included in your Oral History interview?

IJ No, it's been quite interesting, almost cathartic.

Int (*Laughs*).

- IJ But, what was I going to say...it certainly went far more wide ranging than an Oral History of the LRC, so, I'm not sure how much of this you're going to publish.
- Int Well, you will get to edit this...
- IJ Well, it's not for publishing but for archiving.
- Int ...what's curious is that you self identify as a Public Interest lawyer, even now.
- IJ And you don't think I am one?
- Int No, I'm just wondering where that comes from?
- IJ Because I think I am a Public Interest lawyer, um...
- Int Even as an advocate who takes cases for government?
- IJ Ja, because I don't believe that acting for government means you are opposed to the public interest, I think very often in this country it means...it means that you are looking out for the public interest. I mean it's a fine question where in this case I just told you about the Road Accident Fund, the repayments, it's a very fine question as to where the public interest lies.
- Int Ok.
- IJ And the assumption that the personal injury lawyers who are bringing the case against government are the ones looking at the public interest, I think, must be closely interrogated.
- Int Ok. Fair enough. I was wondering whether we could end the interview if you could share a memory of...I know your time at the LRC was brief, but I'm sure having been an advocate at the Bar for a long time you've had interactions, etc, you've mentioned Lee Bozalek for example, a memory that you feel embodies your time, even outside the LRC but in terms of Public Interest Law?
- IJ In terms of Public Interest Law?
- Int Yes, you mentioned the Grootboom case, I'm wondering whether there's a particular memory of doing this kind of work and how the LRC may have shaped that?

IJ It's not specific to public interest work, but the one...one incident that occurred at the LRC and which has shaped my professional, what I hope...I hope it shaped my professional approach to my work, is...involved William Kerfoot, someone who I have high regard for as a good lawyer, but also an ethical person and it's that aspect, the ethical thing. We were doing some case, I forget the details, and he received in the post from the opposing attorney, well, he received an envelope and when he opened it, they'd been meaning to send us a document, a response to a request for trial particulars or something, they'd sent us instead their memos to how they were going to run the case. (*Laughter*). And someone else, another attorney there who shall remain nameless, was eager to...wanted to copy this and use it, and William (Kerfoot) said: no, this was sent by mistake. And he put it back in the envelope and he addressed it back to them saying: this has been sent to us, obviously in error, we've not read it, documents returned. That exemplified William (Kerfoot) and I think, the LRC, and something I've tried to incorporate in the way I approach law.

Int Thank you, that was great, thank you very much.

IJ It's a pleasure.



**Ismail Jamie–Name Index**

Appolis, Julian, 16  
Bozalek, Lee, 6, 10  
Budlender, Geoff, 6, 14, 17  
Chaskalson, Arthur, 9  
Grobbelaar, Gerrit, 14  
Grootboom, Irene, 16, 17  
Hlophe, John, 17, 18, 19  
Kentridge, Sydney, 9  
Kerfoot, William, 6, 10, 24  
Mandela, Nelson, 3  
Meer, Shehnaz, 6, 10  
Mgoqi, Wallace, 3, 6  
Navsa, Mahomed, 9  
Nupen, Charles, 9, 10  
O'Regan, Kate, 17, 18  
Pienaar, Kobus, 15  
Pretorius, Paul, 9  
Smith, Henk, 6, 9, 14  
Tip, Karel, 9  
Tregrove, Wim 14  
Van der Ross, Ben, 11  
Walton, Matthew, 10  
Weaver, Tony, 5  
Zuma, Jacob, 17, 18  
**Joel**, 10  
**Pete**, 14

**Cases:**

Grootboom, 16, 20, 23  
Richtersveld, 14 -15  
Rikhoto, 6, 7  
Pass Law cases, 7

## **Legal Resources Centre Oral History Project**

### **PUBLISHER:**

*Publisher:- Historical Papers, William Cullen Library, University of the Witwatersrand*

*Location:- Johannesburg*

*©2012*

### **LEGAL NOTICES:**

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

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

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

### **DOCUMENT DETAILS:**

*Document ID:- AG3298-1-065*

*Document Title:- Ismail Jamie Interview*

*Author:- Legal Resources Centre South Africa (LRC)*

*Document Date:- 2008*