

Pages 1118 - 1197 - 1200 (A)
COPY FOR MR. PARKINGTON

VOLUME XII.

S. Store 326 : 323.2 (68232) COM

COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE EVENTS
IN THE DISTRICTS OF VEEENIGING (NAMELY THE
SHARPEVILLE LOCATION AND EVATON) AND VANDERBIJL-
PARK, TRANSVAAL PROVINCE, on 21st MARCH, 1960.

TUESDAY, 3rd MAY, 1960 - at
- 9.45 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

AS BEFORE.

INDEX

(SEE INSIDE).

INDEX.

D. MARUPING:

Cross-examination Pages 1118 - 1120

J. FRIEDMAN:

Evidence-in-Chief " 1120 - 1125
Cross-examination " 1125 - 1136
Re-examination " 1136 - 1139
By the Chairman " 1139 - 1140/1

H. STEYN:

Examination-in-Chief " 1142 - 1144
Cross-examination " 1144 - 1145
Re-examination " 1146

P.D. SWANEPOEL:

Examination-in-Chief " 1146 - 1148
Cross-examination " 1148 - 1150
By the Chairman " 1150 - 1151

A. LAMBINON:

Examination-in-Chief " 1152 - 1153

PAUL MFAMBILA:

Examination-in-Chief " 1153 - 1155
By the Chairman " 1155 - 1156

DANIEL RABALESE

Examination-in-Chief " 1156 - 1158

GLADWIN MEGO:

Examination-in-Chief " 1158 - 1161

PIET KOK:

Examination-in-Chief " 1162 - 1164

PAUL KEEN:

Examination-in-Chief " 1164 - 1169
Cross-examination " 1169 - 1172/3

T. WHITE:

Examination-in-Chief " 1174 - 1176
Cross-examination " 1176 - 1179

J. MEYER:

Examination-in-Chief " 1179 - 1181
Cross-examination " 1181 - 1185

G.P. NEL:

Examination-in-Chief " 1185 - 1186
Cross-examination " 1187 - 1188
By the Chairman " 1188 - 1190

I.P. FERREIRA:

Examination-in-Chief " 1191 - 1197
Cross-examination " 1197

EXHIBITS

Photograph of motor car belonging to Paul Mfambila, showing left rear broken window ..

Exh. "G1".

Photograph of motor car belonging to Paul Mfambila, showing dents in car ..

" "G2".

DOCTORS' REPORTS:

Dr. Friedman

" "H1".

Dr. Steyn

" "H2".

Dr. Swanepoel

" "H3".

Dr. Keen

" "H4"

COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE EVENTS
IN THE DISTRICTS OF VEREENIGING (namely the
SHARPEVILLE LOCATION AND EVATON) and VANDERBIJL-
PARK, TRANSVAAL PROVINCE, on 21 MARCH, 1960.

TUESDAY, 3rd MAY, 1960 - at
9.45 a.m.

APPEARANCES: AS BEFORE.

DOLPHY MARUPING, onder vorige eed:

KRUISVERHOOR DEUR MNR. FLEWMAN: Maruping,
jy sê jy was aan die Suidekant? --- Ja.

Dit wil sê die voorkant van die Polisiestasie,
waar die Polisiestasie se naam op geskryf is? --- Aan
die linkerkant.

Voor die groot hek, of voor die klein hek? ---
Daar is glad nie 'n hek nie.

Nou, watter kant is die groot hek; agter
jou. As jy gekyk het in die rigting waar jy gestaan
het, was die groot hek agter jou? --- Ja.

En hoeveel Polisie het daar gestaan? ---
Ek kan nie sê nie.

Min of meer - tien, twintig? --- Onthrent dertig.

Jy sê daar was skietery aan daardie kant waar
jy gestaan het? --- Onderkant?

Ja? --- Nee.

Het jy nie gister gesê daar is skote daar
afgevuur nie? --- Ja.

Waar was die skote afgevuur? --- Agter.

En wie is daar raakgeskiet? --- 'n Kind ...

DIE VOORSITTER: Laat ek nou net mooi verstaan
wat jy bedoel. Daar waar jy gestaan het, was daar ook
blanke Polisiemanne? --- Ja.

Hulle het ook gewere of rewelvers gehad? ---
Ja.

Het hulle geskiet? --- Ja.

Watter kant-toe het hulle geskiet? --- Vorentoe.

Ken jy 'n foto? --- Ja.

Kyk bietjie na hierdie Bewysstuk "B" (aan getuie oorhandig.) Verstaan jy dit? --- Dit is die Polisiestasie by Sharpeville.

Wys vir my met jou vinger, waar het jy gestaan - jy en die blanke mense? --- (Getuie toon aan).

Jy wys heel aan die regterkant, dit wil sê die Oostekant van die Polisiestasie.

Was jy nog binne-in die Polisiestasie, in die gronde? --- Ek was in die straat gewees.

Saan met - weet jy watter offisier was naby jou gewees? --- Nee, ek weet nie wat sy naam is nie.

Watter kant-toe het julle gestaan? --- Hier, in die straat.

Is dit 'n teerstraat? --- Ja; dit is 'n teerstraat; Zwane-straat.

O, jy ken Zwane-straat? --- Ja.

Jy was in Zwane-straat gewees? --- Ja.

En jy het gekyk na die Polisiekantoor? --- Ja.

Hou sê jy daardie mense het ook geskiet? ---

Ja.

Wanneer het hulle geskiet? --- Dit was toe hoor ons daardie skoot, toe skiet hulle ook agterna.

In watter rigting het hulle geskiet? Kyk, hier in Zwane-straat staan daar 'n groot klomp mense. Het hulle geskiet na die mense wat hier in Zwane-straat gestaan het, of het hulle in 'n ander rigting geskiet? --- Op na die

D2 MARUPING
Kraaisverhoor.
DR. FRIEDMAN
Evidence-in-Chief.

MNR. PLEWMAN: Daar is 'n gebou bekend as die "Hall" wat hy miskien sal ken; die "Beer Hall", wat aan die Westekant is. Ek weet nie of dit sal help nie.

DIE VOORSITTER: Het jy enigiemand gesien val daar, wat besonder was? ---Ja.

Hoeveel? --- So een klein seuntjie het daar voor ons geval.

Wat het van hom geword? ---Hy was doodgeskiet.

MNR. PLEWMAN: GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

MNR. CLAASSEN: GEEN HERVERHOOR NIE.

JACK FRIEDMAN, sworn, states:

EXAMINED BY MR. CLAASSEN: Dokter, are you a District Surgeon of Johannesburg? --- Vereeniging.

A number of bodies were brought to you in Johannesburg for post mortem examinations to be held?

---Yes.

These were cases from the Sharpeville Location?

---Yes.

How many post mortems did you hold? --- Fifty-two.

And did these people all die of bullet wounds?

---Yes.

How many separate bullet wounds could you trace in these fiftytwo bodies? --- Ninetysix.

I believe you analysed these ninetysix wounds as far as direction is concerned? ---Yes.

--- And ---

by over
sumos
at de
parag
nes ha
ss 4"
nes th
fran-

And whether they were high wounds, or low wounds? --- Yes.

Will you give us the categories that you placed them in? --- I sub-divided them in those firstly entering the front of the body and passing backwards, at 45° or less. In other words, that is a forward inclination rather than sideways. Then the second group ...

Just give us the number as you go along? --- There were two in that group. That, of course, excludes head injuries.

We will come to that later? ---Yes; then those entering the front of the body and passing backwards at an angle greater than 45°, that means a sideways inclination.

How many were there? --- There were five. Then those entering the back of the body passing forward at 45° or less; that means, they passed rather towards the front of the body than towards the side of the body. Of those, there were fifteen. Then those entering the back and passing forward at an angle greater than 45°, that is a sideways inclination; they were eleven. Then I took ricochets, of which there were sixteen.

As far as the ricochets are concerned, you have not divided them into front or back or side? ---No.

What is the reason for that? --- Well, the reason for that is that ricochets are bullets, forced bullets which have already struck another object and as such it is not possible to say their true, direct route which they came. They may have a slight

circular tendency; and I thought it wiser to separate ricochets entirely from all the others.

Now the next group? --- Then I took a miscellaneous group. Now, in these I included the head wounds, wounds in the arms and wounds in the perineum. My reason for separating those was that these structures, at any rate, the head and the arms, are mobile structures. The head, of course, is ^{not} quite mobile, as mobile as the arms. Now, a wound, for example, in the back of an arm does not really mean that he was shot in the back. His arm might have been above his head, for example, and caught the bullet on the back of the arm. The same applies to a lesser degree in the head, due to the mobility of the head. It does not follow that because a wound is in the front of the head, he must necessarily have been shot from the front. He may have been with the side of his body towards the shooting, with his head turned to that side. Therefore, I separated those off. Then there were two in the perineum, that is between the legs, and those, also, I took as being in a separate grouping from the others. Now, of these miscellaneous, there were 21.

Before you go onto the next group, those cases in which the wound was a side wound - there were firstly five, and secondly eleven; that is sixteen of those? ---Yes.

Two more or less in front, fifteen more or less in the back? ---No; there were five from the front, which went sideways - para. 3; and there are ...

I just want to know, doctor, whether I am

correct, adding the group that you have under para. 3 and para. 5 together, as showing wounds more or less in the side - more in the side than from the front or the back? ---Yes; they went sideways.

Now, you have summarized those which one may call low shots and high shots? ---Yes. All the shots already mentioned, from which one should subtract the ricochets and those two shots in the perineum - I would say that all those mentioned in paras. 2, 3, 4 and 5, should be regarded, primarily, as arbitrary high shots; that is, I took them above the buttocks. Those in the buttocks and lower, I regarded as low shots.

How many were there that you would classify as high shots? --- There were 33.

Under para. (a) - Horizontal shots; you first had sixteen. That is to be? --- Seventeen.

And shots with a marked upward or downward trend? --- Now sixteen.

Is this correct - shots with a marked upward or downward trend? --- Shots with a marked upward or downward trend, were sixteen; that is only applying to the trunk, the body above the buttocks.

Well, now, under para. 8 you've got shots above the navel and the buttocks. Those which were in a horizontal position, were seventeen? --- Yes.

And others with marked upward or downward trend, sixteen? ---Yes.

Why did you separate the upward or downward trend --- trend ---

trend? --- Because it indicates a change in the normal, erect posture. I think if I may show some of these, it would make my meaning much clearer. Now, if you would care to look at these two. There is one more or less horizontal. Now, the small figure in the top righthand corner shows, roughly, a horizontal track of the bullet through the body. The other one shows a marked upward trend. Now, in order for that track to be brought about, that one with the marked upward trend, the person would have to be stooping, unless he was fired at from right underneath him.

Might he have received the wound lying down? --- That is another possibility. The idea that I had was that where there is a marked upward inclination of the bullet, it suggests that the entry point might have been lower than it would seem to be, whereas those in the horizontal position, always provided if the shot person were in the erect posture, would not indicate any lowering of the entrance, the bullet wound.

In other words, whilst you have classified it under the shots here, wounds caused by high shots, it is really a wound that might very well have been caused by a low shot? --- Yes.

Now, what about those with a downward trend? --- Well, those apply mainly to the wounds which entered the front of the body. For example, assuming a person receives a shot anywhere here, round about the middle of the chest - high up - and it comes out here, low down, in the back, in order for that to happen, the person has to be stooping forwards, which

means that it brings the entrance wound to a lower level. Now, these are wounds with a marked downward inclination. Of course, there are other interpretations, other possibilities; he may be lying down, on his back or something like that; but whatever it is, I think it is reasonable to assume that shots with these upward or downward tendencies, were not as high as they originally seemed to be.

What is your next category? --- Then I took a group of shots in the buttocks and legs. Those are the low shots. They numbered 26.

Were you also present in sorting out and classification of the reports made by other doctors? ---Yes.

For instance, the cases that were treated at the Baragwanath Hospital? ---Yes.

And also the other post mortem examinations at Vereeniging? ---Yes.

And also patients that were treated at Vereeniging? ---No; not patients.

The reports of Dr. Swanepoel - were you assisting with the sorting out of those? --- Well, I indicated to him how I thought they should be classified.

It was all done in consultation with you? ---Yes.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. FLEWMAN: Dr. Friedman, just before coming to your classification, there are one or two general questions I would like to ask you. Of the 52 post mortems you performed - you can check

my figures, if you like. I would just like to give you examples of the sort of person - you have "Native Male, 40 years"; another one, a Native male of an approximate age of 45 years. One of the bodies was a Native female of an approximate age, or apparent age of thirteen years. Another male of 45 years, one of fifty years, one of 58 years; another of 45 years, one of fifty years; a Native youth of fourteen, and so on - I can give you more, if you like; another one of 48, of 40 years, a child of twelve years; another Native male of 50. The apparent age of the persons on whom you performed post mortems, varied considerably - it included the ages such as I have now given you? ---Yes.

Now, I would also like to ask you ...

THE CHAIRMAN: Which age group predominated?

--- The old age group. I haven't actually taken that figure out, but it is quite easy to do so. But I think that the over thirties probably predominated.

CROSS-EXAMINATION CONTINUED: Yes; I am just putting these for my purposes, as examples of the ages of persons you examined. I would like to come to another point, and that is the question of the type of injury. Did you have experience of finding a bullet which had split, a bullet which had parted and formed more than one track after entry? ---Yes.

That is something that happens? ---Yes.

And without wishing to go into details, you also found cases where there were very, very gross exit injuries; injuries of a very gross nature? ---Yes.

Coming to your classification, I would like

?
to be added to category B

to deal with the suggestion put to you about the eleven under category 5 and those to be added - the point of these eleven shots is that they came in from the back at varying angles; you have to include a large number of that? --- All over 45°, approximately.

So that they came in at various angles from the back, passing forwards? --- Yes.

Now, coming to category 7, your miscellaneous; I don't know if you have all your post mortem reports with you? --- Yes; I have.

I may have to refer you to some of them specifically? --- Yes.

How many of the 21 are heads? --- Thirteen.

The wounds to the heads, are there some where no track can be determined? --- Yes.

How many are there? --- Four.

THE CHAIRMAN: Doctor, in regard to these head injuries, could you draw any inference as to the posture of the person; whether he was standing erect, whether he was bending down, or whether he was lying on the ground? --- Well, I think that would be an unsafe thing to do.

I am merely asking ...? --- I did not do that; because of the obvious mobility of the head, it could be in virtually any position, excepting turned right round, of course. So I ...

I am more concerned, at the moment, with the position of the head in relation to the ground; take a person of say over five ft. in height. Now, could one draw any inference from a head wound as to where the head was, whether it was 3 ft. above the ground or

in category 5 had.
to show side to side -
from the front or back
about these eleven shots
the back (etc)

I think it was.

" - suggestion that the eleven in category 5 had to be added to ~~para~~ category 3. to show side to side - more from ^{the side} ~~the side~~ than from the front or back (See page 1123) The point about these eleven shots is that they came in from the back (etc)

to deal with the suggestion under category 5 and those to these eleven shots is that they were at varying angles; you have a number of that? --- All over

So that they came in from the back, passing forwards? ---

Now, coming to category 5, I don't know if you have all the photographs with you? --- Yes; I have.

I may have to refer to them specifically? --- Yes.

How many of the 21 are there? The wounds to the head - no track can be determined? ---

How many are there? ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Doctor, regarding head injuries, could you draw any inference from the posture of the person; whether he was bending down, or whether he was on the ground? --- Well, I think it is an unsafe thing to do.

I am merely asking ... because of the obvious mobility of the head, it can be in virtually any position, even if the person is on the ground, of course. So I ...

I am more concerned, at the moment, with the position of the head in relation to the body of a person of say over five ft. in height. Can you draw any inference from a head wound as to the position of the head, whether it was 3 ft

DR. FRIEDMAN
Cross-examination

to be added to category B

to deal with the suggestion put to you about the eleven under category 5 and those to be added - the point of these eleven shots is that they came in from the back at varying angles; you have to include a large number of that? --- All over 45°, approximately.

So that they came in at various angles from the back, passing forwards? ---Yes.

Now, coming to category 7, your miscellaneous; I don't know if you have all your post mortem reports with you? ---Yes; I have.

I may have to refer you to some of them specifically? ---Yes.

How many of the 21 are heads? --- Thirteen.

The wounds to the heads, are there some where no track can be determined? --- Yes.

How many are there? --- Four.

THE CHAIRMAN: Doctor, in regard to these head injuries, could you draw any inference as to the posture of the person; whether he was standing erect, whether he was bending down, or whether he was lying on the ground? --- Well, I think that would be an unsafe thing to do.

I am merely asking ...? ---I did not do that; because of the obvious mobility of the head, it could be in virtually any position, excepting turned right round, of course. So I ...

I am more concerned, at the moment, with the position of the head in relation to the ground; take a person of say over five ft. in height. Now, could one draw any inference from a head wound as to where the head was, whether it was 3 ft. above the ground or

*category 5 had
show side to side -
the front or back
of these eleven shots
etc (etc)*

two ft. above the ground, or whether the person was lying down? ---I don't think so. Of course, there were no shots which went in at the top, for example. There was one shot which went in low down at the back, at the back of the head, after the bullet had travelled under the skin at the back. That particular person was obviously - his trunk was in a horizontal position; the bullet ran along the skin, underneath the skin, from about the middle of the back towards the top of the back, came out and then entered his head. So that particular person could have been in a horizontal position, with his head bent up. For example, running in a crouched position.

CROSS-EXAMINATION CONTINUED:

/I wonder if you could just give me the number of your post mortem report which you have just referred to? --- I can find it for you.

Would it be 586? --- It is 607.

No. 607 is the one where the bullet entered the back and after passing through the back, entered the head, indicating, I would suggest - I am not suggesting that it was in fact so - but indicating a crawling position in relation to the direction of the bullet; crawling away, with the bullet from behind? ---Yes. If you would look at the diagram, there, the lowest number - the very lowest one - No. 3; that is the entrance wound. The bullet passed up towards No. 2, where it came out from underneath the skin, and it then entered the neck tissues and then the head at No. 1. In order to do that, the individual has to be in a relatively horizontal position, with possibly the head bent backwards, as one would in a

crawling position, or running in a steeping position.

For my purposes you can't really define it more closely, and I would not ask you to; but that is one you have included in your category 7 - that is miscellaneous? ---It is included both in 8(b) and ...

No, well, don't worry about that; I am discussing 7 - that's all. It is included in 7? --- Yes; I think so - the head injury.

I want to come to ^{some of} the other headings; for present purposes, I am dealing with your category 7. If you look at your No. 568 - that is the head injury included in your category 7? ---Yes.

And that head injury was from behind, slightly to the left; is that correct? ---Yes.

That is a head injury from behind, almost in the midline? --- That is right.

Can we go to 577, which I think is also one included in your category 7? --- Correct.

And that is a head injury, the entrance wound being at the back and the track of the bullet being forward? --- That is so.

No. 584; that is a head injury included in your category 7, from behind to the front? --- That is so. I have an analysis of these head wounds, if you want them.

That would be, perhaps, simpler? ---Yes. I have analyses of the head wounds included under para. 7.

Perhaps you can give me the result? --- Front to back, nil. Back to front, 8. Sideways, 1. Four undetermined.

--- Well ---

Well, that will save a lot of time. I wonder if you could tell me the number of the one which you have classified as sideways in that classification? --- It is the one that entered the car and went across to the back.

Practically straight across? --- Yes.

I wonder if we can come, now, to some of the indeterminate ones. I have a No. 586. I wonder whether you could tell me whether that was included in your indeterminate ones.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know if there is any distinction, but I think Dr. Friedman referred to "undetermined".

MR. PLEWMAN: Perhaps we should retain his terminology, Sir; I will endeavour to do so.

CROSS-EXAMINATION CONTINUED: Undetermined - 586? ---Yes.

Was that included in your undetermined head injury category? ---Yes.

Is that the wound which is an injury of about 5½" x 4½", a very gross deformation of the head? --- Yes.

I just want to know if we are talking about the same one? ---Yes; para. 1 of my report - 586.

In that case, there was more than one bullet wound? ---Yes.

The other wound was a wound in the buttocks, was it? ---Yes. No. 586 had two wounds - one in the head and one in the back.

The one in the buttock went up through the liver and again I want to perhaps deal with it this way,

by suggesting that presumably ^{if} that was the first bullet wound received, there would have been no movement after the head injury? ---Yes; I think there would be no doubt that nature he would have fallen straight away.

And it is not a definite conclusion, but looking at the buttock injury, it was probably, again, someone in a crawling position, a horizontal position, away from the direction of fire? ---Yes; it entered his buttock and came out at the top of the chest.

Well, that is a sufficient definition of the track, for my purposes. You are not in a position to suggest what could have caused an injury like the head injury in that case, are you, or is it pure speculation? ---It suggests a bullet with a high velocity.

More than one, or just one? ---One could do it, at a high velocity and at close range.

It is equally consistent, I suppose, with more than one bullet? ---Yes.

I understand that one can't define these things? --- Yes.

Now, if - did you by any chance do any analysis of those shots in the buttocks and legs? ---Yes.

Can you divide them for me into shots in the buttocks proper - that is the shots up to the level, or down to the level of the gluteal fold?--- From the crest of the ilium at the top of the bone on the buttock, to the gluteal folds, there were ten.

That is ten out of the 26 in category 9? --- Yes.

Can you give me a further breakdown into shall

we say, gluteal fold to knee, and below knee? ---Yes.
Gluteal fold to knee, there were nine.

Have you any way of - and the rest are below that? ---Yes.

Which is seven? ---Yes.

Now, the crests of the ^{ilium to} gluteal folds are, I take it, probably from behind? --- The bullet entered from behind but may have passed sideways.

I mean, in a general direction? ---Yes; I've got those broken down further.

Side to side and back to front?--- Front to back, there are not any.

There can't be in the buttocks? ---Yes. Now, back to front, with a horizontal inclination - that's not sideways; it's forward, approximately less than 45° and with a horizontal inclination, there were two. Now, I am just dealing, from crests to gluteal folds. Then, from behind, and with an upward inclination, there were three. Then, from behind and sideways, in a horizontal inclination, there were two. Then, sideways, with an upward inclination, there were two, and one undetermined.

Well, just for purposes of a general description, those ten shots are then either from the back forward, or sideways, from the back? ---Yes.

Now, the gluteal fold to the knee? --- Front to back, that is mainly in the side, these injuries are. Front to back were three; and the three were horizontal. Then there were four from back to front, horizontally situated. There were two with a sideways inclination but which entered the back of the thigh, but to the side.

--- That ---

That is nine; so again, you have six of those nine from the back to the front, or from the back sideways? --- That's right.

Can you give the same thing to me, with the remaining seven? --- Yes; front to back and horizontal, one, below the knee. One front to back, as I said, horizontally situated. One front to back with an upward inclination, a marked upward inclination; two from back to front, horizontally and two from back to front upwards; one sideways, and horizontally.

So, of the seven four are back to front and one is sideways? --- Yes; the total front to back were five, back to front thirteen, sideways, seven; and one undetermined.

That is in that category? --- A breakdown of category 9.

There is one feature in category 7 which I have not dealt with, the two in the perineum. Clearly those, in broad, general terms, were from behind - they must have been? --- Well, not necessarily. It depends what you mean by "from behind".

It could ^{not} have been shot into a person advancing into the fire; it must - he must have been retreating or lying down? --- He must be lying down, with his feet towards the firing, and ...

His feet towards the firing, and his head away? --- That's right.

Crawling or lying down? --- Yes.

Now, you have category 6, which is ricochets. I would just like to ask some general questions about

recochets. The method by which you can finally establish whether an injury was caused by a ricochet or not, must depend in part on additional evidence regarding the distance he was from the firearm? --- Partly, yes. There is - some of these were clearly ricochets, irrespective of the distance.

Yes; there was a shattering of the bullet?

--- Yes; I found fragments of bullet casing.

Where you find a fragment of bullet at the end of a track, there is no doubt about it? --- That's right.

Where you find no fragment of bullet, where the bullet has gone out again, at an exit, there are additional problems? ---Yes.

An irregular entrance wound of itself is not sufficient evidence to say conclusively that that wound was caused by a ricochet? --- It is not absolutely conclusive, but it is a very strong pointer. There are other - if you get a large, lacerated, irregular entrance wound, it could be caused by a rough fragment of bullet or a piece of broken-off casing; it could be caused by a whole bullet which has struck, say, the ground without shattering, bounced up and then struck the body; or it could be caused by a bullet which is at the end of its flight or, in some firearms where the bullet tumbles at an early stage.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was evidence here which suggested that in the case of the sten gun that might happen? ---Yes; in view of the shortness of the barrel. It may begin to lose its straight trajectory at an early stage.

CROSS-EXAMINATION CONTINUED: You have adopted, as you had to, a method of classification; where you rely on an angle of 45° , that must of necessity - and it is not a criticism of anybody - be a crude method of classification? --- Well, I will put it this way, that it is perfectly clear that in a body you can't measure angles exactly. These classifications of over 45° or less than 45° are approximate.

That is the point? ---Yes; it is not possible to be mathematically accurate; but I assessed it to the best of my ability and knowledge.

Can I put it to you, Dr. Friedman, that on the figures that you have given us - it is a matter for us to work out, but for the purposes of record at this stage - the majority of the injuries which you examined, were from behind? ---Yes; the majority did enter the body from behind.

We can work that out in greater detail? --- I can work them out now, if you wish me to. It would only take a second.

I just want to make one point clear, if I may, before you do so. We may have different methods of assessing this. I may include heads, so if you are going to work it out ...? ---Well, I will include the lot; all the injuries, which entered the anatomical posterior of the body.

That is all right? --- The only thing that I haven't got immediately available, are those in the arms because they are such mobile structures that I don't think it would be worthwhile.

Well, let us exclude arms and exclude ricochets - so deduct those two categories from your total number of injuries? --- Fortyseven.

I make it 51. If you take your 96 and deduct from that sixteen? --- There were sixteen in para. 4; 11 in para. 5; eight in para. 7 and ...

Knee to ankle? --- (Inaudible).

Include the sideways? --- If we are to include the sideways ...

Sideways but entering from behind? Eight in the head? --- Yes. (Witness calculates).

There are 52 wounds; you are excluding from this calculation the 16 ricochets and those in the arms which are, I think, sixteen? --- Yes; that is correct.

So that is 54 out of 74? --- 52 out of 74. That is if you deduct the ricochets and the arms.

So that is about 68% 60 70% - roughly. You don't need to work it out.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

MR. LOUW: NO CROSS-EXAMINATION.

RE-EXAMINED BY MR. CLAASSEN: Doctor, would you say that a tumbling bullet at the moment that it enters the body can turn so much as to cause a ragged entrance wound? --- It can travel in different ways. If the bullet strikes some hard object, it may ricochet.

At the moment that it enters - it may travel sideways, I understand? --- If the bullet strikes the ground and it bounces, it may enter

It may cause a laceration - correct? --- It may, although I think although the bullet can cause

a laceration, it is more likely for a fragment of the bullet to cause a laceration. But one cannot - I think I only had one instance amongst these, possibly, of that type of wound. There were other bullets found that had ricocheted, and it is rather a long, oval entrance. But a bullet may cause a laceration. However, there was only one instance of that nature.

How long have you been district surgeon, or assistant district surgeon? --- About 25 years.

I take it during that period you gained a lot of experience on bullet wounds? --- Oh, yes.

It is a very common thing to find death caused by a ricochet bullet? --- Well ...

Considering the number of cases that you have had? --- No; it depends on the circumstances. The - obviously a vast number of cases that I have had to deal with, were single shots, single side shots. But in no case has there been a prevalence of anything like that.

Did you find more wounds caused by a ricochet bullet in this case than you would have expected? --- Than I would have expected under the circumstances.

Yes; you know more or less the ...? --- No, I think - it is a difficult question to answer, but I am not surprised to find sixteen ricochet bullets.

Sixteen out of 96? --- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is apparently some
--- suggestion ---

suggestion that some of the bullets struck the wire on its way through - this wire fence, of diamond mesh; apart from those that may have just struck the ground, or may have ricocheted off somebody else's body, after striking a bone.

RE-EXAMINATION CONTINUED: You had some cases where you thought that the bullet had split? --- Well, for example one woman had a large number of wounds in her leg and thigh. I did not count the separate wounds. I can show ...

I don't want details. The entrance wounds in these cases, would they have been clear wounds, or ... ? ---

What caused the bullet to split? --- Well, in the particular case I have in mind, there was no question at all that it must have struck a rock or some hard surface, and then split into numerous pieces.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you find any fragments? ---Yes. There were numerous fragments.

What were they - steel casing, or ...? --- I did not examine them. There were numerous, small, fragments.

RE-EXAMINATION CONTINUED: My learned friend asked you about the gross exit wounds. I take it he meant the large exit wounds that you found? ---Yes.

Is there anything abnormal about that, as far as bullet wounds go? ---I don't think so. In the bulk of the cases they had struck bone, and when that happens one is almost certain to find large exit wounds.

Was there anything in the appearance of

--- these ---

these exit wounds to suggest to you that a bullet was used of an abnormal caliber? --- Not at all.

Like dum-dum bullets, for instance? ---No.

Have you seen wounds caused by dum-dum bullets? ---No. If the bullet has high velocity, whether it be rifle bullets or sten gun bullets, does not matter, and it strikes bone, it will almost certainly cause a large exit wound.

You have had a number of those cases? ---

Yes.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

BY THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Friedman, I don't know whether you will be able to answer this question at all, but generally speaking, from the nature of the wounds observed by you, would most of those people have dropped on the spot, as it were, or is it just as probable that they would still have been able to move away some distance? ---Yes, possible. Excepting where there was a head injury. There was one where the bullet entered the spinal column and severed the spinal chord; he would have dropped. But the others need not necessarily have.

And I take it, it would be quite impossible to determine how far these people were from the particular firearm that discharged the bullet? --- It is impossible to answer that. The only thing one might possibly say is in cases where bone has been fragmented including the destruction of soft tissues and in other cases where there has been soft tissue damage of extensive nature, the suggestion

--- might ---

might be that the bullet had high velocity.

MR. CLAASSEN (THROUGH THE CHAIRMAN): Doctor, I don't want you to go to your records and give me an accurate figure, but could you remember - those cases in which the wounds were in the head, can you remember whether there were also other wounds to the body? --- Yes. There were some; correct.

You can't say more or less what possible proportion - a person may have sustained a bullet wound and then have been able to run a distance and then have fallen, and then have sustained the head wound? ---Yes; quite possible.

Were there quite a number of these cases? ---If you would spare me a minute, I've got them all here; I can give you those who had head injuries plus other injuries.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Friedman, I wonder whether I may ask you, in giving that, if you would give us the number as you go? --- Yes.

- ADJOURNED 11.15 a.m. -

- RESUMED 11.30 a.m. -

---JACK---

JACK FRIEDMAN
By the Chairman.
H. STEYN
Hooftgetuenis.

JACK FRIEDMAN, still under oath:

BY MR. CLAASSEN (THROUGH THE CHAIRMAN):

Doctor, have you got the figures ready?—Yes. There are six cases which had head injuries plus other injuries. They are Nos. 585, 586, 590; 599 had a head injury plus a ricochet; 607 was the one that spoke to you about, where the bullet went ⁱⁿ under the skin and then entered the head. I don't know whether you want that included or not. Then, No. 612.

HERMANUS STEYN, beëdig, verklaar:

VERHOOR DEUR MNR. CLAASSEN: Dokter, u is distriksgeneesheer, Vanderbijlpark? —Ja.

Het u na-doodse ondersoek gehou op sekere liggare wat ook gekom het van Sharpeville? —Ja.

Hoeveel gevalle het u gehad? — Vyftien gevalle.

U het dieselfde indeling gemaak van orde, soos dr. Friedman? —Ja.

Kan u ons dit net gee - die aantal wonde? — Die aantal wonde was 21.

En die wat ...? — Van voor na agter, met 'n hoek van 45° of minder, een. Van voor in die rigting na agter, met 'n hoek groter as 45°, nul. In van agter, in die rigting na vore, met 'n hoek van 45° of minder, twee. Ingang agter, met 'n rigting na vore, met 'n hoek van groter as 45°, drie. Opslagkoeëls, vyf. Ander: Kop, twee; arms, een. Dan is daar 'n indeling, hier, skraalskote, twee. Dan het ek 'n verdere groep hier, 'n geval wat operer is,

waar nie ingangswonde of uitgangswonde gekry kon word nie, twee. Dan,

Daardie - die totaal van die wat u nou net mee gehandel het, is dan ses?— Dit is reg. Skote bokant die boude: Horisontaal, 3; in 'n afwaartse rigting, 1; in 'n opwaartse rigting, 2. Skote in die boude of bene, 10; bene alleen, van agter, 14; van voor, 1.

U het ook twee na-doodse ondersoeke gehou van persone wat gedood is te Vanderbijlpark; dit is nie hierby ingesluit nie? —Nee.

Het u u verslag hier? — Ja. (Bladsy 392).

Hoeveel gevalle het u daar gehad? — Twee.

Dood ook veroorsaak deur koeëls? —Ja.

Sal u daardie twee gevalle behandel? —

Die eerste een het 'n koeëlwond gehad deur die voorarm, een deur die regterkant van die bors en dan ook aan die linkerkantse arm.

Sou dit veroorsaak gewees het, dink u, deur een koeël? — Die arm se wonde is altwee klein wondjies, $\frac{1}{2}$ " in deursnee gewees en die een wond op die borskas ook $\frac{1}{2}$ " in deursnee. Die ander wond aan die linkerkant was groter.

So wat was die afleiding wat u gemaak het? — Dit mag een koeël gewees het wat eers deur die arm is, en toe deur die bors.

Daar is nie been geraak nie? — Daar is nie been geraak aan die regterkant of aan die arm nie. Die linkerkant se ribbebeen is gevang.

En die ander geval? —In die ander geval

was daar een koeslwond net bokant die skouerbeen, dwars in, van die linkerkant. Die koesl is in hospitaal verwyder; dit het in die kanaal van die derde nekwerwel ingegaan. Dit is in hospitaal verwyder.

Waar was die ingangswond? ---Net bokant die linkerblad.

En waar was die uitgangswond? --- In die derde nekwerwel. Die rigting was van links, na regs opwaarts.

Sou dit ook aandui dat die persoon in 'n gebukkende posisie was? ---Ja.

Daar was net die een wond? ---Net die een wond.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. PLEWMAN: Doctor, your category 6, ricochets: Could you tell me how you classify a ricochet. What do you classify as ricochets? --- According to the size of the entrance wound.

Let me make it quite clear why I ask this question. I think since this category was determined, we have had some evidence that a bullet may tumble at a relatively short distance, and that is why I ask you about this. Do you include in ricochets any irregular entrance wounds? --- Irregular, and bigger.

Bigger than a round or oval bullet wound? --- Yes.

So that you may include in your ricochets, a bullet entering in a tumbling position, that would give an irregular appearance? ---Yes.

Now, can you tell me, of your ricochets - 5;

can you tell me which of those were entrance wounds from behind? --- Three from behind and two from the side.

Now, category 7, miscellaneous and heads: Twoshots in the head - were they from behind? --- They were from behind.

Can you tell me anything about what you call a skramskeot, that is a graze? --- There were two; one just over the right hip joint in a horizontal position. It was just a quarter of an inch wide and and an inch long.

Not something that you can determine any track - from back to front or back to front? --- Right.

Or side to side, depending on how the person was facing? - -Yes. The other was also horizontal, and on the lower leg; also a groove, $\frac{1}{4}$ " in diameter and about $1\frac{1}{2}$ " long.

Did you say there was one in the arm? --- No.

Where you got shots with a marked upward or downward trend, I suppose one of the things which may account for the angle of the shot would be if you had, for example, people standing on vehicles near to the injured person. That would account for your marked downward trend, I assume? --- If the downward trend were very marked, he would have been shot from above.

There might have been people lying down; that would have been the more probable? pppPeople a distance away, steeping or bending.

The figures I can work out for myself. Can I put it to you that the majority of the wounds you saw were wounds from the back? ---Yes.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

H. STEYN
Re-examination
P.D. SWANEPOEL
Examination-in-Chief

RE-EXAMINED BY MR. CLAASSEN: Doctor, at the end of the tracks of these wounds, that you thought were caused by ricochet bullets, did you find any fragments of bullets? ---In two instances; fragments of bullets.

PHILLIPPUS SWANEPOEL, sworn, states:

EXAMINED BY MR. CLAASSEN: Doctor, you are Superintendent of the Vereeniging Hospital? ---Yes.

A number of persons injured at the Police Station at Sharpeville were taken to your hospital for treatment? ---Yes.

I think you are going to deal with 38 such cases? ---Yes.

Did you attend to all of them? --- No, I did not.

Is your report really based on the reports of the different doctors who treated these patients on admission? ---Yes.

And your report really constitutes a correlation of the other reports? ---Yes.

Did you rely entirely on the reports, or did you confirm the reports by inspection of some of the patients; what is really the position? --- I confirmed them by consulting the doctors concerned in most cases, except for one doctor was at the time not available.

There you relied on the report? ---On the report, and also the anaesthetist in one case, who was present at the operation.

--- You ---

You had 38 patients? ---Yes.

And what were the total number of wounds? ---
Forty-eight.

I understand that you could not classify these wounds in the same way as the doctors; is that correct? --- That is correct.

Instead of speaking about angles, you have only classified them, for instance, as "entering the front, passing back"? --- Yes.

And there were? --- Two.

And then those entering the back and passing forward? --- Six.

Just to stop there for the moment; I take it that the reason that you could not give the angle was that in some cases you could not do that by probing the wound? --- I was merely concerned with the welfare of the patient. It did not enter our minds at all that we may have to specify subsequently in this connection. I was chiefly concerned about the patient.

So these wounds that you speak of as entering the front and passing backwards, and entering the back and passing forwards, may have been at an angle? --- I don't think so, for the simple reason that according to the information supplied by the doctors in all these cases, if I remember correctly, there were entries indicating the direction the bullet had taken.

And, now you have ricochet bullet wounds, 17? ---Yes.

And miscellaneous, including heads, arms,

and perineum, 10? --- Yes; that is correct.

The shots above the navel and buttocks, horizontal, 7; shots with marked upward or downward trend, 1? ---Yes.

And shots in buttocks or legs, 13? --- Correct.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. FLEWMAN: Dr. Swanepoel,

I want to take your figure of ricochets and just discuss that with you for the moment. Your report was drawn up from bed letters, I take it? --- No. They were drawn up from the Police docket, form U.D.J.H.8 and a copy of a form that was given to us by the Police, according to which they wanted ...

Oh, you did not consult the bed letters of the patients concerned? ---No; the doctors did.

What has been the classification of a ricochet, for the purposes of this report; how did you arrive at the conclusion that a wound is a ricochet? --- Generally speaking, all wounds larger than an ordinary bullet wound is, with a lacerated ...

Can I put it to you, wounds other than wounds with a round or oval shape? ---Yes.

We have had it in evidence that you can get a tumbling bullet at a reasonably short distance from one of the firearms used. Would that necessitate - if one were to allow for that as a bullet wound, would you have to re-classify those 17 to any extent? ---It would be impossible.

Why do you say it would be impossible? --- Because you would have difficulty in deciding where to draw the line, which wounds could have been caused

by straight bullets and which have been caused by ricochets.

Well, that is the whole point. It applies equally to the classification you may have made. Some of those could very well be entry wounds of a bullet in ordinary flight; when I say "ordinary flight", a bullet in direct flight, not deflected - some of your 17? — After it started tumbling, yes.

After it started tumbling. You can't give a better classification than that? — No.

You don't whether they found in any of those 17, followed the track up and found pieces of broken bullets? — No, a few were found.

Do you know how many cases there were of those? — I can't tell you off-hand.

Is it a difficult calculation to pursue, or not? — No, but I haven't that information here.

You can tell me something, I take it, about the ricochets. Can you tell me, of that 17, how many were from the front to the back - if we use that as a broad category? — There were two of those.

Can you break it down for me further; in how many cases could you not determine a track or? — There was one back to front, some five were side to side, in nine cases the direction was not stated.

Your category 9, can you break that down for me into shots in the buttocks proper and shots in the legs below the gluteal fold? What would be - let's take shots in the buttocks proper first? — Shots in the buttocks - just one; although I want to mention that there was one in front in a similar position.

Are you talking about the same patient? ---
No; referring to "buttocks, 1" may give the impression
that it applies only to the back. He had another wound
in an almost similar position in front.

That was one in the private parts? --- Yes.
In the thigh, there were seven, and four below the knees.

Now, of those seven in the thigh, were there
any from the back? --- There were some. I doubt if
it is on the ...

I think you said to me this morning, five;
would that be correct? You may have a note of it
somewhere? --- Oh, yes; I beg your pardon. You
asked me whether they were from ...

From behind? --- Oh, two from the front and
five from the back.

Can you do the same for the leg injuries? ---
There was one from the front, one from the back, one
from side to side, and one undetermined.

Your category "Miscellaneous, including
head, arms and perineum" - I take it there are no
head shots there? --- No head shots.

Did you have any shots in the perineum? ---
None.

Can you give me a breakdown in the case of
arms, in the same manner as we have dealt with back to
front and front to back? --- I haven't done so.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

MR. CLAASSEN: NO RE-EXAMINATION.

THE CHAIRMAN: Doctor, do you keep any record
of the times of admission? --- Yes.

Have you got any record, here, of when these patients were admitted, or at least, when the first were admitted? --- I have taken from the bed letters the time of arrival in the ward. Ordinarily, an out-patient's card is made out first and that actually gives the time of arrival at the hospital.

Would it be inconvenient to get that information for me? ---I can certainly get it. Would you be prepared to accept the information as taken from the bed letters?

Yes. I don't want, necessarily, the time of admission of each individual person. If you could just, on going through your records, find when the first lot arrived? --- Approximately ten to two.

And where is this hospital? ---In relation to this particular ...

Well, in relation to Sharpeville Police Station? --- It is in a North-Easterly direction, approximately $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles by direct route - I would not say direct route; there is no direct route. I think they come by the main road, passing the Municipal Buildings; I think it is about 2 miles.

In other words, the route which an ambulance would normally take? ---Yes.

And you say at ten to two the first patients were admitted to hospital? ---Yes.

Did you have sufficient staff available to deal with them at once? ---Not immediately.

ALBERTUS LAMBINON, sworn, states:

EXAMINED BY MR. CLAASSEN: Doctor, you are a District Surgeon? ---Yes.

Vereeniging? ---Yes.

You held a post mortem examination on the body of one person brought to you from Sharpeville? ---Yes.

When did you hold the post mortem examination? --- Not from Sharpeville; from the hospital.

When did you hold the post mortem examination? --- On the 5th of April, 1960

Was that a case of death following a bullet wound? ---Yes.

Will you tell us where the entrance wound was, and the exit wound, if there was one? --- The entrance wound was at the base of the fourth rib on the right side; what I mean by the "base of the rib" is where the rib is attached to the spinal column.

Just indicate to us where that would be? --- Just here, (indicates). That was the entrance wound. The exit wound was at the base of the neck, immediately posterior to the left clavicle.

Just indicate that spot (witness indicates)? --- The base of the left clavicle, behind the clavicle, at the base of the neck.

Would that indicate that the person must have been crouching or lying down? --- No. I would be of the opinion that the bullet was deflected by the rib, ^{upwards,} the fourth rib - deflected outwards, /on account of the fact that the entrance wound was a round wound.

That means that the track was not really a straight line? ---No; ^{was} it/deflected from its course

A. LAMBINON
Evidence-in-chief.
PAUL MPAMBILA
Evidence-in-chief.

by striking the rib.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

MR. FLEWMAN: NO CROSS-EXAMINATION.

PAUL MPAMBILA, sworn, states (through Interpreter):

EXAMINED BY MR. CLAASSEN: Paul, do you live
at Sharpeville? ---Yes.

How long have you been living there? --- Seven /
years.

Are you employed at the Central Butchery,
Vereeniging? ---Yes.

On the 21st March this year, you know the
day of the shooting at Sharpeville? ---I remember the
shooting, but I was not present when the shooting took
place.

Did you go to work on that day? ---No. I did
not go to work.

Have you got a motor car? ---I have.

Did you go out in your motor car on that day?
---I did.

Where were you going to? ---I was on my way to
work with the car.

What happened? ---I then found a number of
Natives near the Municipal offices, near the hostel.
They were standing about and they were making a noise.
They were rowdy. I then stopped the car and I listened
to the crowd. They were shouting "Afrika" and they
were raising their arms. I listened and I thought
something else would be mentioned, but nothing else

was mentioned. The whole road was blocked by these people and I wanted to drive along and pass them. I was going to drive to another road which was not as crowded as this road and when I took the turn somebody threw a stone at my car and it struck the window. The window broke and then many of these Natives approached me. Stones were then thrown at my car and only three windows remained; they were not broken. I then managed to drive along quickly to the Municipal Offices. I then alighted from my car and I met a number of Police at this spot. I went to the Police.

And you did not go to work at all on that day? ---I did not.

Was there any other damage done to your car except the breaking of the window? ---It had scratches on the sides as well; dents, actually. (The interpreter): The Witness calls it scratches.

There are two photo's here; are they both of your car (handed to Witness)? --- They are.

The left rear window, the window of the left rear door seems to be broken; is that correct? --- That door was broken - the rear back door - the rear left door.

(Photograph handed in, Exh. "G1").

Which is the window that they broke? --- The left rear window was broken. That was damaged first.

On that day, by the stones? ---Yes; on this particular day. All the windows were broken on this date.

I thought you said one of the windows had

--- been ---

been broken before?

THE CHAIRMAN: You mentioned something that had been broken before; what was it? --- (The Interpreter: No, My Lord, the Witness did not say anything had been broken before).

EXAMINATION CONTINUED: Have a look at this photograph, Exh. "G2". On the left-hand side there are four or five small dents. Were they there before the stone throwing? --- They were not there. All these dents and scratches from the car were done on this particular day.

(Photograph of car showing dents, Exh. "G2").

MR. CLAASSEN: NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

BY THE CHAIRMAN: This crowd that you found - have you any idea of how many people there were? --- Oh, many.

Would you say many in terms of hundreds? --- More than hundreds.

I am not certain whether you told us - what time did you go to work? --- Between 8 and 9 a.m.

And what sort of people were in this crowd; mainly men, or men and women? Children? --- It was a mixed crowd; women, children, elderly people, young people.

Did they say anything to you? --- No.

Did you hear them shouting any slogans? --- Yes; I did. I stopped. They shouted out "Afrika!" "Afrika!" "Iswe Letha!" - "Our country!"

Did you gather from them that they did not
--- want ---

PAUL MFAMBILA
By the Chairman.
Daniel Rabaless.
Hoofgetuënis.

want you to go to work? ---I did not think anything.
I did not know what was happening.

You don't know why they threw these stones
at your car? --- I did not know and I even don't know
today.

Did you know before that day that something
was going to happen on the 21st March? ---I did not
hear anything before the 21st, but on the Friday
I got a pamphlet to the effect that people should
not go to work on Monday. They could go to work,
but they should not take their passes to work.

What sort of pamphlet was this? --- It was
a piece of paper like these, here, and machine-
written.

Can you read? ---I cannot read, but some-
body else read it.

Anyhow, you understand from what the other
person read, that you should not take your reference
book with you on Monday, but that you could go to
work? ---Yes; you must not take your reference book
along. This notice also further said that if
Police would arrest anyone on that particular day,
then everybody should go along to the Police to have
themselves arrested.

MR. PLEWMAN: NO CROSS-EXAMINATION.

DANIEL RABALESE, beëdig, verklaar (deur tolk):

VERHOOR DEUR MNR. CLAASSEN: Daniel, woon jy
te Sharpeville? ---Ja.

Werk jy by die Suid-Afrikaanse Spoorweë en
Hawens? --- Ja.

Hoe lank werk jy al daar? — Elf jaar.

Hoe lank woon jy al te Sharpeville? — Sewe maande; ek het tevore in die "top" lokasie gewoon, ook in V_oreeniging.

Jy onthou die dag toe die skietery plaasgevind het daar by die Polisiestasie te Sharpeville? — Ja.

Daardie nag voor die skietery, was jy by jou huis gewees? — Ek was.

Het jy by jou huis geslaap? — Ja.

Wat het daar gebeur? — Naturelle het gekom en my wakker gemaak gedurende die nag. Ek het nie opgestaan nie. Hulle het verby gegaan. Daarna het ander Naturelle gekom, my beveel om op te staan. Ek het nie opgestaan nie. Een het toe my venster gestamp met 'n klerie en hulle is toe weg.

Was die venster gebreek? — Die venster het gebreek.

Het jy gaan werk, daardie dag? — Ek het. Ek het werk-toe gegaan, en ek het gewerk.

Die volgende dag, het jy ook gewerk? — Nee; ek het nie werk-toe gegaan nie.

Hoekom nie? — Ek was voorgekeer op pad deur Naturelle. Ek kon nie werk-toe gegaan het nie.

Waar het hulle jou voorgekeer? — In die lokasie, binne die lokasie.

Wat se mense was die, wat jou voorgekeer het? — Naturelle.

Mans? — Dit was mans - allemalik mans het my voorgekeer.

—Hulle —

DANIEL RABALESE
Hoofgetuigenis.
GLADWIN MERO
Hoofgetuigenis.

Hulle het jou nie aangerand nie? —Nee.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

MNR. FLEWMAN: GEEN KRUISVERHOOR NIE.

GLADWIN MERO, beëdig, verklaar (deur tolk):

VERHOOR DEUR MNR. CLAASSEN: Gladwin, waar woon jy? — Te Sharpeville.

Hoe lank woon jy daar? — Ek woon al daar lankal - ek weet nie hoe lank nie.

Hoe oud is jy? — 22 jaar.

Onthou jy die skietery by Sharpeville? —Ja.

Voor daardie tyd, waar het jy gewerk? — By die Munisipaliteit in Vereeniging.

Jy is bewas van die feit dat die Bantoes op daardie dag, 21e Maart, vergader het en na die Polisie-stasie gegaan het? —Ja.

Weet jy deur wie hierdie optog georganiseer was? —Nee.

Het jy deelgeneem daaraan? —Nee; ek het nie deelgeneem nie. Ek het wel gesien dat Bantoes - ek was daar by die Poliestasie gewees voor die skietery.

Tydens die skietery? — Ek was reeds huis-toe toe daar geskiet was.

Ken jy vir Joe Tsolo? —Ja.

Weet jy of hy verbonde was aan die P.A.C.? — Ek weet, ja.

Wat was hy gewees? — Ek weet nie.

Omtrent 'n week voor die 21e, toe die skietery

daar plaasgevind het, het hy met jou gepraat? ---Nee; nie met my persoonlik nie. Hy het ander Bantoes aangespreek.

Waar het dit gebeur? --- Dit was in die biersaal, in die groot biersaal

Hoeweel Bantoes het hy daar toegesprek? --- Ons was baie. Ons was besig om te drink; ons was baie gewees.

Wat was daar gesê? --- Ek het nie alles gehoor wat hy gesê het, daar, nie, maar hy het onder andere gepraat van die paste.

Wat het hy gesê daarvan? --- Die Bantoes was gesê dat hulle nie moes bewysboeke dra op die Maandag saam met hulle nie. Hy het ook verder gesê aan die Bantoes dat hierdie bewysboeke nie so bevredigend was soos tevore nie, want by voorbeeld as jy met hierdie bewysboek na Johannesburg moet gaan, sal jy geen werk daar kry nie. Hulle is nie gelyk aan die vorige bewysboeke wat gedra was nie. Met die vorige bewysboeke kon jy ander plekke ook werk kry.

Het hy enige iets gesê omtrent die werk, daardie dag, of julle moes gaan werk? ---Nee. Ek het niks gehoor omtrent die werk-toe gaan nie. Ek het net gehoor omtrent hierdie pas, of die bewysboeke.

Het hy niks gesê omtrent die werk, of daar gewerk moes wees op daardie dag nie? ---Ja; hy het melding gemaak van die werk-toe gaan op die Maandag, maar niemand het hy geforseer om nie werk-toe te gaan nie. Hy het net gesê die Bantoes moet wegbly van die werk af; maar hulle was nie geforseer deur hom om weg te bly nie.

Het hy vir enige van die mense wat hy toegesprek het, daar, gevra om hom te help met enige organisasie of so? —Nee. Ek het nie gehoor dat enige hulp gevra was om dinge uit te voer nie.

Het jy — ken jy 'n tipe Bantoe daar in die lokasie wat "tsotsi" genoem word? —Ja. 'n Tsotsi, sover ek aangaande is, is 'n man wat hier in die nag rondloop en wat fluit en ronddans, by voorbeeld.

DIE VOORSITTER: Jongmense, of ou mense? — In die lokasie is daar tsotsis onder die ou mense, en ook onder die jongmense.

Wat doen hulle in die dag? — Dit is maar mense wat werk, behalwe Saterdag. Hulle werk by voorbeeld gedurende die week maar Saterdag gaan hulle partye -toe. Hulle praat die "fly" taal.

DIE VERHOOR HERVAT: Nou, daar by die biersaal, waar Tsolo die ander toegesprek het, was daar tsotsis by? — Daar was.

Sou jy sê dit was 'n meerderheid tsotsis? — Ek kan nie sê of daar meer tsotsis as ander Bantoes was nie.

Assosieër jy met tsotsis? —Nee; ek is 'n man wat werk en ek het 'n vrou.

Meen dit dat jy geen omgang maak met hulle nie? — Ek het omgang met hulle; ek gaan partykeer saam met hulle. Hierdie wat ek gewoonlik mee saamgaan, is mense met wie ek saam werk.

Weet jy van pamflette wat in die lokasie versprei is? —Ja.

Was dit voor die skietery? — Voor die skietery.

Waarom trent het die pamflette gegaan? ---
Ek weet nie. Ek het nooit eens gedink om hulle te
lees nie.

As jy dit nie gelees het nie, het jy geweet
waarom trent dit handel? --- Ek het geweet waarom dit
handel.

Wat het jy verstaan, waarom handel dit? ---
Hierdie pamflet was tot die effek dat ons niemoes
Maandag werk-toe gaan nie.

En is dit versprei in die lokasie? --- Ja;
dit was in die posbusse gekry, in die oggend.

Deur wie is dit versprei? --- Ek weet nie,
maar dit was as 'n reël in die posbus gekry in die
oggend. Die kinders bring dit van die posbus af.

Weet jy of Tsole geassosieër het met tsotsis?
--- Ek kan nie sê nie want ek het Tsole nie dikwels
gesien nie. Ek het by voorbeeld nooit in sy geselskap
uitgegaan nie.

Het jy hom ooit in die geselskap van tsotsis
gesien? --- Nee. Ek het hom ook nie in die geselskap
van tsotsis gesien nie. Hy was 'n persoon wie ek op
pad gesien het, werk-toe. Hy het ook in die rigting
gewerk waar ek gewerk het.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

MNR. FLEWMAN: GEEN KRUISVERHOOR NIE.

MNR. LOUW: GEEN KRUISVERHOOR NIE.

---PIET KOK ---

PIET KOK, beëdig, verklaar:

DIE VOORSITTER: Wat is jou moedertaal - weet jy wat 'n "moedertaal" is? Watter Bantoe taal praat jy? — Kleurlingtaal.

Wel, dit is Afrikaans? —Ja.

VERHOOR DEUR MNR. CLAASSEN: Piet, woon jy in Sharpeville? —Ja.

En is jy in diens van die Vereeniging Munisipaliteit? — Ja.

In hulle Nie-Blanke Sake Departement? —Ja.

Jy onthou die skietery in Sharpeville die dag van die 21e Maart? —Ja.

Daardie nag voor die skietery, was jy by jou huis? —Ja; ek het gaan slaap.

Vertel ons wat het gebeur, daar? — Hulle het daar by die huis gekom, toe klop hulle; toe ek versuin om oop te maak, kap hulle die venster stukkend. Naderhand toe maak ek oop. Toe kom baie; toe sê hulle vir my, "Staan op! Trek aan!" Toe vra ek waarheen gaan ons. Toe sê hulle, "Nee, ons gaan ons land soek". Toe is dit vol in die jaart. Toe trek ek my skoene aan. Daar met die versuin-versuin toe trek hulle my uit en toe stoot hulle my, hulle het my gedruk op die stoel, toe/staan hulle/binne in die huis. Toe trek ek vir my mooi aan en ek is nou kantoor-toe.

Hoe laat was die mense by jou gewees? — So kwart-oor-twaalf.

Die nag? —Ja.

Jy sê toe trek jy vir jou aan met die mening - het jy met hulle saangegaan, die mense wat jou daar

komwakker maak het? ---Nee.

Is hulle toe weer weg? --- Toe is hulle weg. Daarna is ek kantoer-toe. Daar by die kantoer het ek toe gebly tot die môre ontrent so'n bietjie oor 7-uur. Daarvandaan is die hele swerm in die location in, regoor die hostel. Daar het die blankes hulle voor-gekeer.

Wie was dit; Polisie? --- Ja. Die sersant het vir hulle gesê om huis-toe te gaan, maar hulle het nie geluister nie.

Het jy 'n broer, ook, Jan? ---Ja.

Ken jy vir Norman More? ---Ja.

Woon hulle ook daar naby jou? --- Ja; hy was ook daar.

In dieselfde huis? --- In dieselfde huis; maar hulle is uit, ook saam met hulle.

Wanneer - toe jy wakker gemaak is? --- Toe ek wakker gemaak is.

Is hulle met die klomp saam? --- Ja.

Was hulle gewillig gewees om saam te gaan? --- Nee. Hulle is daar uitgesleep.

Weet jy of hulle by die Polisieostasie was toe die skietery plaasgevind het? ---Nee, hulle was nie daar nie.

Was jy ook nie daar nie? --- Ek was daar.

Waar was jy gewees? --- Ek was in die van.

Watter van? --- Binne-in die lorrie.

Binne-in die Polisieekamp? ---Nee. By die van en lorries.

Watter van en lorries is dit? --- Die van waarna;

ons werk.

DIE VOORSITTER: In watter straat was jy gewees toe die skietery - het jy die skietery gehoor? ---Nee; ek het nie die skietery gehoor nie.

VERHOOR HERVAT: O, jy was nie so naby nie? ---Nee.

- VERDAAG: 12.35 n.m. -

- HERVAT: 2.15 n.m. -

PAUL KEEN, sworn, states:

EXAMINED BY MR. CLAASSEN: Doctor, you are a surgeon in charge of the Non-European Hospital in Johannesburg? ---Yes.

And I understand that owing to the shortage of staff at the Baragwanath Hospital, you have been specially seconded to deal with the Sharpeville cases? ---Yes.

You have had 128 patients from Sharpeville admitted to Baragwanath Hospital? --- That is correct; there were actually 133. The records you will find on the table. 7

You did not attend to all these cases? --- I have seen every case from the 31st March; there were 20 that were discharged before that. Those I have not seen.

The evidence you are about to give in this case will be based on your own observations as well as reports made by the other doctors? --- Yes. There are twenty that I have not dealt with. Most of these cases, though, were in the unclassifiable group and the notes were not very satisfactory from the legal point of view, and most of those twenty will be in

classification, "Unclassifiable". So that in practice I did see practically all of them.

These 128 persons had, I understand from your report, 178 wounds? --- Correct.

You can classify them into wounds entering from the front and passing backwards. How many of these were there? --- There were twenty wounds entering front and passing backwards.

That is not including wounds caused by ricochet bullets or wounds in the arms or head? --- That is correct.

Under the category of wounds entering the back and passing forwards? --- There were 57.

Ricochets? --- There were 15 ricochet wounds, of which ten were definite and five probable.

How can you distinguish between the two? --- My criteria for diagnosing a ricochet wound was a large, ragged entry wound; an entry wound only with no evidence of a bullet in the patient, and where there were several ragged wounds close to each other.

And under miscellaneous? --- These consisted of wounds on the arms and head, which I was asked to exclude from the other categories. There were three from front to back, and seven from back to front. But I think these can be ignored from a statistical viewpoint as these parts of the body are very mobile.

What is this 7th category that you've got - horizontal, vertical and oblique? --- These were wounds where I could not decide whether the bullets had passed from the front to the back or from the back to the front.

--- Take ---

Take vertical wounds, where the bullet went straight up the side like this. I could not decide whether it was from back to front, or from front to back. The horizontal wounds - one example I can give you is a bullet wound right across the front of the chest. I could not decide which was the entry wound or exit wound, and it was not front to back or back to front.

And for that group you have given the number 42? --- That is correct. I have done no further analysis of those 42 wounds.

Is that the unclassified? ---No; the unclassified were the cases where it was impossible to distinguish between exit or entry wounds or where there were insufficient details on the bed letters.

That is 34? --- That is 34.

Do I understand you correctly - is the 34 included in the 42? ---No.

And the bullet wounds above the iliac crests? --- There were 48 above the iliac crests and 115 below.

In other words, you would say there were about 48 high shots compared with 115 low shots? --- Yes.

These 48 shots that went in the upper part of the body, if I may call it that, were some of them wounds showing an upwards direction? ---Yes.

Or a downward direction? ---Yes.

Can you give us the number of those? ---No.

You haven't got it? ---No.

--- Well ---

Well, I won't worry you about it. I just wanted to know; it could give some information? ---
Yes.

Have you made any further classifications? ---
I have done an analysis of the ricochet wounds of which there were ten in the lower half of the body and five in the upper half of the body; three on the foot, two on the calf, four on the thigh and one in the buttocks. In the upper half there were two on the trunk, two on the arms and one on the hand.

Then I see you have an analysis of vertical, horizontal, oblique and groove wounds? --- These represent the 42 wounds. They have been analysed. There were twentynine on the trunk and legs and thirteen on the arms and in the head. Now, of these 42 wounds an analysis of their direction shows that in thirty the wounds were sustained when the patient was standing sideways to the track of the bullet, as illustrated by the case I have mentioned, where there was a groove on the anterior chest wall, or where there was an entry and an exit wound in the buttocks or if there was a horizontal groove at the back of the thigh. These cases were therefore included in a group in which I considered that the patient was facing sideways to the track of the bullet or possibly lying down. There were three cases of bullet wounds where the entry wound was in the sole of the foot and the exit wound was on the dorsum of the foot. In other words, the patient must either have been lying down with his foot facing the track of the bullet or he must have been --- running ---

running away. That is what I mean by a vertical wound; and an analysis of these 42 cases has shown that thirty of them were sustained with the patient standing sideways to the track of the bullet.

Did you work out any percentages? ---Yes. With the 77 cases where there were definite directions from front to back and back to front, and the 42 cases of vertical, horizontal and oblique wounds, giving a total of 119 wounds, and in these cases I felt fairly certain that the direction could be assessed with reasonable accuracy; in my opinion 87 wounds were sustained either from behind or sideways or running or lying down; and this gives a percentage of 73.

These cases that you have included, here, of people lying down; was there any particular way and direction that they must have been facing, lying down or standing? --- Well - for instance, the one with the vertical wound of the foot may have been sustained lying down, with his feet facing towards the track of the bullet.

So that one is fairly clear. Other cases lying down? --- A vertical groove on the side of the body could have been sustained lying down or bending forward at right angle.

You see, I am not quite sure why that has been included in the 73%. What purpose would that serve? --- Well, so far as I am concerned, it is just a broad analysis. If you only take those with definite wounds from front to back and back to front, it only gives an analysis of a small part of the cases, which is a small percentage out of all the cases. I have tried to include other cases to make the

analysis more comprehensive. Now, if you only take those 20 and 57 wounds which were definite, the percentage would be 25% front to back and 75% back to front; and my further analysis has altered that percentage very little.

It did not affect it very much? --- No.

The further analysis that you've got here of the position of the entry wounds? ---Yes; I was asked to break down that analysis a little further, into bullet wounds above the iliac crests and those between the iliac crests and the gluteal fold - that is in the buttocks. The ones from the buttocks to the knees, and the ones below the knee. There were 48 above the iliac crests, as mentioned earlier, 25 in the buttocks, 41 in the thighs and 49 below the knees. In other words, if you take the iliac crests as the dividing line, there are 48 above and 115 below; if you take the gluteal fold as the dividing line, there are 73 above and 90 below; if you take the knee as the dividing line, there are 114 above and 49 below.

The figures that you give here - 48 represent the total; below the iliac crests, 115 and above the iliac crests? --- 73 and 90 below. In other words, if you take your criteria here, it is 48 to 115.

(Reports handed in: Dr. Friedman - Exh. "H1").
Dr. Steyn - Exh. "H2").
Dr. Swanepoel - Exh. "H3")
Dr. Keen - Exh. "H4").

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. FLEWMAN: Dr. Keen,
you have classified what you call ricochets in

category 5 on the basis of a large, ragged entry wound. Could you give me in dimensions, perhaps inches, what you call a large, ragged entry wound? ---By "large" I mean double the normal size of an entry wound, which depends on the bore of the bullet, which is usually a centimetre; and more particularly, on the fact that it has got ragged edges.

In the 15 ricochets in category 5, did you, or were you able to follow up the track of the wound and ascertain whether or not portions of a missile or a bullet could be found? --- Yes.

In all cases? ---No; not in the category where there were several ragged wounds.

So, for instance, correct me if I am wrong, do these 15 include cases where you have both entry and exit wounds? ---No; there were no exit wounds.

In those cases where you could follow the track of the wound, can you tell me whether or not the bone had been struck, or is that not possible? --- In none of these cases was bone struck.

And what was found at the end of the track - apart from the last category that you have given me? ---Usually a portion of casing.

Why I ask you, is this: Because we have had evidence that a bullet may tumble at a relatively short distance, and I wondered if any of your findings would include injuries caused by a tumbling bullet, in these fifteen? ---No.

You don't think so? ---No.

Still referring to those fifteen, could you tell me how many of those fifteen were in the front and

--- how ---

how many were in the back? --- Fourteen in the back, and one in front.

And that figure of fifteen is not included in your analysis which gave you 73%? --- That is correct.

So that though this is not a matter for you to decide, if one were to include them it would increase that percentage slightly? ---Yes; it would increase it.

You have also given, under your analysis of the position of the wounds, three figures, A B and C being an analysis at different levels of the body? --- Correct.

You have read out in your evidence-in-chief to my learned friend (A) that is wounds above the iliac crest, that there were 48 above and 115 below the iliac crests? ---Yes.

The following categories of (B) above the gluteal fold 73, below the gluteal fold, 90; and (C) above the knee, 114 and below the knee, 49? --- Correct.

Having studied these wounds, where would you say, in what portion of the body were the worst, the most serious wounds found? ---In my cases the most serious wounds were found in the buttocks.

In the buttocks - in that area? ---In that area, at the level where the bladder is situated.

Your analysis of wounds in the head - would you be able to tell me anything about the direction of those? Category 6? ---No; I did not make a further analysis, except that three were front to back, and seven back to front.

---You ---

You can't give me more than that? ---I can't give you more than that.

Your 73% analysis on the second page of your Exh. H2, are the wounds from gluteal fold to the knee joint, included in that analysis? ---Yes.

Now, can you tell me, still on the same page, page 4, how many vertical wounds were there in the sole of the foot? --- There was a total of 12 wounds in the foot, but I haven't analysed it further. From memory, I would say four in the sole of the foot.

We had a discussion in which I think a figure of six was given. You don't remember that? --- That number included those that were on the side of the foot.

Is it possible for you to check that at all, Dr. Keen? My note is that there were six in the vertical group - perhaps not of very great moment, but I would be anxious to be certain. Would it mean going through all your cases? ---Yes.

Well, then we can leave that. Now, I want to ask you one further question. When one talks of the head as being a member which can move, let's take it there is a limit to the movement of the head; it certainly can't do more than 180°? --- Yes.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

MR. CLAASSEN: NO RE-EXAMINATION.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is true for other parts of the body. The trunk can move on the legs and there is a degree of movement in other parts of the body. Is that correct? ---Yes.

THOMAS WHITE, beëdig, verklaar:

VERHOOR DEUR MNR. CLAASSEN: U is 'n konstabel in die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie gestasioneer te Sentraal, Johannesburg? — Dit is korrek.

U het oorgekom na Sharpeville op die 21e Maart hierdie jaar? — Dit is reg.

Wie was julle aanvoerder? — Hoofkonstabel Malan.

Hoe laat het julle by die Polisie-kamp aangekom? — Ongeveer 10.15.

Het julle gebly in die kamp totdat die skietery verby was? — Ja. Dit is reg.

Het jy gesien toe kol. Pienaar gekom het? — Ja.

Hoe lank na sy aankoms daar het die skietery begin? — Ongeveer vyf minute nadat die kolonel gekom het.

Kan jy miskien die toestand beskrywe wat jy daar gesien het vandat julle daar aangekom het, tot die aankoms van kol. Pienaar? — 'n Skare van ongeveer 25,000 Naturelle was reg rondom die Polisie-stasie toe ons daar aangekom het. Hulle was oproerig en het 'n vreeslike lawaai gemaak. Hulle was nie in 'n gevaarlike toestand nie, tot ongeveer 1-uur. Toe het die rooer erger geword. Toe die kolonel kom, het hy van die oproermakers arresteer; toe het hulle begin klippe gooi. Op daardie moment het hulle die draad rondom die Polisie-kamp so-te-sê heeltemal platgedruk. Toe die klippe geval het, moes die Polisie skiet.

Jy sê julle moes skiet? — Ja.

Watter wapen het jy gehad? — Ek was gewapen met 'n .303 geweer.

En hoeveel skote het jy geskiet? --- Tien skote.

Het jy na enige besondere persoon gemik? --- Nee.

Watter hoogte was dit jou bedoeling om die mense te skiet? --- Ek het na die bene gemik.

Het jy saam met die ander begin skiet? --- Nee, ongeveer drie sekondes na die eerste skoot geval het, het ek begin skiet.

En het jy saam met hulle opgehou? --- Ja. Om die waarheid te sê, toe die skote opgehou het, - ek het voor hulle opgehou. My geweer se (?) was los, en toe is ek bang om verder te skiet.

Hoe lank reken jy het die skietery aangehou? --- Ongeveer dertig sekondes.

Wat was die posisie; waarom het julle opgehou met skiet? --- Ek het die polisiefluitjie gehoor, en die bevel "Stop skiet!"

Van wie het jy dit gehoor, "Stop skiet!"? --- Kol.Pienaar.

Hoe ver het jy van hom af gestaan? --- Ek was omtrent tien treë van hom af.

Het jy geskiet op 'n bevel wat jy gehoor het? --- Nee.

Hoekom het jy geskiet? --- Oor die gevaar wat daar was; omdat ons lewens in gevaar was.

Hoe lank, sê jy, het hulle aangehou skiet? --- Ongeveer dertig sekondes.

Jy het ons laat verstaan julle lewens was in gevaar? --- Ons lewens was in gevaar gewees.

Was dit nog in gevaar na die eerste skote wat geskiet is? — Die voorstes het probeer omdraai, maar die agterstes het nog steeds vorentoe gebeur. Na die eerste sarsie gevuur is, sou ek nie sê daar was so groot gevaar nie.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

KRUISVERHOOR DEUR MNR. PLEWMAN: Het jy saam met die ander gestaan in die linie? — Ja.

Dit wil sê, julle het gestaan langs die Westelike draad van die Polisiestasie? — Ja.

Min of meer waar het jy gestaan in vergelyking met die posisie van daardie groot hek? — Ongeveer vyf treë links van die hek.

Links van die hek, soos jy na die draad-toe kyk? — Ja.

Het jy 'n bevel gehoor om te laai? — Dit is reg.

Jy sê die draad was so-te-sê plat gedruk. Praat jy van die draad om die Polisiestasie, of net van 'n sekere gedeelte daarvan? — Net aan die Westekant.

En wil jy nou sê dat dit die hele draad aan die Westekant is, of net dele daarvan? — Die voorste deel, aan die regterkant van die hek.

Aan jou regterkant sou die Noordekant wees? — Ja.

Die groot teerstraat is aan jou linkerkant? — Ja.

Jy sê die grootste deel daarvan was aan die Noordekant van die hek? — Ja.

Dit is nie waar jy gestaan het nie? — Nee.

En van wat jy nou gesê het, meen dit dat die draad nooit plat gedruk is aan jou kant van die hek nie? — Hy was om gedruk, maar nie so geweldig as aan die Noordekant nie. |

Hy was nooit plat gedruk nie; dit is die uitdrukking wat jy gebruik het, en dit is wat ek aan jou stel? — Die draad het nie op die grond gelê nie.

Hoe ver was dit oorgedruk aan jou kant, sou jy sê? — Aan my kant, sou ek sê, ongeveer 45°.

Het dit so bly staan na die skietvoorval? — Dit is weer reggedruk, daarna.

DIE VOORSITTER: Wie het die ^{draad} reggedruk? — Ons het die draad weer reggedruk, daarna.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Voor die skietery begin het, was die voorste ry van die mense, die Bantoes, teenaan die draad? — Hulle was teenaan die draad gewees.

Het ander woorde, as hulle vorentoe gedruk was, daar, sou die draad dan oor na jou kant-tee leun? — Ja.

En is dit ook wat gebeur het, dat die mense van agter af vorentoe gedruk het, en dat hulle half vorentoe moes leun? — Dit is nie net dat hulle van agter vorentoe gedruk was nie; hulle het die hele draad platgedruk.

Wat ek graag wil weet, dit was nie hier 'n poging van daardie wat voor gestaan het, om doelbewus die draad plat te druk nie? — Dit sal ek nie aan u kan sê nie.

Volgens staande orders, moet jy wag vir 'n bevel voordat jy skote afvuur in omstandighede soos u daar gehad het? — As 'n offisier in bevel is, moet jy wag vir 'n bevel.

Dit is 'n staande order, en jy dra kennis daarvan? — Ja.

En jy het daardie kennis gehad voor die skietery? — Ja.

Het jy toe geskiet omrede jy die ander hoor skiet het, of het jy maar besluit op jou eie houtjie om te skiet? — Ek het op my eie geskiet, omdat ons lewe in gevaar was as gevolg van die klipgeelery, en omdat hulle die draad platgedruk het.

Hoe groot was daardie gevaar? Soos ek jou verstaan, was die draad voor jou, waar jy gestaan het, nooit plat nie; Hulle was nog anderkant die draad? — Nee, as die skare nog vorentoe gedruk het, dan sou die draad heeltemal platgedruk gewees; dan sou hulle oor gekom het.

Solank die draad gehou het, was daar nie daardie gevaar nie, was daar? — Nee, daar was nie.

DIE VOORSITTER:

/Hoe ver het jy van die draad gestaan? —

Ongeveer ses treë.

Kan jy wys hoe ver? — Ongeveer vanhier na die beskuldigdebank-toe.

Vyf treë.

MNR. PLEWMAN: Ek sou skat effens meer; miskien kan iemand dit afmeet.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Jy sê jy was by die Polisiestasie van net na 10-uur die oggend? — Dit is reg.

En vroeër daardie oggend, wat het julle gedoen; somar agter in die Polisiestasie gesit en wag? — Sommige het buite om die ...

Waar was jy? — Ek was somtyds binne, somtyds buite, in die grond.

Het jy gesien dat sekere arrestasies daar gemaak is? — Ja.

T. WHITE
Kruisverhoor.
J. MEYER.
Hoofgetuigenis.

Waar was daardie arrestasies gemaak? — Binne, twee; by die groot hek, 'n derde.

Was dit die eerste twee wat arrestasies was van persone wat binnekant die draad geloop het, was? — Ja.

Waar was die derde een; buitekant die draad? — Net buite die groot hek.

Met ander woorde, die hek is toe oop gemaak en hy is van buitekant af ingebring? — Ja.

En wat het toe van die hek geword; het dit oop gebly? — Die hek is nie weer toe gemaak nie.

Het jy van die mense wat langs jou gestaan het in hierdie linie, geken? Dit wil sê die man aan jou regterkant en die man aan jou linkerkant? — Konstabel Saaiman was aan my regterkant.

Was hy van dieselfde afdeling as wat jy is? — Ja.

Weet jy of hy geskiet het? — Ek dink hy het met 'n .38 rewolwer geskiet.

En die man aan die ander kant het jy nie geken nie? — Nee.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

MNR. CLAASSEN: GEEN HERVERHOOR NIE.

JOEL MEYER, beëdig, verklaar:

VERHOOR DEUR MNR. CLAASSEN: Jy is 'n konstabel in die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie gestasioneer te Johannesburg-Sentraal? — Dit is reg.

Was jy by die Sharpeville Polisie-stasie op die 21e Maart? — Dit is reg.

Onder bevel van wie het jy gestaan? Met wie het jy saangekom van Johannesburg? — Die Sentraal ...

Ja, maar wie was julle bevelvoerende offisier? Was daar enige offisiere in Johannesburg aanwesig toe julle vandaar vertrek het? — Dit was hoofkonstabel Malan gewees.

Hy was in bevel? — Hy was in bevel.

En was jy ook in gelid opgestel in die Polisiegronde? — Ja.

Het jy geskiet? — Ja.

Waarmee? — Met 'n .303.

Hoeveel skote het jy geskiet? — Tien skote.

In watter rigting het jy geskiet? — Die eerste drie skote het ek onder na die bene geskiet; die res het ek bo-oor geskiet.

Hoe neem jy, bo-oor? — Bo-oor die skare wat daar gestaan het.

Bo-oor die koppe? — Bo-oor die koppe.

Hoekom so? — Na die eerste sarsie skote, het die skare teruggeval, en ek het toe maar bo-oor hulle geskiet om hulle terug te dryf.

Was dit net die Polisie wat daar geskiet het? — Dit was net die Polisie, ja.

Jy het geen ander skote van elders gehoor nie? — Voor die Polisie geskiet het, het daar twee skote vanuit die skare Naturelle gekom.

Watter tyd was dit; hoe lank voordat julle begin skiet het? — Dit was ongeveer 'n sekonde voordat ons geskiet het.

Was jy bewus van enige klippe wat gegooi was?

— Terselfdertyd het die klippe ook sees hael oor gekom.

Het die klippe oor gekom voor die twee skote wat jy gehoor het, of daarna? — Ek sou sê dit was net voor die twee skote. Toe die klippe begin val, toe val die twee skote ook — terselfdertyd.

Het julle 'n bevel gekry om te skiet? — Ja.

Het jy 'n bevel gehoor? — Ek het 'n bevel gehoor.

Kan jy sê van wie dit afkomstig was? — Ek kan nie sê van wie dit afkomstig was nie.

Waar het jy gestaan; hoe ver van kol. Pienaar af? — Na die skietery verby was, was dit omtrent sees van hier na die muur, daar. (Sees tot sewe treë).

Het hy al die tyd stil gestaan op een plek? — Ek sou nie kan sê of hy al die tyd op dieselfde plek gestaan het nie.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

DIE VOORSITTER: Waar was jy ten opsigte van die bak aan die Westekant? Toe jy na die skare gekyk het, was jy links, of regs van daardie dubbele hek? — Ek was aan die binnekant, links van die dubbele hek.

KRUISVERHOOR DEUR MNR. PLEWMAN: Jy sê daar was klippe sees hael. Was dit vir die hele lengte van die linie wat daar opgestel was? — Sover dit my aangegaan het, kon ek nie sien nie, want ek het self 'n besering opgedoen. Ek kon nie sien of verdere klippe geval het nie.

Wat se besering het jy opgedoen? — 'n K1ip het my op my duim getref, een hier, en een daar.

'n K1ip het jou op die duim getref, een op jou bors en een op jou been? — Ja. Een op my duim, een op my bors en een op my onderlip.

Na hierdie voorval, het jy dit uitgewys aan een of ander offisier? —Ja.

Watter offisier? — Ek ken ongelukkig nie daardie offisier se naam nie.

Van watter kant af het die bevel gekom, soos jy gestaan het. Jy het gestaan net links van die groot hek, soos jy na die draad-toe kyk. Aan watter kant het jy daardie bevel gehoor? — Dit het van regs, skuins agter my gekom.

Met ander woorde, iemand wat min of meer regoor die hek gestaan het, maar agter die linie? — Reg.

DIE VOORSITTER: Wat het gebeur toe die klippe gegooi is. Het julle nog in 'n lyn bly staan? —Ja.

Jy sê die bevel wat jy gehoor het, het gekom van iemand wat agter jou gestaan het, na regs? —Ja.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Wat was die bevel wat jy gehoor het? Wat was die woorde wat gebesig is? — "Skiet!"

DIE VOORSITTER: Was dit voor enige skote hoegenaamd geval het? Of nadat daar alreeds skote gevuur is? — Dit was nadat die skote vanuit die skare gevuur is, terwyl die klippe gegooi is.

Het jy net een woord gehoor, of het jy meer gehoor - "Kom ons skiet!"? — Net die een woord.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Het jy nie na die tyd probeer uitvind wie dit was wat geskree het nie? — Ek het probeer uitvind, maar ek kon nie - sover ek kon vasstel, was dit 'n offisier in bevel.

— Sover —

Sover jy kon vasstel, was dit 'n offisier in bevel? ---Ja.

Nie "die" offisier nie; "'n" offisier? --- Ja.

DIE VOORSITTER: Van wie het jy hierdie inligting gekry? --- Net van die manskappe. Ek sê ook maar wat almal sê; ek kon nie sekerheid daarentrent kry nie.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Kan jy vir my sê: Het jy die bevel gehoor dat julle moet laai? ---Ja, ek het dit gehoor.

Is dit deur kol. Pienaar gegee? --- Dit is reg.

Op daardie tydstip, waar het hy gestaan? --- Hy was naby die hek, naby die draad, half aan die voorkant van die linie.

Hy het voor die manne gestaan, tussen julle en die draad, en hy het die bevel daar gegee en hy het seker in julle rigting gekyk? --- Ek reken hy het. Hy het/sy kop gedraai en die bevel gegee.

As jy nou praat van twee skote wat vanuit die skare gekom het, kan jy sê, min of meer, vanuit watter rigting het hulle gekom - watter deel van die skare? --- Dit was reg voor my gewees, reg vanuit die skare.

Reg voor waar jy gestaan het? --- Reg voor my, vanuit die skare.

Van voor in die skare, of van agter? --- So half in die middel.

DIE VOORSITTER: Hoe was die skote - kort op mekaar? --- Ja; dit was kort op mekaar.

Watter soort vuurwapen het dit vir jou na geklink? --- Dit het vir my geklink na 'n rewolwer.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT:

/Kan jy met sekerheid sê of jou skote iemand getref het, of nie? --- Nee; ek sal nie kan sê nie.

En het jy geskiet met die eerste skote wat geval het, of was daar 'n paar skote voor jou eerste skoot? --- Met die eerste skote wat geval het, het ek begin skiet.

Was daar een of twee skote voor jy jou eerste skoot afgetrek het? --- Dit is nou van die Polisie?

Ek praat nou van die Polisie; laat daardie eerste twee skote van die skare maar eenkant. Ek praat nou van die Polisie-skietry? --- Ja; ek sou sê daar het 'n skoot of twee geval voordat ek begin het.

En toe jy klaar jou tiende skoot weggeskiet het, was daar nog 'n paar skote daarna? --- Ja.

Sou jy kan skat hoe lank dit nog aangegaan het nadat jy klaar was? --- Dit is ...

Ek weet dit is moeilik, maar ek vra maar 'n skatting? --- Dit het omtrent net opgehou.

Daar was nog skote, maar dit het omtrent net opgehou? --- Ja; daar was nog 'n paar skote.

Hoe het die skietry begin; met 'n sarsie, of met enkele skote - die Polisie-skietry; ek praat nou alleen van die Polisie-skietry? --- Met 'n sarsie.

Kan jy sê hoe die manne wat weerskante van jou gestaan het - watter vuurwapens hulle gehad het? --- Sover ek kan onthou, het hulle net .303's gehad.

En het jy van hulle geken, of nie? --- Ja.

Wie het lankse jou gestaan? --- Ek sal nie

J. MEYER.
Kruisverhoor.
G.P. NEL
Hoofgetuigenis.

kan sê nie.

Dit is wat ek bedoel; jy kan nie vir my die name gee van die persone wat langs jou gestaan het nie? —Nee; ek sal nie kan sê nie.

In ieder geval, jy was onder bevel van hoofkonstabel Malan? —Ja.

En het jy 'n rapport ingesit in verband met die patrone wat jy weggeskiet het? — Ja.

Aan Hoofkonstabel Malan? —Ja.

GEEN VERDIERE VRAE NIE.

MNR. CLAASSEN: GEEN HERVERHOOR NIE.

GERHARDUS PETRUS NEL, beëdig, verklaar:

VERHOOR DEUR MNR. CLAASSEN: U is 'n sersant in die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie gestasioneer te Johannesburg? — Dit is reg. Sentraal-Johannesburg.

Was u te Sharpeville gedurende die skietery op die 21e Maart hierdie jaar? —Ja; ek was daar.

Onder wie se bevel het jy gestaan? — Ek kan nie sê wie die bevel gegee het nie. Dit het geklink asof daar 'n bevel was.

Nee, met watter offisier het julle saamgekom vanaf Johannesburg? — Ek kan nie sê met watter offisier het ons saamgekom toe ons daar weg is nie.

In elk geval, daar op die Polisiegronde, het jy saam met die ander in gelid gestaan voor die skietery plaasgevind het? —Ja.

Ek verstaanvan jou dat jy nie seker kon wees of jy 'n bevel gehoor het nie? —Ja.

Het jy iets gehoor wat na 'n bevel geklink het, of wat was die posisie? — Ja; dit het geklink asof daar 'n bevel gegee word om te skiet.

En wat se vuurwapen het jy gebruik? — Ek het 'n .303 geweer gehad.

En hoeveel skote het jy afgevuur? — Ek het bevel gekry vir vyf.

Hoe lank, volgens jou mening, het die skietery aangehou? — Die skietery het ongeveer twee na drie minute aangehou.

DIE VOORSITTER: Vir watter gedeelte van die drie minute het jy geskiet? — Eksekuus?

Hoe lank het dit jou geneem om jou vyf skote af te vuur? — Dit hang af hoe vinnig jy kan skiet.

Hoe vinnig het jy geskiet; hoe lank het dit vir jou geneem? — Ek het net tussenposes geskiet.

En oor die hele tydperk van twee na drie minute? — Totdat die offisier gesê het ons moet nie meer skiet nie.

Toe het jy net vyf skote afgevuur? — Ja.

VERHOOR HERVAT: Na watter deel van die persone daar voor jou het jy geskiet? — Na die wat voor my was; ek het nie na die persone geskiet nie. Ek het voor hulle probeer vasskiet.

Op die grond? — 'n Mens neem nie 'n ander se lewe sonar nie; jy probeer hom eers skrik maak, en kyk of jy dit nie so kan regkry nie.

Is dit wat ek verstaan dat jy gedoen het, met jou vyf skote? — Ja.

KRUISVERHOOR DEUR MNR. PLEWMAN: Hoekom het jy geskiet? --- Omdat ons lewens daar in gevaar was.

Maar het jy geskiet omrede jy 'n bevel gehoor het, of het jy geskiet ...? --- Sonder 'n bevel sou ek self ook geskiet het; dan sou my lewe nog in gevaar gewees het.

As jou lewe in gevaar was, hoekom was jy besig om voor die mense te probeer skiet? --- 'n Mens probeer altyd eers om 'n gevaar te vermy voordat jy 'n perseon se lewe vat.

DIE VOORSITTER: Is dit jou eie opinie? --- Ja.

Of is dit wat staande orders sê? --- Volgens my eie opinie.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Sê jy dit is jou eie opinie van hoe 'n mens moet skiet in so'n geval? --- Ja.

Dit is nie wat in staande orders staan nie, of is dit? --- Staande orders sê jy moet eers probeer oor die hoof skiet; jy moet nie net 'n perseon se lewe neem nie, tensy jou lewe self in gevaar is. Dan, die ander manier is ook om in die grond te skiet.

Wêl, kan jy my sê, in hierdie linie, waar het jy min of meer gestaan - hoe ver van die hek af? --- Ek het - presies kan ek nie sê nie, maar dit was ongeveer vyf treë van die hek af.

Direk voor die hek? --- Ja.

Voor die skietery plaasgevind het, het enigiets daar by die hek plaasgevind? --- Ja; daar was die drie Nie-Blankes gearresteer; en nadat hulle gearresteer was, het die Naturelle net klippe begin gooi. Daar was selfs skote gevuur deur hulle, vanuit die skare.

Is dit alles wat daar by die hek gebeur het, onmiddellik voor die skietery; daar het niks verder gebeur nie? — Voor die skietery het ek die skote vanuit die skare gehoor.

Onmiddellik na die skote vanuit die skare gekom het, het jy 'n bevel gehoor dat julle moet skiet? — Dit het gegaan asof daar 'n bevel was om te skiet.

DIE VOORSITTER: Het jy ander skote hoor val voordat jy self geskiet het? — Ja; ek het enkele skote gehoor.

Die vraag is, behalwe die skote wat jy gehoor het, wat van die skare afkomstig was, het jy gehoor of daar van die lede van die Polisie geskiet het voordat jy begin skiet het? — Ja.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: En nadat jy jou laaste skoot afgeskiet het, was daar nog 'n paar skote daarna? — Ja.

Van die Polisie se kant? — Ja.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

MNR. CLAASSEN: GEEN HERVERHOOR NIE.

DEUR DIE VOORSITTER: Die arrestasies waarna jy verwys by die hek, weet jy deur wie dit uitgevoer was? — Deur 'n offisier; ek vermoed dit was 'n offisier. Hy was in privaat-drag.

Waar was die persoon wat hy arresteer het; was hy aan die buitekant van die hek, of binnekant? — Hy was hier by die hek gewees.

Was die hek toe oop, of toe? — Die hek was oop.

En wat het geword van die Bantoes wat daar agter die hek gestaan het, toe dit nou oop gemaak is? — Ek

kan nie so sê wat het geword van die Blankes wat by die hek gestaan het nie.

Nie die Blankes nie - die Bantoes? --- Van die Bantoes by die hek?

Ja? --- Onmiddellik na die arrestasie het hulle klippe opgetel, die wat by die draad gestaan het.

Die wat daar by die hek was, het hulle enigiets gedoen? --- Hulle het probeer by die hek inkom.

Het hulle dit reggekry? --- Ek kan nie - dit is moeilik om te sê of hulle dit reggekry het of nie.

Hoekom? --- Onmiddellik na die poging by die hek het ons 'n bevel gekry dat ons in lyn moet staan.

Jy weet nie wat toe van hulle geword het nie? --- Ek het toe nie so opgelet nie.

Toe julle begin skiet het, kan jy onthou, was die hek toe alweer toe gewees, of was dit nog oop gewees? --- Die hekke was nog oop.

En het jy gesien wat die posisie by die hek was, toe julle begin skiet - die Bantoes wat in daardie omgewing was? --- By die hek - dit is moeilik om te verklaar.

Kan jy nie onthou nie? --- Ek was daar voor by die hek gewees; ek kan nie verklaar nie. Ek kan nie onthou nie.

As jy nie kan onthou nie, wil ons nie hê jy moet raai nie? --- Ek raai nie.

As jy nou dink? --- Sal u net die vraag herhaal?

Toe julle begin skiet, sees jy onthou - jy sê jy het voor by die hek gestaan? ---Ja.

Reg voor die hek? ---Ja.

Ek het ook verstaan jy het toe gesê die hekke v

toe oop gewees? --- Dit was oop.

Wat was die posisie by daardie hek gewees toe julle begin skiet; waar was die Bantoes? Was hulle binnekant die hek, was hulle buitekant die hek? --- Soos die hek so is, was hulle feitlik, kan jy sê, deur die hek gewees, gedruk gewees.

Was hulle deur die hek gedruk gewees? ---Ja. Hulle was forseer om nader te staan.

Was dit nou die posisie toe julle begin skiet het? ---Ja.

Wat het van hulle geword, die wat besig was om deur te druk, toe die skote val? --- Ek kan nie nou duidelik wees nie.

Kan jy my behoorlik verstaan as ek jou vra? --- Ek kan nie mooi duidelik die vraag verstaan nie.

Luister nou mooi: Wat ek jou vra, is dit: Jy het begin skiet? ---Ja.

Toe jy begin skiet het, kan jy vir my sê wat jy daar voor jou, by die hek gesien het? --- Die Bantoes het klippe gegooi na ons-toe. Hulle was by die hek, in die hek en hulle het 'n dreigende houding ingeneem en op ons geskree.

En na die skote geval het, die eerste skote geval het, wat het hulle gedoen? --- Toe het die Naturelle padgegee. Party het weggehardloop en party het plat geval. Onmiddellik daarna het ek opgehou met skiet.

IGNATIUS PETRUS FERREIRA, beëdig, verklaar:

VERHOOR DEUR MNR. CLAASSEN: Mr. Ferreira, u is Direkteur van Nie-Blanke Sake, Afdeling Vereeniging Stadsraad? ---Ja.

As sulks, val Sharpeville-lokasie ook onder u beheer? ---Ja; die hele administrasie daarvan.

En jou pligte in verband met jou pos, verwys neem dit jou dikwels na Sharpeville? ---Ja; tenminste elke tweede dag.

Kan jy vir ons net sê wat die toestand was in Sharpeville 'n tydjie voor die skietery? Ek wil meer weet in verband met organisasie vir hierdie optog? --- Ek mag sê, in al die lokasies in die Unie, van die lokasies wat ek gesien het, was dit die gelukkigste; ons het 'n baie gelukkige Bantogemeenskappe gehad. Hulle het hier voorregte gekry wat ek dink hulle in baie ander plekke nie gekry het, die selfde voorregte nie. Ek en my Departement en my Raad was altyd daarop uit om te sien dat al die Naturelle gelukkig daar bly en dat hulle almal as redelike mense behandel moes word.

Ja, mnr. Ferreira, ons wil ons eintêk met probeer bepaal by die organisasie - as u daarvan weet - vir hierdie optog wat plaasgevind het op die 21e? --- Ons het vanaf September/Oktobor laasjaar begin vasstel dat dinge nie al te pluis is nie, deurdad sekere organisasies - die A.N.C. - het daar sy bedrywighede gehad het; en al hoe meer en meer het hulle lede begin werf. In Januarie hierdie jaar, 1960, was hulle op die punt dat hulle baie lede gewerf het. Ons was ook verwittig, ek en my Departement, waar hulle vergaderings hou, wanneer die vergaderings gehou is, en wie

I.P. FERREIRA
Hoofgetuigde.

die Uitvoerende Bestuur van daardie organisasie was. Ek mag ook net meld, op die 20e Januarie 1960 het ek 'n dringende brief aan die Distrikskommandant geskrywe en sekere sake onder sy aandag gebring wat tot my kennis gekom het.

Weet u wie eintlik aan die hoof gestaan het, hier, van die P.A.C.? — Ja; ek weet dit is een More. Hy was daar in uitbreiding 1, erf-en-diens skema, woonagtig.

En het hy andere gehad om behulpsaam te wees met sy organisasie? — Ja; ek het van die ander geweet maar ek het hulle nie persoonlik geken nie. More het hulle geken, persoonlik. Ek het verskeie samesprekings met hulle gehad in die kantore. ^{superintendent se}

Die persone wat behulpsaam was, was hulle ook woonagtig ...? — Hulle was inwoners. Party van hulle was woonagtig in Sharpeville.

En ken jy van die persone wat lede was van die P.A.C.? — Nee, ek het van hulle geweet maar ek het hulle nie persoonlik geken nie, behalwe die met More; die het ek ontmoet in die superintendent se kantore.

En wanneer het jy bewus geraak van die feit dat daar georganiseer word vir hierdie besondere optog? — Die eerste was die more van die 8e. Die superintendent het my in kennis gestel dat daar 'n vergadering in Sharpeville was. Ek is toe dadelik scheemte uit. Daar was 'n klomp Bantoevrouens daar in die spruit, daardie kaal plek tussen die eerste lot huise en die tweede lot huise. Hulle het daar bymekaar gekom en vergadering gehou. Die superintendent het hulle toe gewaarsku dat hulle nie 'n vergadering kan hou sonder permissie nie. Hulle het toe drie Bantoevrouens

Ja? — Ek was toe in die kantoor, en toe het hulle vir ons vertel dat hulle die vorige aand gewaarsku is dat indien hulle nie sou kom na 'n "protest meeting" om te kla oor die hoë huur nie, hulle aangerand sou word en hulle huise afgebrand sou word.

Dit was nou een insident wat u ondervind het in verband met die ...? — Ja. Dit was die 8e Maart hierdie jaar gewees.

Het u later ook bewys geraak van biljette wat versprei was? — Ja. Ek het daardie tyd feitlik elke nêre Sharpeville besoek, en ek het in die posbus - van die biljette in my besit wat daardie tyd in die posbus gedruk was.

Weet u watter tipe van persone behulpsaam was met die verspreiding van die biljette? — Nee; dit was blykbaar gewoonlik in die aand versprei. Ek persoonlik dra nie kennis van wie dit gedoen het nie.

Daardie nag voor die optog, gedurende daardie dag, wanneer het u bewys geraak van wat gebeur? — Wel, om halftwee die Maandagnêre, 21 Maart, het een van my inspekteurs my by die huis kom roep en toe is ek dadelik uit. Omtrent 2-uur was ek by die Polisie-stasie - toe is ek met die Polisie uit Sharpeville-toel.

En hoe was die toestande toe vir u gewees, daar? — Die hele lokasie was feitlik wakker gewees, by daardie tyd. Die Naturelle het so groepies-groepies gestaan, maar nooit groot klompes bymekaar nie. Die polisie, was dit aan my gerapporteer, was toe al van baie vroeg daardie nêre, vanaf 12-uur al besig.

Die Polisie, het ons gheer, in getuigenis,

Ja? — Ek was toe in die kantoor, en toe het hulle vir ons vertel dat hulle die vorige aand gewaarsku is dat indien hulle nie sou kom na 'n "protest meeting" om te kla oor die hoë huur nie, hulle aangerand sou word en hulle huise afgebrand sou word.

Dit was nou een insident wat u ondervind het in verband met die ...? — Ja. Dit was die 8e Maart hierdie jaar gewees.

Het u later ook bewys geraak van biljette wat versprei was? — Ja. Ek het daardie tyd feitlik elke nêre Sharpeville besoek, en ek het in die posbus - van die biljette in my besit wat daardie tyd in die posbus gedruk was.

Weet u watter tipe van perseon behulpsaam was met die verspreiding van die biljette? — Nee; dit was blykbaar gewoonlik in die aand versprei. Ek persoonlik dra nie kennis van wie dit gedoen het nie.

Daardie nag voor die optog, gedurende daardie dag, wanneer het u bewys geraak van wat gebeur? — Wel, om halftwee die Maandagnêre, 21 Maart, het een van my inspekteurs my by die huis kom roep en toe is ek dadelik uit. Omtrent 2-uur was ek by die Polisiestasie - toe is ek met die Polisie uit Sharpeville-toel.

En hoe was die toestande toe vir u gewees, daar? — Die hele lokasie was feitlik wakker gewees, by daardie tyd. Die Naturelle het so groepies-groepies gestaan, maar nooit groot klupe bymekaar nie. Die polisie, was dit aan my gerapporteer, was toe al van baie vroeg daardie nêre, vanaf 12-uur al besig.

Die Polisie, het ons gehoor, in getuigenis,

het die lokasie gepatrolleer? — Ek het saam met hulle gepatrolleer.

Was enige geweld gebruik aan die kant van die Polisie of aan die kant van die Bantoes, by hierdie geleentheid? — Nee, geen geweld nie. As die Polisie-voertuie naderkom, het 'n klomp jong Naturelle, wat ons gewoonlik noem "tsotsis" wat bymekaar was, uitmekaar gespring en weggehardloop.

Houkom sê jy die klompie was "tsotsis"? — Wel, ek wil nie sê alle jong Naturelle is tsotsis nie, maar die meeste is gewoonlik tsotsis. Daar is natuurlik ander wat ook nie tsotsis is nie.

Kan jy 'n tsotsi identifiseer van 'n ander jong Naturel, as jy hom sien? — Tot 'n mate, ja - van hulle tipe van skoene en klere wat hulle dra, en hulle kouse - gewoonlik veelkleurige kouse - en die tipe van pet wat hulle dra.

Sê u dat die tsotsis taamlik bedrywig was daardie aand? — Ja; veral by die busstoppe en in die hoofstraat. Maar net sodra die Polisie nader kom, dan - ons het tweesyds, een aan die buitekant patroleer, en een aan die Westekant, by die systraatjies; net sodra die voertuie verbykom spat hulle uitmekaar uit.

Tot hoe laat het u daar gebly? — Tot ontrent 7-uur, toe het ek gou gaan brekvis, en ek het dadelik weer teruggekom. Ek dink half-ag was ek weer terug gewees.

En hoe lank het u toe daar gebly? — Tot die anderdagnôre, half-oen. Ek was toe nie altyd met die Polisie saam nie. Ek was meer by die kantoor gewees. Die telefoonkabel was afgesny toe het ons 'n peskantoor voertuig gehad wat radiohoër gehad het, en ek het die

uitsendings gemaak van die "van", daar.

U het by die kantoor gebly? —Ja.

En gedeelte van die tyd was maj. van Zyl ook daar by u? —Ja. Hy het af-en-toe soheentoe gekom om boodskappe te stuur na sy hoofkwartiere.

Tydens die skietery, was u toe by die Administratiewe kantore gewees? —Ja.

Tesame met maj. van Zyl? —Ja; ek dink daardie tyd was hy daar.

Was u daar gewees toe kol. Pienaar verby gekom het? —Ja, wel, daar was so baie, ek weet nie in watter van die voertuie hy gekom het nie. Maar daar was baie offisiere gewees, daardie dag. Ek weet nie presies in watter voertuig hy gekom het nie.

Het u die skietery gehoor? —Ja.

Wanneer het dit ontrent plaasgevind? — Ek sou sê dit was tussen kwart-oor-een en half-twee, maar dit is by benadering.

Hoe lank het dit geduur? — Wat ek gehoor het - ek weet nie of dit die .303's of die stengewere was nie, maar ek sou sê dit het minder as 'n halfminuut geduur. Dit was net een sarsie, toe is dit verby.

U ken die lokasie; u ken die inwoners daarvan, neem ek aan. So kort voor die skietery begin het - of sal ek liewers sê, toe u laaste in die lokasie was en die skare gesien het, watter afleiding het u gemaak van hulle houding? — Ek kan u vertel wat werklik gebeur het, daar. 'n Sekere mnr. van Wyk het gekom - ek dink dit was hier ontrent 9-uur, 10-uur, daar rond. Hy wou 'n Naturel kom haal wat in sy droegskeermakery werk. Toe sê ek vir hom "Man, kyk net hoe staan die mense

hier die hele straat, die sypaadjies vol". Jy kon nie beweeg, daar nie. Net toe kom daar 'n ou Naturel, "Baas, hier onder by huis No. 9 is - by Huis No. 100 vermoer hulle een van jou bier-boys. Toe spring ses van ons, mnr. van Wyk en nog ander mense wat ek nie ken nie, in die kar om te gaan kyk, daar. Dit is die heel eerste straat waar jy inkom. Daar is huis No.100. Toe ons daar kom - dit was een van ons Munisipale boys; toe is hy nie daar nie; toe sê hulle nee, hy het toe weer by die klomp aangesluit. Die man ry toe taanlik vinnig; toe gooi hulle klippe. Die Bantoes staan toe aan die Westekant en aan die Suidekant van die straat, heel vol - veral vrouens was daar, en kinders. Toe gooi hulle met net so'n klip hier by die drywer se kop, dat die splinters se spat. Toe ry ons op tot waar daar 'n groot klomp mans daar was. Toe sê ek vir mnr. van Wyk "U sien self; u kan nie hier deur kom nie". Toe het ons 'n rukkie daar vertoef, toe kom ons terug. Toe word die drywer blykbaar bang, en hy ry toe vreeslik vinnig. Toe gooi hulle ons met klippe dat dit soos kanonskote gaan. Die kant waar ek gesit het - eers aan hierdie kant het 'n klip 'n ruit stukkend gegooi, toe weer aan die ander kant. Omtrent al die ruite van die kar was stukkend gegooi, en die "body" van die kar was ook stukkend gegooi. Toe ja hy; dit was hoofsaaklik Bantoevrouens en kinders. Dit wys u nou hoe dit daardie tyd was.

Het jy destyds enige menings gehad omtrent wat kan of mag gebeur? ---Ja. Ek het definitief gevoel daar sal moet geweld gebruik word, veral nadat die jet-vliegtuie oor gekom het. Toe lyk dit vir my het al die vrouens en kinders wat nog in die huise gewees het, ook uitgekom, hoofstraat-toe.

Verstaan ek dat die oproepe na jou eers deurgekom het? —Ja.

Van die Polisiestasie af, oek? —Ja; oer die radio van die poskantoor—"van", na die poskantoor hier, en hullehet dan die mense gebel.

Wat was die houding van die Polisie in die algemeen omtrent die noodsaaklikheid van versterkings? — Wel, maj. van Zyl het 'n paar keer uitgekom van bo, en dan sê hy hy voel bekommerd oer die posisie, hy moet hulp kry, die Naturelle is baie opstandig. Dit het hy 'n heel paar keer virmy gesê.

Het u gehoor dat hy gevra het, oek, vir versterkings? — Ja. Omtrent 9-ur was die eerste kabela weer reg gewees; toe kon ons weer deurkom. Toe het ons gereël met die poskantoor. Ons het spesiale nommers gebel om deur te kom Johannesburg-toe, en Pretoria-toe. Hy het oek sy offisiere gebel in Johannesburg en in Pretoria, en gesê wat is die posisie.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

KRUISVERHOOR DEUR MNR. PLEWMAN: Hoe lank is u al in bevel van Nie-Blanke Sake in Vereeniging? — 14½ jaar.

Is jy iemand wat die inwoners van hierdie omgewing, die nie-blanke inwoners, goed ken? —Ja. Ek ken hulle goed.

Het jy 'n goeie invloed oer hulle? —Ja.

As ek dit so mag stel, is u iemand na wie hulle sou luister? —Ja, deur middel van ons Adviserende Raad.

Hulle luister na jou? —Ja.

Is jy ooit gevra om die Polisie behulpsaam te

wees te Sharpeville Polisie-stasie?—Nee; as't ware, ek het die Departement ses jaar gelede gevra om 'n Polisie-stasie in Sharpeville te bou.

Nee, ek dink nie jy het my vraag heeltemal verstaan nie. Ten opsigte van die 21e, is jy gevra deur die Polisie om hulle behulpsaam te wees by die Polisie-stasie, waar daar 'n groot skare byeengekom het? — Dit was outomaties. Mr. Labuschagne en die inspekteurs en ons beskikbare Bantoe-polisie was reeds op diens van omtrent 12-uur daardie nag.

Is jy gevra om scheentoe te gaan om met die mense te praat? —Nee; ek is definitief nie gevra nie.

Dit is nie gevra of jy hulle uiteen kan maak op een of ander wyse nie? —Nee.

En mr. Labuschagne self is iemand wat die inwoners van hierdie lokasie goed ken? —Ja.

Hy is al twaalf daar?—Nie in sy huidige posisie nie.

Nie al die tyd in sy huidige posisie nie, maar hy is al twaalf jaar in Sharpeville? —Ja.

Hy ken die mense goed? —Ja; hy ken hulle baie goed.

Het hy 'n goeie invloed? — Ja. Met die wetsgehoorsame Naturel, sou ...

Wat is die ander soort? — Ek glo nie dit is 'n vraag wat ek moet antwoord, daardie, nie.

DIE VOORSITTER: U gebruik die terme? — 'n Wetsgehoorsame Naturel is 'n Naturel wat die lokasie se regulasies en wette wat van toepassing is, nakom.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: En die oorgrote meerderheid van die inwoners van Sharpeville, is hulle

wetsgehoorsaam? ---Ja; ek sou sê hulle is.

90%? --- Dit is moeilik om persentasies te gee.

Ek gee u maar net mnr. Labuschagne se syfer? ---
Ja, dit is meentlik 90%.

So, as ons van die inwoners van Sharpeville
praat, kan ons aanneem dat óf jy of mnr. Labuschagne
'n goeie invloed het oor 90% van hulle? ---Ja, maar
onder normale omstandighede.

Jy sê dat in Oktobermaand van verlede jaar
was dinge nie alles plus hier in die lokasie nie.
Jy sê die A.N.C. - dit is seker die African National
Congress? ---Ja.

Het begin lede werf; is dit wat jy gesê het?
---Ja; hulle het al voor daardie tyd bestaan, maar ...

Nou, hoekom beskryf jy dit as iets wat "nie
alles plus is nie"? --- Omdat ek weet wat die A.N.C.
se strewe is. Hulle het sekere strewes wat nie stryk
met die wette van hierdie land van vandag nie.

Is jy 'n lid van die A.N.C.? --- Ek dink
nie dit is 'n redelike vraag wat aan my nou gevra word nie.

Ek wil weet wat jou kennis van die organisasie
is, en dit is dié dat ek die vraag vra.

DIE VOORSITTER: U kon dit anders stel.

MNR. PLEWMAN: Ekakus, Edelagbare; dit was
nie 'n refleksie op die Getuie nie.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Ek sal dit só stel:
Jy is nie 'n lid nie; jy dra nie persoonlike kennis
van die bedrywighede van die A.N.C. nie? --- Ek dra
wel kennis, van pamflette wat hulle uitgee.

Dra jy persoonlike kennis daarvan? ---Ja.

Het jy van daardie pamflette? ---Ja.

Mag ek hulle sien? (Aan mr. Plewman oorgandig).

DIE VOORSITTER: Dit is nou pamflette wat van die A.N.C. afkomstig is? —Ja.

Het jy pamflette van die ander organisasie waarna ook verwys word - die P.A.C.? — Ek het hierdie een pamflet, wat uitsluitlik na die A.N.C. verwys.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Het u hierdie pamflet gesien wat bekend staan as die "Freedom Charter"? — Ja.

Weet jy wanneer die Freedom Charter as sulks oor besluit is - was dit nie vier jaar gelede nie? — Ek ken die organisasie nie so goed nie. Daar is soveel duisende pamflette; ek stel nie soveel belang in hulle nie. Ek weet in breë trekke wat is hulle beginsels, wat is hulle strewes.

DIE VOORSITTER: Wanneer het u dit in u besit gekry? —Omtrent vier/vyf maande gelede.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Is dit die enigste een wat jy het? —Ja; daar is ander van die aartappel-boeket, ook; pamflette wat van tyd tot tyd uitgegee is.

Wat hierdie een sê, is - hoekom verbind u hierdie pamflet met die A.N.C.? — Hulle praat hier van die Congress; sover ek weet. Die een is Sesuto of een of ander Bantoetaal. In elk geval het ons na 'n inspeksie van hierdie pamflette in Sharpeville gekry. Van hierdie pamflette is tydens 'n klopjag kort na die ^{een van die} onluste in sekere huise gekry, waar ons 'n drukkery gekry het. Ek het nie veel notisie geneem nie; die Polisie het die pamflette geneem.

Is daar iets daarop wat sê dat dit deur die

A.N.C. uitgegee is? --- Ek wil nie die Hof se tyd mors deur die hele ding te lees nie. "Boycott - Official Celebrations - Follow the Congress".

Is daar iets daareop wat sê "Uitgegee deur die A.N.C."? "Follow the Congresses". Daar is niks hierop wat sê dit is die A.N.C. wat hierdie pamflet uitgegee het nie. Het u dit so aanvaar? --- Ek het nog nie die hele ding deurgelees nie.

DIE VOORSITTER: Is ek reg as ek sê dat daar twee "Congresses" is - dit is die A.N.C. en die P.A.C.? ---Ja.

Dit mag op enigiets dui.

MNR. PLEWMAN: Op die oomblik gaan my vrae oor die A.N.C., Edelagbare.

DIE VOORSITTER: Maar die getuie kan dit lateraan nagaan.

MNR. PLEWMAN: Dan sal ek nie op hierdie stadium verder aangaan met vrae hieroor nie.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Nou wil ek net by iets anders kom. Hierdie beskrywing van mense as "tsotsis"; dit is al dikwels hier in die Hof gebruik. Is u 'n persoon wat 'n beskrywing kan gee van 'n tsotsi; wat is hy?--- Ek het instruksies gekry om (onhoorbaar). Daarom het ek spesifiek gesê, al die jong Naturelle is nie noodwendig tsotsis nie.

DIE VOORSITTER: Dit mag blykbaar verskillende grade van betekenis hê? --- Wel, 'n tsotsi is normaalweg 'n jong Naturel wat nie werk nie en wat/roof en steel lewe en ander mense aanrand, en so 'n lewe maak; wat nie voltyds werk nie.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Jy het daardie sand deur die straat gery en kloppe jong Naturelle gesien,

en jy is vandag hier bereid om te sê dat hulle tsotsis was? --- U moet my woorde nie verdraai nie; ek het dit nie gesê nie.

Dan het ek jou misverstaan; dit is hoekom ek die vraag stel. Sê jy dat dit nie tsotsis was nie? --- Daar was helder ligte gewees en die voertuie het ook ligte tenminste gehad. Jy kon baie goed sien.

Hoe kan jy 'n tsotsi - as jy moet weet of hy werk of nie werk nie, of hy roef en so aan - hoe kan jy sê, as jy 'n man sien, of hy 'n tsotsi is? --- Kan u daardie vraag nie liewers aan 'n lid van die P.A.C. vra nie? Hy sal dit beter kan beantwoord.

DIE VOORSITTER: U het die terme, "tsotsi" gebruik? ---Ja.

En u het 'n beskrywing gegee? ---Ja.

Die advokaat vra u daaroor, en u moet die vrae beantwoord? --- Hulle dra gewoonlik 'n sekere soort skoene, gekleurde kouse en nou broekies, en dan het hulle partykeer 'n pet op, 'n swart pet of 'n geel pet. Ek sien hulle dikwels. Nou nog kan jy hulle dikwels sien; hier by die winkels sit hulle en "dice" speel. Hulle is gewoonlik jong Naturelle tussen die ouderdom van 15 na omtrent 22 of 23.

Is dit mense wat in die daglig aangetref word? ---Ja. Wel, hulle was aangetrek soos die tsotsis wat 'n mens nog gewoonlik in die dag sien - party van hulle.

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Party van hulley omtrent hoeveel? --- Ek het nie op daardie stadium dit nodig geag om hulle te tel nie. Ek is nie bereid om 'n beraming te gee nie; dit sou nie korrek wees nie.

Ek het nie so spesifiek opgelet daarna nie.

VERDERE KRUISVERHOOR VOORBEHOU.

KRUISVERHOOR DEUR MNR. LOUW: Mnr. Ferreira, mnr. Labuschagne het gesê dat hy van mening was dat van die persone wat leiers was die dag met die oproere in Sharpeville en die skietery daar op die 21e Maart, was Sutoes. Sou hy daarby gemeen het Basutoes, of sou jy daardie vraag nie kan antwoord nie? --- Ek dink tenminste 70% na 75% van die mense van Sharpeville is van Sutoe afkoms. Dit mag Suid- of Noord Wel wees. Maar ons het ook 'n baie groot persentasie Basutoes van Basutoland wat hier woon en in diens is in die Vereeniging Munisipale gebied.

Maar sover u weet, van die persone wat verwond was - ek kan u net sê, daar was vyf Basutoes doodgeskiet, wat aan wonde beswyk het; en daar is ongeveer 18 na 20 gewond. Kan jy sê of van die leiers van die A.N.C. of P.A.C., Basutoes is, of kan jy dit nie sê nie? --- Nee; ek kan nie. Ek het nie een van die name tot my beskikking nie, maar sover ek weet nie een Basuto-leier van die A.N.C. of P.A.C. nie. Dit is sover ek weet.

Is daar van die Basutoes wat die reg het om in die lokasie te woon, op die Munisipale Raadgeweëde Raad in Sharpeville? --- U vra my nou 'n moeilike vraag.

Kyk, daar woon sekere Bantoes, Basutoes in Sharpeville? --- Ja.

Nou, daar is getuënis, daar is 'n Adviserende Raad van Bantoes in Sharpeville? --- Ja.

Nou, is daar miskien van daardie Adviserende Raad wat Basutoes is, of weet u nie? --- Ek kan u sê,

as 'n Basuto 'n permit het kragtens Artikel 12 en hy woon vir vyf jaar of langer hier, is daar niks wat hom verbied om verkies te word as lid van die Adviserende Raad nie.

DIE VOORSITTER: Weet u of enige van hulle wel lid van die Adviserende Raad is? --- Daar is een wat doodgeskiet is, maar ek is nie seker of hy 'n Basutoe - ek weet hy is 'n Basutoe maar ongeveer vyftien jaar gelede het party van die Basutoes hulle belasting oorgeplaas. Ek het hom persoonlik geken, maar ek weet nie ...

KRUISVERHOOR HERVAT: Was hy op die Raad gewees? ---Hy was op die Raad gewees - 'n lid van die Adviserende Raad.

Hy is ongelukkig een van die persone wat nou doodgeskiet is? ---Ja.

Ek mag op hierdie stadium sê, Edelagbare, dit mag nodig wees om mnr. Labuschagne weer terug te roep maar ek sal vroegtydig vir my geleerde vriend, mnr. Claassen, kennis gee.

GEEN VERDERE VRAE NIE.

MNR. CLAASSEN: GEEN HERVERHOOR NIE.

- VERDAAG: 4.00 n.m. -
tot 4 Mei 1960 om
9.45 v.m.