S. Store 326: 323.2 (68232) com Volume 18 page 1281 -- 1306

16TH NOVEMBER, 1960.

COURT RESUMES: APPEARANCES AS BEFORE, EXCEPT THAT SIMON NOW INTERPRETS.

MALAKIA MMDTONG, duly sworn, states:

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

Mr. Mmotong, I think the last question that you had answered was to the effect that you had taken down the exact words of Job Tsolo, who made a speech? Is that correct?

—— It is correct.

Now, the version as you have given it to us in the Court yesterday, is that the complete statement that he made?

——Yes.

There is nothing to add to it? --- There is nothing that I want to add to that.

And it is complete? --- Yes, it is.

How is it that you remember it today, so that you can give us back the words as you did? -- I was asked the question, to mention the words that had been used, which I did.

and were you absolutely word perfect when you gave us your evidence yesterday about what was said? --- Yes, although I did not refer to my notes.

But are you word perfect in it? --- Yes, I remember that they are perfect, but I do not know buy they are written in my notes.

What is this reference in the statement to cars?

In the statement there is a reference to cars, and it seems to be nonsense? — It is in connection with what?

Your statement. You see, as I took it down yesterday, it went as follows: "There are 80 cars in the country,

of/

COURT RESUMES : AN

MALARIA MORTONG. CROSS-EXAMINATION

Mr. Mno

had answered was to eradt words of Job It is correct.

Court yesterder, t

id , well

they I went to edd

at woll

cias gree us book greetyen, to near

.1.0

ADG WO

soned fra curry in In 516 1 appendig

Die Grad (Gelein wert)

a sy potes.

JEG V

datage design and the

Companie of 64

Tour

ee treit the layer

of which they intend to borrow 40 of these 80, so that they can face each other". -- Yes, it is correct.

But what on earth does that mean? --- I don't know what that means, but the man who was the Chairman then knows what that means.

Well, as he said it at the time, did it seem to make sense to you? -- I was writing what I heard him saying, and making sense would not help me in any way, because I would not ask him any questions.

As you wrote it down at the time, did it seem to make sense to you? — It made no difference whether it made sense or no sense to me, because I marely took down what he was saying.

All I am asking you is not whether it made any difference, but whether as you heard it, it struck you that this thing made sense or did not make sense? —— It made sense to me because I took it down, but he knows what it meant.

It is not possible that you either wrongly recorded or wrongly remembered something that Job Tsolo said, and that is different to what you told us yesterday about these cars?

What I told the Court yesterday is what I heard. There is no difference between the two versions.

You reported on this remark of Job Tsolo when you gave your evidence to the Commissioner, did you not? —— Yes, I did.

Now, I want to read to you at page 2721 what you there said. "Job Tsolo, who was the Chairman, said: We are ready to destroy white domination against the black people in Africa. The only weapon is to fight. There is no freedom without bloodshed, and that there are 80" - then the record says/....

of which they intend can face each other' But what

what that means, bu

Well, as sense to you? --- I

meking sense would not sek him any que

MANAGE A

make souse to you?

.zatysa esw

MIL I S

difference, but wh this thing made ser sense to me becaus

......

It is n

or wrongly remember is different to when the standard of the s

onebive rugy eva

Now, I

You re

there said. "Job ere reedy to dest in Africe. The o says the next word is inaudible - "who are ready to destroy
the" - then the next word is inaudible - " and that we intend
to ask for 40 from those 80, so that they could face each other
and say that the P.A.C. is the only organisation in Sharpeville".
You did say that, did you not? -- That is correct.

I am not suggesting to you that what you said then is any more comprehensible than what you told us in Court yesterday, but I do want to point out to you, tapart from the obvious differences in phrasing, another difference. You told us yesterday that what you heard was: "There are 80 cars in the country, of which they intend to borrow 40 of these, we that they can face each other", but what you told the Commission is that "there are 80 - it is not reported what these 80 were - who are ready to destroy the" - and it is not recorded what they are to destroy .- Now, there was a reference in other words in your evidence at the Commission to something or some body being ready to destroy, and there is no such reference in the evidence that you gave yesterday. Now, which report is correct? --- The reports are the same. I will be pleased to produce the notes which I wrote. You have typed out your own notes.

Is there any other comment you want to make on the point that I have just put to you? —— As you say I did not make mention, did not write snything about the cars, in the statement which I made to the Commission, will you please show me the place where there is not written anything about the cars?

Would you like to see the actual report? --- Not that what, I don't want that one which you have. I mean the note which was written down by me.

IN THE COURT:

The note which was withten down by you? -- Yes. Well/....

1,284.

eays the next word the" - then the next to ask for 40 from and say that the P. You did say that,

le any more comprel

yesterday, but I di obvious difference us yesterday that

in the country, of

so that they can f

these 80 were - wh

not reserved what

a reference in oth

to something or so

no much reference

Now, which report

beaselq ed Litw I

neve typed out you

point that I have

make mention, did

etatement which I

Perso

BLUOW . D. Com . No. of the

A 6.450克

that what, I don't

BY THE COURT

The no

Well, you must not ask Counsel for that, he must ask you for your note! --- The note that I wrote was taken by the Commission.

Oh, the note that you wrote was taken by the Commission. Oh, is that what happened to it.

BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR:

Quite a few of my exhibits Sir found their way into the Commission's exhibits.

BY THE COURT:

Have you got it available or not?

BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTORS

No, they are all up in Pretoria Sir.

BY THE COURT:

Has the other accused understood what this witness has been saying? so far today?

BY ACCUSED NO. L:

I did not understand because the Sesuthu that
was used was Northern Sesuthu and not Southern Sesuthu, and I
speak Southern Sesuthu.

BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR:

Your Worship, No. 75 complained to me Sir whilst my learned friend was busy with this point. I did not wish to interrupt him at that stage, but he came and said the proceedings were too fast, he could not understand and follow them.

BY THE COURT:

The proceedings were too fast? --- Yes.

Well, No. 75 had better instruct his Counsel

to talk slower I think!

BY THE COURT : TO THE ACCUSED:

Accused, I don't know, are you complaining that you are too far from the witness, or what, because I will remind you/....

THE PARTY OF THE P We11.

ask you for your

HY THE PUBLIC PI

into the Commis

HY THE COURT:

evali

A DITHERA SHE AS

BY THE COURT:

the Doublestant home has been earing

BY ACCUSED NO.

I di

was used was No

数は似まっからでは近、主義等級

speak Southern MARKIN SH LITER

er the public pi

my learned frie te interrupt his

proceedings wer

them.

PRUOD ANT TH

The

Well

to talk slower

THE COURT :

Accu

are too far fro

you that you were sitting much nearer to him at one time, and you had a complaint about that, about not having something to rest your backs on?

(The accused have no complaints).

(The Court reads back the evidence that has been given so far today to the accused, and it is interpreted to them).

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

I want to put it to you that because of the difference in the two versions, you are an inaccurate observer? --- What differences are there?

BY MR. UNTERHALTER:

I don't know if Your Worship understood that. Your Worship will recollect that yesterday this witness was ordered by Your Worship to give his evidence in Northern BY THE COURT:

No. I did not order him.

BY MR. UNTERHALTER:

No, I mean Your Worship suggested it to him.

BY THE COURT:

I just put it to him that whatever language he can express himself the best in.

HY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR:

I think the point Sir that my learned friend is making is that the Interpreter is now putting Southern Sesuthu to the witness.

BY MR. UNTERHALTER:

There should be two languages being used Yes. Your Worship, Northern and Southern, and he is only using one.

BY THE COURT:

Mr. Interpreter, this witness told me he speaks Sepedi, so that you went to speak to him in Sepedi, and when you/....

by the Commission

oh,

Commission. Oh.

Quiti

subsection country,

YOUR

1,286.

you that you were sitt you had a complaint ab

rest your backs on? (The accused have no

(The Court reads back today to the accused,

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY

T want to

difference in the two

--- What differences

BY MR. UNTERHALTER:

I don't l

Your Worship will re ordered by Your Wor

BY THE COURT:

ES I OH

BY MR. UNTERHALTER.

No. I me

BY THE COURT:

I just

can express himsel

BY THE PUBLIC PROS

I thin

dt tadt at gairlem

Sesuthu to the wi

BY MR. UNTERHALTE

Yes.

Your Worship, No.

one.

BY THE COURT:

Sepedi, so that

you have translated into English then you have to translate it into Southern Sesuthu to the accused.

BY THE COURT : TO THE WITNESS:

The point was that because of the differences between the evidence/and the evidence to the Commissioner, it was put to you that you are not an accurate observer? --- What evidence have you got that I am not?

Will you stop asking questions! I told you about that yesterday. Will you answer questions! I have heard a difference between your evidence today, and between your evidence given at the Judicial Commission. Now, do you agree that you are an inaccurate observer, or don't you agree? ---I do not agree.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

Now, you claim that among the people who were present at that meeting, was No. 2 secused? --- Yes, that is correct.

Are you absolutersure about that? --- I am sure about that.

You have no doubt about it? --- I have no doubt that he was there.

Now, where was he? --- He was in the house.

Whereabout in the house? -- I won't say exactly where in the house because there were other people also in the house: some people were entering and some going out. and others were seated.

So do I understand you correctly that you don't know whereabout in that house No. 2 accused was? --- He was in the house with the others.

But you don't know whereabout exactly? --- I do not know where he was exactly, because when I entered the house I found him seated in the sittingroom.

Whereabout in the sittingroom was he seated? --

I/....

1,287.

you have transl it into Souther

BY THE COURT : The

toda the evidence/an

to you that you have you got the

MILL

that yesterday.

difference between

evidence given

that you are an

I do not agree.

CROSS-EXAMINATIO

. WO K

at that meeting

Are

about that.

HOY

that he was then

.woM d sactifies the

Where

where in the hou

the house; some

others were seat

So do

know whereabout

in the house wit

But 1

not know where h

house I found hi

Where

I'do not know where exactly, because there were many people

Was it on a settee or was it on a chair? --- I can't in the room. say where exactly, because some of the people were standing, while others were seated, and there were those that were going out and those that were going into the room.

And among all these people who were there, what was it that makes you remember the presence of No. 2 accusedeso particularly?

BY THE COURT:

Mr. Unterhalter, are you now quite fair in putting to him that he remembers him so particularly, because he has mentioned a whole lot of people.

BY MR. UNDERHALTER:

Yes, I shall come to that in a moment, Your Worship. BY THE WITNESS:

I did not remember the accused in particular, but I saw the others also there.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

You have told us in your evidence-in-chief that you remember five people in all, i.e. No. 8, No. 3, No. 1, No. 2, and No. 39? Is that correct? --- It is accused Nos. 8, 2....?

Nos. 8, 3, 1, 2 and 39? Isthat correct? --- Are those the people who were these?

Those are the people whom you said you remember werethere? --- Accused No. 1 was also there.

BY THE COURT: Yes well, just put your next question. We seem to be getting nowhere.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

Now, smong these five, which are a portion of the thirty people who were there, how is it that you remember No. 2/

I do not know where

in the room.

ti seW

say where exactly, while others were out and those that ome bas

it that makes you

Pyliniustrag

BY THE COURT:

JAU V.TM

to him that he rem mentioned a whole BE WE . CHARRENTY BE

Yes, L

BY THE WITHESS

bib I

I saw the others

CHOSS-EXAMINATION

You has

remember five peo

end No. 39? Is B. SON

elgoog out soout

Second Those

werethere? --- Ad

THE COURT

the this antes w

to be getting no

CHOSS-EXAMINATIO hasse I fow, l

thirty people wh

No. 2 so particularly? --- I do not remember accused No. 2 in particular, but I saw them all there.

You know that when you went down into the Court room and started to point out the various accused who were present at that house on the 10th January, you started with No. 8, you then next pointed out No. 3, you then passed by No. 2, you touched No. 1, and then you went and touched No. 2, and you then moved further back and touched No. 39. Do you agree that that was the order in which you pointed them out? --- It may be so because you were looking at me.

Now, as they are seated in the Court here No. 2 is next to No. 3, and between No. 1 and No. 3? --- Yes, that is correct.

Why did you pass No. 2 by instead of touching him and then going on to indicate No. 1? --- I did not realise that I passed accused No. 2. All I know is that I touched them.

Were you not perhaps in some doubt as to whether No. 2 was a man who should be pointed out by you? --- I was not in any doubt, because if I was in any doubt I would not have walked past accused No. 2.

I am not sure that I understood your last answer. Did you say that if you were not in any doubt, or rather if you were in any doubt you would nothere walked past him? -If I had any doubt I would not have touched him.

BY THE COURT:

Mr. Unterhalter, you have now made a feature of what happened in Court yesterday, and I think that I must place on record now that he did plint out the accused in the order in which you have mentioned, but that there was hardly any hesitation about going back to No. 2 when he had got to No./....

No. 2 so part

Your som and star white present at the out at the No. 8, you the

No. 2, you to

egree that the

to his case to No is near to No mentioned a wind

is correct.

and then gold

them.

and ho. 37

No. 2 was a

not in any d

Did you say you were in

If I had any

what happen place on rec order in wh No, 1, and they are sitting about half a pace apart. Is that correct? I would like your comment on it ifyou don't agree with me, so that that can go on record.

BY MR. UNTERHALTER:

Your Worship, we are not in a position of having to determine periods of time. With respect to Your Worship I would say that there was some hesitation, but the degree of hesitation was very slight.

BY THE COURT:

I'll agree, that is right. There may have been some hesitation yes.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

Now, if No. 2 accused gives evidence he is going to deny that he was in that house on the 10th Jamuary. He is going to say that he was working en a special Sunday shift at the African Cables by whom he was then employed. Now, in the light of what I have just said to you, would you perhaps care to reconsider what you have said about No. 2 accused being there on the 10th Jamuary? —— If accused No. 2 denies that he was there, I cannot say anything else, because that will be his version.

Do you mean by that that you persist in your original story, or you are not able to deny what the accused is going to say? —— It all depends on accused No. 2, as to whether he will deny that or not.

BY THE COURT:

No, you are being asked now if he denies it are you going to say he is wrong or are you going to say "I may be wrong"? Now, just befair. Think it over. — I saw accused No. 2 with my own naked eyes.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

Was quite a lot said at that meeting?

By/....

BY THE COURT:

Do you mean now by way of formal speeches and not monversations over the beer mugs?

BY MR. UNTERHALTER: CROSS-EXAMINATION CONTINUED:

Yes, political speeches? --- The speeches that they made were the speeches that I told the Court about yesterday.

Please answer the question more directly? Were there many political speechew that afternoon? --- At that particular meeting?

That is so. --- The speeches that were made were the speeches that were made by Job Tsolo.

Was that the only speech that was made? -- Yes, it is the only speech that I heard.

Nothing else of political significance that you heard from anybody else? -- Nothing else. I don't know if my ears left me in the lurch.

Did you record the names of all the people who were present, or did you only write down the sameless of Job Tsolo? --- I wrote down the names in my Police pocket book.

Not in the notebook where Policemen record the details of the speeches they are listening to? --- I wrote the words that were spoken by Job Tsolo on a paper which I handed in, i.e. to the Commissioner.

You told us that you wrote the names of the people present in your little notebook, and that I take it is the usual notebook that every Policeman has when he writes down the events as they occur while he is on duty? -- Yes.

And in addition to that notebook members of the Security Branch are issued with a notebook in which they record the speeches they hear? Is that so? -- That is correct. Did you use one of those notebooks are issued for

the/....

No, 1, an that corr agree with

BY MR. UM WINNSHIE

to determ I would be

of heat to BY THE COU

es di ---

some hest CROSS-EXAL

to course

to deny th is going t

at the Afr in the 11e

care to re

being ther that he wa

td bd IIIw

s fantziro f guitog at

whether he HOO THE ME

going to a

I SARIOTA

No. 2 with

CROSS-EXAMT

BY THE COURT:

gonversations BY MR. UNTERH Ye

made were the

19

T

No

there many po particular me

the speeches

it is the onl

heard from an

my cars left

were present. Tsolo? --- I

arous details of th the words the

handed in, i

imalalao present in y usual notebo the events a

Security Bra record the ap

Marin.

the recording of speeches when you attended the meeting at this house on the 10th January? --- I did not make use of that book, i.e. for reasons that I can tell you now.

But you used a piece of paper did you not? -- I used a piece of paper.

BY THE COURT:

Yes.

You mean a loose piece of paper? --- A loose piece of paper, and it was torn from an exercise book.

A loose piece of paper from an exercise book? --

CROSS-EXAMINATION CONTINUED:

Did you put the names of all the people who were present on that loose piece of paper?

BY THE COURT:

Are you now trying to confuse the witness? because that is not what he said. I can't stop your question, but perhaps your question is inadvertent, because he said he took the names of the people down in his pocket book and the speech on a loose piece of paper.

HY MR. UNTERHALTER:

Yes. Your Worship, I want to ascertain whether in additionlto the names in the netebook they were on a piece of paper.

BY THE COURT : TO THE WITHESS:

On the loose piece of paper did you also put down the names of the people present? --- Yes, I wrote down the names of the people on that piece of paper, but I wrote in detail the names of the people who were present in the Police notebook.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

So that there is a double record of the names of the people who were present at that meeting? There is one in your notebook, and the other is on a loose piece of paper? Yes/

the recording of this house on th book, i.e. for But

used a piece of BY THE COURT:

You n

piece of paper, A Loc

Yes. E sedonean m

CROSS-EXAMINATIO

Did s

present on that

BY THE COURT:

Are y

that is not what perhaps your que the names of the on a loose piece BY MR. UNTERHALT

additionate the n

of paper.

MY THE COURT : TO

On the

.seY

the names of the of the people on names of the peopl OROSS-EXAMINATION

So that

the people who wer in your notebook, --- Yes, Your Worship, I wrete the names in detail in the notebook.

BY THE COURT:

Won't you try to reply to the questions straightforwardly? It is very simple. Did you write the names both in the book and on the piece of paper? --- Yes, Your Worship. The difference is that I wrote the names in detail in the pocket book.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

What does that mean, that you wrote them in detail? --- In the exercise book I noted the speech that Job Tsolo made, and in the pocket-book or the note-book I wrote the names.

But you also wrete the names on the lease piece of paper? -- I did not write all the names on the loose piece of paper, but I am certain of having written Job Tsole's name on the loose piece of paper.

Are you having difficulty in understanding the questions as I put them to you? --- No, I have no difficulty.

You see, I understood you to say just a couple of minutes ago that you had compiled so to speak a double record of the names, one on the loose piece of paper and the other in your note-book, and that the only difference between them was that in the note-book there was more detail about the names than there was on the loose piece of paper. New, is that correct? --- That is correct. That is because in the notebook I wrote all the names of the people.

Now, when you say that there was more detail in the note-book, even though there are two lists of names, what do you mean by more detail in the note-book? --- In the pecket note-book I wrote only the names, and in the exercise ... or on the/....

Yes, Your Worship, I

book.

THE COURT:

Won't you try

forwardly? It is very in the book and on the p

pocket book.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR.

What does the

___ In the exercise book

names.

But you also

itid you gut

paper? -- I did not wr of mper, but I am certa on the loose piece of p

questions as I put them

in a laces pleas of parties of the rest of

minutes ago that you he
of the names, one on th
in your note-book, and
was that in the note-bo
than there was on the
cerrect? — That is co
book I wrote all the n

mete-book, even though you meen by more detail note-book I wrote only

THE STORMER WILL ME

the piece of exercise paper I wrote the speech that was made by Job Tsolo.

Then are you now saying that only wrote one list of names, i.e. in your note-book, and on the piece of exercise paper you did not write any list of names, but you only recorded a speech by Job Tsole? —— There are names of people that I wrote on the paper, but the names in full I wrote in the note-book.

name, the full surname, in your note-book, but you may only have put an initial in the loose piece of paper? --- On the piece of paper I wrote the names and the surnames of the people, but in the note-book I wrote the names and the surnames of all the people.

Well, I wen't pursue it. You recorded the names in your note-book with ears, because it was important that they should be so recorded? —— I did not know that there would be cases in connection with that speech.

Policemen must always be ready for cases: CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

BY THE COURT:

Did you write the names in your note-book, your Policeman's note-book, with care? --- That is correct.

You know the people whose names you recorded in your Policeman's note-book? --- I know the names of the people whom I know there.

and these were the names you recorded in your notebook? --- Yes, the names of the people whem I knew.

Did you put the date in your note-book? --- That is correct.

Did you put a little memorandum in your note-book that these people were seen at room 8171 I think it is?

the piece of exerci

Then are names, i.e. in year paper you did not ded.s speech by Joh

beok. By that

name, the full surn have put an initial piece of paper I wr but in the nete-bootse.

Well, I

in your nate-book with should be so recordences in connection II THE COURT:

Policemen

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY

In your Did you w

You knew You knew

your Policemen's net

And these

Die M. Did yeu pu

you mean.

I wrete erri Did you pu

that these people wer

Whatever the address was, did you put the address where you had seen them that day? SETE as correct. — That is correct.

Did you make any other comments in your Policeman's note-back about this meeting you attended? --- I den't remember, but I remember writing their names and the date.

Now, these books, these Peliceman's note-books, are really a diary of everything that you encounter that is of importance while you are on duty? --- That is correct.

And when you have completed one of them to whom do you hand it? -- If one is full I hand it to Sorgeant Wessels, who is my Sorgeant, and then he keeps it in the office where he knows

And did you complete and hand this particular notebook to Sergeant Wessels? --- The book is not on me here, but it is with him.

If it is required it is with Sergeant Wessels? ---

We will show them to you, we can't expect you to remember the numbers. Will you look at them again please? Exhibit 5, exhibit 6, exhibit 47 and exhibit 49. Have you seen them all? ——Yes.

Are these all the enes that you saw, or are there others? --- These are all the enes that I saw.

You have made reference in your evidence-in-chief to a pamphlet called "Calling the Nation"? --- That is a pamphlet which I saw.

Was that Exhibit 49, or Exhibit 48, I am not sure?

--- I wanted you to name the exhibits, and you refused to.

BY THE COURT:

Did he say "Calling the Nation"? Did he use the

1, 295.

Whatever the ad had seen them t

or let fee fac to mote-beek about

remember, but I

won now

really a diary o impertance while

you hand it? ___ who is my Sergeen

He knews

b bak to coefa

w baa

book to Sergeant it is with him.

#1 11

Yes, that is corr s ,well sag

pamphlets, Exhibi

which are these e

I we will

temember the nuch Exaibit 5, exhibi

seen them all? ___

Are th

others? --- Those

ad usy

to semphlet oal pamphlet which I

dt esW

- I wanted you

BY THE COURT: that the Did he

works "Calling the Nation"?

BY MR. UNTERHALTER: That is how I have recorded it in the evidence-in-

chief.

BY THE COURT:

Except that "Calling the Nation" he says was

Exhibit 5.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

Was that the one that you saw last in the series that came to your attention? --- Yes, that is correct.

Now, you say that on the Sunday you were cycling when you heard certain reports. Was that Sunday the 20th March? --- Yes, I was eyeling.

And as a result of these reports did you immediately go on duty? --- I was on duty at the time when I was cycling.

That was at eleven e'cleck that night? --- That is

correct. And then you joined a certain group to assist in dispersing people? --- Yes, that is correct.

You wase well known to members of the Police were you? ---Yes, I was known to them.

Did you join a patrol of Policemen who know you? --- That is correct.

I am not sure if I understood the reason that you gave for saying that you remained in the van, but as I took it down it was to the effect that you did not get out because bhing in civilian clothes you might have been assaulted by the Pelice while they were dispersing the crewd. Did I understand that correctly? --- That is correct.

Would your colleagues nothere known you and not have assaulted you had you been with them during a baton charge? --- If that happened during the night and I was seen getting/.... 1,295.

ms "Calling the Nation"?

to terror of the state of the state of

MR. UNTERHALTER:

That is hew I have I

.lei

THE COURT:

Except that "Calling

hibit 5.

OSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTER

Was that the one th

at came to your attention? -

Now, you say that

en you heard certain reports

arch? ---Yes, I was eyeling.

And as a result of

on duty? --- I was on duty

That was at eleven

errect.

And then you joine

Hapereing people? -- Yes,

Youwre well know

you? ---Yes, I was knewn to

did you jein a pa

- That is correct.

I am not sure if

gave for saying that you ren

to down it was to the effect

was in civilian clethes y

the Pelice while they were

understand that cerrectly?

Would your colle

have assaulted you had you

charge? --- If that happen

getting out of the van and chasing semebedy, the Constables will chase after me and assault me, thinking that I am running away and I am one of the meb.

In other words, you are saying that you would not have been recognised by your colleagues? --- They would not have recognised me because it was dark.

Were you performing any function at all as a Policeman being in that wan? --- I was.

what function was that? — I was travelling in
the van because I was teld that if the van... they will drive
the van to some people and then step it there, and then open
the van and look to see who these people were, but I was teld
not to get out of the van.

You were not driving the van, were you? --- No, I

Your function was to open the door, was it? ---That was not necessarily my function, but my function was
to stay in the company when they were travelling by van.

You have told us that you came across No. 4 accused on the occasion when Lieutenant Fourie spoke to Man --- Yes, we found them have.

And Lieutenant Peurie teld him and the erowd to go home? ---Yes, he teld them.

And did they obey and disperse? -- They did not disperse.

What did they do? --- Accused No. 4 then spake and said that they wanted to talk semething among themselves and that they would not go away.

Yes, carry on? — Then Lieutenant Fourie told then that he was giving them a short while, during which time they must be gene, and that if they wanted to say something or talk semething among themselves, they should do so during the/....

getting out of the van a
will chase after me and
away and I am one of the

have been recognised by have recognised me becan

Policemen being in that

What function

the van because I was t

the van and look to see not to get out of the v

You were not

was not.

Your function

That was not necessarilte stay in the company

on the eccasion when Li

heme? --Yes, he told t

disperse.

out his bear was at that

said that they wanted that they would not go

that he was giving the the the the the the

or talk something emon

in fees you betinesse evel

manufact to the TI ---- Townsell

the day and not during the night.

What happened at the end of all these discussions?

--- Pelicemen them assaulted them with batens, i.e. sticks.

And then they dispersed? -- Then they dispersed.

New, later in the early part of the merning you were

at the hestel you say? --- Yes, I was at the hestel.

And there you witnessed the use of teargas and you also saw a bagon charge, did you? ---Yes.

Were you there for some time before the teargas was used? —— I was there Your Worship.

And you say you witnessed the arrest of accused No. 2? --- Yes, I did.

New, you also witnessed the arrest of accused No. 1? -- That is correct, I did.

And was No. 2 accused arrested first? --- I cannot say.

Don't you remember the order of the arrests? --I do not remember.

Were you assisting Sergeant Wessels in these arrests?
--- I opened the van and then the people went into it.

Does that mean that the two of them, accused No. 1 and accused No. 2, were brought to the van together and went in one after the other? Is that what you are saying? —— Accused Nos. 1 and 2 were brought to the van and they went into the van one after the other.

By that are you wishing to convey that they went into the van almost together? That they entered a matter of seconds the one after the other, having been brought there together? — All that I know is that one entered the van and then the other followed him into it.

Well, was there any appreciable interval of time

the day and not d What h

We true was a barry

The same Little

and th

,woM

And t

at the heatel you

you also saw a b

Were

And 3

No. 29 --- Yes,

.woM

And

Don

I do not rememi

-- I opened ti

and accused No.

Accused Nos. 1

into the van

of seconds th

together?

- Pelicemen the

I --- ?besu saw

That is cor

say.

Were

Des

in one after t

and then the

between the one and the other going into the van, five minutes say? --- I did not look at the time, but I don't think that there was an interval of five minutes.

Well, would it be an interval of a minute or just a couple of seconds? --- Ill I can tell the Court is this, that the one entered the van, then the other followed him. BY THE COURT:

We would like you to try to help us by saying what period of time elapsed between the one going in and the next one going in? -- Will the Court allow me to guess?

Estimate, not guess. --- Then I should not be blamed for estimating Your Worship.

Very well. --- I estimate the interval to be about two minutes.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

And you were in the company of Sergeant Wessels during all the time that he spent in arresting these people? -- I was in the company of many other Policemen there, including Sergeant Wessels.

I am not concerned about the others, but can I understand that you were at the side of Sergeant Wessels throughout the period of the arrest of these two people? ---I was not near him, but he was walking together with other Europeans on my righthand side, and I was to his lefthand side.

But when he came to arrest these people, were you next to him when he arrested them? --- I went up to him after he had called me and after he had arrested one of them.

Which one was that? -- I do not say which one it was, because I only know that they were both arrested there at the same time.

> Now, you went up to him after he had arrested one of/

between the one
say? --- I did n
there was an int
Well,
a couple of seco

We won
period of time el
one going in?

Estima

HY THE COURT:

for estimating You

two minutes.

GROSS-EXAMINATION

And yo during all the the the the late of the late of

understand that y
throughout the pe
I was not near hi
th one
Luropeans on my r
Buropeans on my r

next to him when
he had called me
into the
Which

was, because I on together at the same time. and then was Now, y of them, and did you go with Sergeant Wessels and the person whom he had arrested towards the van, and were you present when this person was placed in the van? — I was together with Sergeant Wessels when he took that person and put him into the van.

Was that the first person that he put in, whoever it may be? --- Yes.

And then did you and Sergeant Wessels leave the van and go towards the crowd, and were you present when he effected the second arrest of whoever that may be? —— I stood at the door of the van.

And did Sergeant Wessels leave you there and go

off on his own? —— Yes, and then he came back with another,

i.e. another one.

And then he put the second one in the van? — Yes.

Did you hear any conversation pass between either had of these people whom he arrested, and himself, i.e. Sergeant Wessels? — I did not hear any conversation. All I heard was that accused No. 2 and accused No. 1 had their arms raised up and said "Iswe Lethu!" That is what I heard.

You observed these people as they came towards you in the custody of Sergeant Wessels? --- Yes, I saw them, and I saw them even before Sergeant Wessels arrested them.

You noticed how No. 1 secused was dressed? —— I am unable to say how accused No. 1 was dressed, but I saw him there.

Did you notice how No. 2 secused was dressed? ——
I did/notice how secused No. 2 was dressed, but I saw him
there.

Did you notice anything on the lapels of No. 2

secused? — I saw those things. There were two things, only
two/....

re and assentant of them, and did whom he had arres when this person with Sergeant West come to algues a

Deligino 900 600 Was the

It may be? --- Yes

into the van.

and the

to be have and go towards the effected the secon Lie bil man stood at the door for and die

off on his own? 1.c. another one.

And the

Did you

of these people w Wessels? --- I di din was that accused up and said "Iswe . La lerabon You ob

in the custody of I saw them even b Europeum County

unable to say how

next to it was the there

ne bad sa Did you

pog I did notice how

Side in the constant of the co

one add to Did yo

as I secused? -

Do you remember what was written on them? -- I did two. not look at them closely, but I saw written en them "P.A.C.". That is on both? Now, when you say both, what do you mean by both? -- There were two things on the lapels, one was higher up and the one just further down.

By both you therefore mean two labels on the lapel?

--- Yes.

Did they both have "P.A.C." on them? --- Yes, they both had "P.A.C." on them.

Is that all that they had on them? -- That is all that I saw.

Had there been anything else on them would you have noticed it? --- When I looked at him I nothered these "P.A.C." labels. If there were other labels I wouldhave seen them.

No, if there were any other words on either of those labels would you have noticed them? --- I am not certain of the other words which might have been there, but the words I saw were "P.A.C.".

Look, you must please try to answer the question. If there had been any other words besides the letters "P.A.C." on one or other of those labels, would you have noticed those words? --- I would have noticed them provided I took particular notice of them and went close enough/to read them.

You were quite close to him, were you not? -- I was close to him yes.

A distance of would you say a pace? --- Maybe a pace or something to that effect, but I was looking at his face.

BY THE COURT:

Looking at? --- At his face.

Cross-examination

two.

not look at them of

you mean by both?

of Jost and

one was higher up

TAN MEY

off bid

both had "P.A.C."

effected tile that that: I cawine door

edt bell

noticed it? --- Wh

labels. If there

no, if

those labels would of the other words

I cow were "P.A.C.

Look, y

If there had been

on one or other or

fluow I --- Pebsow

notice of them and

You wer

close to him yes.

stelb A

pace or something

BY THE COURT:

I was blooming

Lookin

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

You were also looking at the lapel I take it, because you were interested to see what was there? ---Whit, they had their arms raised after I had noticed this lapel, but when I went closer to them'I did not take particular notice of this label because I was looking at them and into their faces.

As a member of the Swearity Branch of the Police, were you not particularly interested to see the lettering on this thing? --- After I saw the P.A.C. on the lapel I became satisfied.

that might have been there? You were not interested to read anything else that might have been on that label, othern than the words "P.A.C."? —— No, this happened immediately. I did not take particular notice to see if these were other letters on it.

Did you subsequently get into the van with No. 1 and No. 2 accused when it drove off? --- No Your Worship.

You did not see them at all after that, until after the shooting I presume? -- I did not seethem after that.

Now, you have said that No. 2 accused was leading that big crowd? --- That is correct.

What makes you say he was leading the crowd? --That is because accused No. 2 was standing right in front
of the crowd, and he had his hand put up in this manner as I
am indicating to the Court, and saying "Iswe Lethu!", and the
crowd who were following him also said in response "Iswe
Lethu!"

was he the only one in the front of that erowd who was raising his hand and saying "Iswe Lethu!"? --- Accused No. 2wwas the only one who was in front, and behind him were

children/....

CROSS-EXAMINATION H

You were

() 高级等 because you were in distant for makin boat they had their arms one was elemen and when I went closer of this label because

faces.

- 000 d

As a mem t. D. A. TH back adod

ER KIG.

you not particularly thing? --- After I fied.

da hull So you w

the toolion that might have been anything else that

the words "P.A.C."?

not take particular Mon undia sat to

on it.

Did you

and No. 2 accused w

You did

on one or sense the shooting I pres

Now, you to be a self of

that big erowd? ---

What mak

see the sid profe That is because

of the erowd, and h an indicating to th

crowd who were fold

Lethu!"

Adona. Was he t

THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF TH who was retaing his No. 2wwas the only children and behind the children were women, and men were following them.

You see, that evidence differs from evidence that we have heard previously in this Court. That evidence is to the effect that there were a whole group of people in front of this crowd, marching up and down? One of the witnesses said that No. 2 accused was among that group who were marching in front of the crowd?

BY THE COURT:

I think it would be more accurate if you said the evidence was that there were several people in front of the crowd, and not use the word "group". "Group" suggests people My impression was that they were at various together again. places leading this crowd.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED:

And he did not especially say that the No. 2 accused stood out as the only one in front of that crowd? Now, is he wrong when he says that? -- I won't say whether or not he is wrong, because I do not know what he saw.

Well, having put to you what he has said, do you perhaps say that you are wrong in the description that you gave of accused No. 2 just now? --- I am not wrong because I am telling the Court what I saw with my eyes.

Now, Seeiso Street has on one side of it the hostel? the milk depot, and on the other side and more towards the entrance it has the brewery? --- That is correct, but I do not know anything about the dairy that I can make mention ofl

The hostel side I shall call the north side, and the brewery side I shall call the south side. Now, at the time of the arrest of No. 2 accused was he in the middle of the street, was he on the south side of the street, or was he on the north side of the street? --- Seeiso Street is divided into two. There/

children and behind th

following them. CROSS-EXAMINATION NY

You see, th

we have heard previous because you were that the effect that there they had their summer this crowd, marching u

when I wenk closed support lets! aids to

in front of the crowd? faces.

BY THE COURT:

I think it

LESS STEEN TOR HOVE evidence was that their mains crowd, and not use the

tion. together again. M

places leading this co

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY tung sale maintyas

And he did

- P. C. A. T" abrow say accused stood out as a religations said for Now, is he wrong when . of mo

or not he is wrong, b

Well, bavi

wad No. 2 accues an perhaps say that you

gave of accused No. 2 am telling the Court

Now, Secta

the milk depot, and o entrance it has the b not know anything abo of the cree The hostel

brewery side I shall the arrest of No. 2 a

was he on the south

elde of the street? d etc galatar saw odw

No. 2wes the only on

There is a patch of grass that divides the street. Accused No. 2 was in the street which is on the righthand side of the main street, and this street runs past in front of the hostel.

So it was on the hostel side of Seeiso Street? ---Yes, in other words, they were walking in the direction of the

On the hostel side of Seeiso Street, and that is town. where he was arrested? --- That is where he was arrested.

This witness said that he saw No. 2 accused arrested? BY THE COURT:

BY MR. UNTERHALTER: I am under that impression Your Worship.

BY THE COURT:

He saw one, but he does not know which one was arrested. He went to the wan and saw Wessels come with the I thought your question was about where in the street was accused No. 2 at the time when he was leading the frowd? Is that not what you are asking him? BY MR. UNTERHALTER:

Yes, I want to get that.

BY THE COURT:

Then you may put it that way perhaps.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. UNTERHALTER CONTINUED: At the time I'll put the question in two parts. that you saw No. 2 accused leading this crowd, where was he? On the hostel side of the street or on the brewery side of the street? -- He was on the hostel side of the street.

In the street or on the pavement? --- In the street. Did you see him being arrested by Sergeant Wessels? --- I saw him being arrested by Sergeant Wessels.

Was he arrested at the same spot where you saw him leading the erowd, i.e. on the hostel side of Seeiso Street

There is a patch of was in the street w street, and this s So it w

Yes, in other word town.

On the

where he was arrea

BY THE COURT:

This w

HY MR. UNTERHALTE

u me I

BY THE COURT:

He say

arrested. He wer

other one. od bad

street was accus

the bear growd? Is that

H MR. UNTERHALT Yes,

HY THE COURT: Then

I.I

that you saw No of Angel Mile and

On the hostel tak fi somerano street? ---He

ant uson enjining In

OE 80 Did

de l'ofte crouses mid was I ---

ew is discrete add

was his on the sea leading the e edds of the street

in the street? --- Yes, he was arrested on that side because they could not some to town because the Constables had blocked their way there.

But it was on the hostel side and it was in the street according to you? --- That is correct yes.

Now, you saw the attack on the crowd with the teargas bombs by the Police? --- I saw them throwing the teargas.

Was accused No. 2 arrested before the tearges bomb attack, during the tearges bomb attack, or after the tearges bomb attack? --- At the time when they attacked with the teargas accused No. 2 had been arrested already.

That is before any teargas bombs had been thrown at all, No. 2 accused had been arrested? --- Yes.

No. 2 accused is going to say that he was in the front of the erowd, he was not acting as a leader, and he was on the northern side of the street on the pavement? He is going to say that he raised his hands to his eyes, which were affected by the teargas bombs that had been thrown, and it was at that stage that he was arrested. What do you say to that? --- I say that accused No. 2 was arrested before the teargas had been thrown.

He is going to say further that he only had one ticket on his lapel when he was arrested? --- I say that I saw two tickets.

Before the arrest of Nos. 1 and 2 accused, did you know them both? --- Did I know them?

Yes? --- Yes, I did.

Did you know a lot about them? --- Yes, I knew

them. Did you know a lot about them? -- I don't understand you Sir. I don't know what you went now.

Did you know a great many things about No. 1 and No. 2

in the street? they could not their way there

There is

Yes, is But

etreet accordin woll

gas bombs by th eaW

attack, during bomb attack?

teargas accused THE THE That

st all, No. 2 ON bedeers

front of the er on the northern going to say th

affected by the

was at that st that? --- I say

teargas had bec

December of Heat ticket on his saw two tickets

Bef know them both dom

Yes Did

them. A STATE OF

Did

stand you Sir. Did

No. 2 accused? -- I knew that accused Nos. 1 and 2 belonged to that movement of the P.A.C.

Did you know that they were friends? --- I did not know that.

If that is so, why did you tell His Worshipin your evidence-in-chief that No. 1 accused was in the company of his friend, No. 2 accused? --- I said accused No. 2 was accused No. 1's friend merely because they are seated together in Court, 1.e. next to each other.

What makes you think because men wit together in a Court of law, and are charged together with a crime, that they are necessarily friends? -- That is because I was replying to questions put to me, and every time reference would be made to either accused No. 1 or accused No. 2, and then I would have said accused No. 1 is accused No. 2's friend.

Because their numbers follow? Because of the order in which they appear in Court, do you think they are friends? --- Not because their numbers follow each other's, but it is because of the way in which you referred to them.

Now, you have said that you pointed out No. 19 accused on the identification parade?

BY THE COURT:

Mr. Unterhalter, I would like to stop at this stage if you are going on to a new point.

BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR:

Is Your Worship prepared to entertain just a quick application from myself regarding to an amendment of the charge at this stage, or shall I do it later?

BY THE COURT:

No, I don't want to get involved in enything like that now.

BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR:

As Your Worship pleases.

By/....

1,306.

WIR. URREMAKEEL

Tour Vorship, it might perhaps more time tomorrow if I saked Your Vorship to order that the notebook of this situess be produced in Court temperow for prose-transmissation thereof.

11 11 11 11 11

You, we need the anticoperate with and I think
it should be produced, and I must also sob the Cross to be
propered.— I don't say it will be accommany - but to very to
get hold of this original moto of the appears, i.e. if you can
ur. Proceedables

or the remote the present the

COURT ADDITION THE EX THE TOTAL 1919.

1. 2 accused?

that movemen

esst Did

. tant wom

g TI

ort dence-in-chi

Lend, No. 2 a

to. 1's friend

furt, i.e. nex

Janw

wel to Jane

they are necess

to questions pu

to either accus

teve said accus

Beca

tder in which

ou --- Sabretel

ut it is becau

Now,

secused on the

THE COURT:

.xM

stage if you ar

THE PUBLIC P

X aI

application fro

charge at this

HT COURT:

No,

won feat

W THE PUBLIC