

Ass

SAAKNOMMER: CC 482/85

PRETORIA

1987-08-18

DIE STAAT teen:

PATRICK MABUYA BALEKA EN 21

ANDER

VOOR:

SY EDELE REGTER VAN DIJKHORST EN

ASSESSOR : MNR. W.F. KRUGEL

NAMENS DIE STAAT:

ADV. P.B. JACOBS

ADV. P. FICK

ADV. W. HANEKOM

NAMENS DIE VERDEDIGING:

ADV. A. CHASKALSON

ADV. G. BIZOS

ADV. K. TIP

ADV. Z.M. YACOOB

ADV. G.J. MARCUS

TOLK:

MNR. B.S.N. SKOSANA

KLAGTE:

(SIEN AKTE VAN BESKULDIGING)

PLEIT:

AL DIE BESKULDIGDES: ONSKULDIG

KONTRAKTEURS:

LUBBE OPNAMES

VOLUME 263

(Bladsye 14 109 - 14 150)

THE COURT RESUMES AT 14h00 ON 1987-08-18:

POPO SIMON MOLEFE, still under oath:

MR BIZOS: M'Lord, before My Learned Friend continues, there was a request to the investigating officer in terms of Your Lordship's order and he has consented for Mr Ramagula, accused no 9, to be allowed to go the Vaal Triangle during the forthcoming weekend. The proposed alterations of the conditions have been reduced to writing and they have been signed by Captain Botes, and we would ask if Your Lordship pleases to alter pro tem the conditions of bail of accused 10 no 9 for this purpose.

COURT: Is that merely for the coming weekend?

MR BIZOS: Only for the coming weekend, M'Lord. I took the liberty of explaining those to accused no 9 with one of the other accused interpreting, but in any event the interpreter is in court should Your Lordship want to translate it to him.

COURT: I think it should be interpreted.

The following temporary amendment is made to the conditions of bail in respect of accused no 9, Ephraim Ramagula: 20
he is granted permission to visit the Vaal for the period 22 and 23 August 1987 subject to the following conditions:

- 1 he reports at Jeppe police station between 06h00 and 09h00 on 22 August 1987 immediately before leaving for the Vaal;
- 2 he reports at Sebokeng police station immediately on arriving at the Vaal and thereafter between 18h00 and 21h00 on 22 August 1987; between 06h00 and 09h00 on 23 August 1987 and again immediately before his departure from the Vaal on the same day;

30

3 he reports at Jeppe police station as usual between
18h00 and 21h00 on 23 August 1987;

4 during his visit to the Vaal he limits his movements
to his home address, the address where the cleansing
ritual is to take place, the graveyard where his deceased
mother is buried and his reports to the Sebokeng
police station;

5 he does not enter the residential areas of Boipetong,
Bophelong or Sharpeville during the abovementioned
period;

10

6 all other conditions of bail stand and are strictly to
be adhered to.

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR JACOBS: Mr Molefe, is it
then correct - you did not answer my question - that the
immediate minimum demand that the constitution be suspended
was not conveyed to the representatives of the other coun-
tries that the UDF spoke to? -- I cannot remember I per-
sonally talking about that. I do not know if other officials
of the UDF did or did not do it.

And in any letters written by the UDF it was not con- 20
veyed? -- I missed the question.

In any letters written by you as the general secretary
by the UDF, if any, it was not conveyed in that as well? --
To those officials?

Yes? -- I cannot remember writing a letter to them.

And also it was not conveyed that the South African
security forces, the defence force and the police had to be
suspended and disarmed? -- I cannot remember raising that.
I personally have never supported that view.

Mr Molefe, I put it to you that it is generally

30

accepted/...

accepted and stated as a fact in the UDF that the changes implemented by the Government will bring about an escalation of conflict and violence. Is that a correct statement? -- I do not know about that kind of a general statement. However, I know that the UDF did argue that the constitutional proposals, because we were not addressing the fundamental problems of apartheid, were a recipe for violence by excluding the majority of people from a vote in the country. This is a view that was held widely by those who criticised the proposals, including Chief Buthelezi. It is something 10 that is not confined to the UDF.

But it was an accepted fact in the UDF, they work on that fact. Is it correct? -- I cannot say it is a fact, an accepted fact. It was a warning, it was sounded as a warning that if you continue to proffer proposed solutions which do not address the issue of a vote to the majority of the people in the country in a central government, your proposals may well be a recipe for continued violence in the country. One cannot say - I do not understand what counsel wants when he says it is an accepted fact. 20

And is it also accepted and stated as a fact in the UDF that if the Government does not agree to a national convention, this will also lead to an escalation of conflict and violence? -- I do not accept this thing of accepted as a fact. I do not know what counsel means by that.

Is it not accepted in the circles of UDF? -- What does the word "fact", accepted as a fact mean? The warning was sounded out. All the UDF is trying to put across by such a statement or such statements is that such proposals have a potential of creating conditions for violence or a potential 30 for/...

for fuelling those conditions that existed already, that this violence is there. The best way of ending it is to extend a vote, we do not have a vote.

And is it correct, Mr Molefe, also that it is accepted and stated in the UDF that in the liberatoin struggle it must be accepted by the people, by the masses that there will be violence and loss of blood? -- I do not know of any official UDF statement in that regard.

Is it accepted as such by the UDF? -- It is not accepted as such.

10

And I put it to you, Mr Molefe, that notwithstanding this, that there will be conflict and bloodshed, that the UDF proceeded in its quest to organise and mobilise and politicise the masses to actually participate in the freedom struggle? -- The UDF continued to mobilise and organise, and I must state here that all the UDF was saying was that unless meaningful changes are effected, there cannot be any hope for peace in this country, and the UDF took the responsibility to put pressure on the Government to bring about those changes, and we felt that as citizens of this country we had a duty and responsibility to draw the attention of the Government to its errors with a view to getting it to correct those errors. We cannot be expected to be trampling on a red-hot iron that is burning our feet, and be expected that we should not scream as a result of the pain that we feel. We cannot be expected, it could not have been expected for a German or a Jew in Germany who knew about the gas chambers, to keep quiet simply because those in power, those who were responsible for that would not be happy. We see it as our duty to speak out against those things that

20

30

we/...

we believe are the source or the cause of the problems in the country, and we believed that the extent to which we organise and mobilise, build our organisations, the extent to which we are able to build a voice, an effective voice of the people, would in fact have had the effect of alleviating the situation of violence because there is someone who is speaking. So the masses of the people who are denied a vote, who are suppressed through various mechanisms of the State, so that when we organise, we are not organising violence. We are organising to assist in bringing an end 10 to the suffering of those who do not have a vote.

But my question was that irrespective of the fact that it is realised that there will be conflict, that there will be bloodshed, that the UDF did proceed in organising, mobilising and politicising the masses to actively participate in the freedom struggle? -- It is not a question of seeing that there will be. There was conflict already. There has been conflict in the country already. All we were talking about is the need to de-escalate that conflict, as a way of finally bringing it to an end, and that would be expres- 20 sing itself in the extension of a vote or commitment on the part of the Government, a meaningful vote finally for all the people of South Africa. It was really a signal to the Government that we would like you to make this commitment. We are not saying that violence was going to - there was going to be - conflict was going to start. It was there already, we had people who had already taken up arms. There had already been reports about the consequences of these decisions to embark on an armed struggle and so on. But we could not have been expected to acquiesce with 30 apartheid/...

apartheid and oppression simply because the Government did not like what we said. It is our duty, it was our duty and it was our responsibility to speak out, to make known to the Government what we believed was the best solution for the country.

Mr Molefe, is it also a known fact that the Government did implement a tri-cameral parliament and the Black Local Authorities? -- That is a fact, yes.

And is it a fact that even up to now the Government did not concede to a national convention? -- I think in a clear way it has not, but there are indications that the Government is prepared to talk. I have listened to what the Prime Minister was saying in respect of the talks that took place in Dakar. He was saying that the more certain people go and talk to the ANC, the more they will make that organisation resist in negotiation. The impression I am getting there is that he is looking forward to a situation when the negotiations would be possible, and in dealing with the political prisoners he was saying that he did not believe that the whole question of the precondition of renunciation of violence is still a condition, that he thinks that they would be treated as ordinary criminals when the whole question of their release is reviewed. Now, those are indications that the Government itself is looking forward to that situation. The participation in the discussions with the EPG, the Eminent Persons Group, that came in South Africa, and further discussions with the foreign secretary of Britain, Sir Geoffrey Hart, all those things indicate that the Government accepts the fact that it will have to talk.

Now/...

Now, Mr Molefe, that is speculation. What I am putting to you, what you now said to the Court is only speculation. What I am putting to you, it is a fact that the Government up to now did not agree to a national convention? -- That is so.

And I put it to you, it is the object of the UDF and the UDF did work to get the masses themselves to actively engage the Government and Government structures in a violent confrontation? -- I reject that proposition. Violence has never been part of the UDF program. It is not part of the policy of the UDF, and that much we have said in several public statements that we have made, in big meetings and speeches when we addressed meetings, we made that position clear. And in fact even in this case, the AZ-series, I think it is "AAZ2", contains a draft speech by myself which was delivered by me, it states the position of the UDF with regard to violence. 10

And I put it to you that that speech and the other speech where you say that you are not a violent organisation is because of the fear of being banned, that you cannot say that openly? -- When I made that speech I did not think of any fear of being banned, and in any event we were not a violent organisation. We did not avoid saying we are violent because we were afraid of being banned. That was simply not our policy. 20

Mr Molefe, another thing is, you did not answer my question, the last question fully, the question before the last one, that it is the masses who must engage - that it is the policy and the aim of the UDF that it is the masses themselves who must engage the Government in conflict and 30

in/...

in violence? -- We are not calling for a conflict with the Government. We believe that the decisions taken within our organisations must be the decisions taken by the ordinary people, the ordinary people must participate actively in our organisations and in our struggle against apartheid, but that does not include the element of violence, and I think in April at a press conference held at the NGC of the UDF, I think even the day before that, that position was made very clearly by - it was made clear by the national publicity secretary as to what form of mass action are we 10 talking about, and he made it clear that we are talking about disciplined non-violent mass action.

ASSESSOR (MR KRUGEL): When was this? -- In April before our arrest. And on 19 April again, when the State President was making allegations, after he had made allegations in the House of Assembly to the effect that the UDF was a front or part of the ANC, SACP conglomerate that is banned on creating a situation of ungovernability and overthrowing the Government by violence finally, we responded and we made the position of the UDF clear again, on 19 April. I 20 believe newspapers of the following day, I think 20 April and the 21st, would carry that statement.

MR JACOBS: Mr Molefe, I would like to refer you to some documents of the UDF now. First I want you to have a look at EXHIBIT "J3".

COURT: Is there an agreement on this document?

MR JACOBS: It was found in the UDF offices Johannesburg. Just to make it clear on this specific point, that this "J3" was part of the minutes of the National Executive Committee meeting held in Johannesburg on 10 and 11 November 30

1984, that is "J1", also found in the UDF offices. -- Yes, that is - I do not know if that is part of the minutes, but we saw previously an aspect of the minutes which refers to political aspects of - I think political aspects of the front, something like that.

Mr Molefe, on "J1" page 4 it refers there to input of political aspects of the UDF, and that this is the input on the political aspects of the UDF. -- I was not there. I do not know. It may well be that it refers to this one.

And it is attached to this report, "See attached input", 10 and according to this, this paper was not rejected by the UDF, is that correct? -- I do not know. I was not there.

Now, on "J3" page 2 paragraph 2.2, I put it to you that paragraph 2 depicted the accepted view of the UDF National. Is it correct? Do you accept that? -- That this paragraph reflects the view of the UDF National?

Accepted view of the UDF National? -- The whole paragraph as it is?

Yes. -- I believe the UDF would have no problem with that. I think we had set out that position clearly in our 20 organisers' handbook of the million signature campaign.

Will you read that 2.2, the first part of it? -- It is headed "Our View" and it reads:

"The masses are the makers of history. It is they who must become active participants in the struggle. Without this there cannot be any successful victory. It therefore becomes imperative to evaluate our organisational activities in such a way that we draw the maximum participation of the broad masses through mobilisation, education and by mapping out in clear 30 terms/...

terms the need for unity, to reject attempts by the enemy to divide our forces on racial lines."

MR JACOBS: So Mr Molefe, do you agree that that is the perception and it is accepted that it is the masses themselves who must fight the freedom struggle? -- Yes, who must participate in the freedom struggle, yes.

And they must actively participate? -- That is correct. I think participation really means active.

And it is also an accepted fact that it is the maximum participation by the masses? -- That is what is said here, 10 yes.

I would like now to go to EXHIBIT "C6", Volume 1. It was found by A Hendricks at East London.

COURT: Found by him or at his place?

MR JACOBS: At his place. This is, just to get it on record here, it is the UDF Border Extraordinary Regional General Council meeting, Rhodes University, on 10 June 1984, page 2, we start with the last paragraph. -- We dealt with this document previously. I do not know it. I saw it for the first time here as an exhibit. 20

Yes, we will come back to that. In this document it is stated that:

"Allround political mobilisation and education and agitational work must go on by the UDF as far as the people are concerned."

Do you agree? -- What section are we reading?

Page 2 the last paragraph. -- If by this the writer of this paper means that all sections of the society must be mobilised and be educated, if that is what he means, then I agree, I share the same sentiment, but I do not know 30 precisely/...

precisely what he means, and if he means anything else, I have problems accepting the proposition.

Will you have a look also on the same page at the third paragraph from the top, and will you read that one?--

"But we are revolutionaries and not narrow nationalists. We accept fully the idea of a unity in action between all the oppressed groups and being fundamental to the advancement of our liberation struggle."

And it goes on:

"How could we forget the proud record of such patriots 10
and comrades as Basil February, Abdul Ramein, Gandhi, Cathrada, Fischer, Aget and many others. Our struggle being for a non-racial democratic South Africa, we cannot delay our non-racial approach."

MR JACOBS: And read the next one as well please? --

"But we must not be ambiguous on the question of the primary role of the most oppressed African masses, but of course those belonging to the other oppressed Black groups and the White revolutionaries who show themselves ready to make common cause with our aspirations 20
must be fully integrated on the basis of individual equality. There can be no second- or thirdclass participation in the democratic movement of our liberation. It is for the enemy that we reserve our assertiveness and our justified sense of grievance."

MR JACOBS: Mr Molefe, according to this the perception is that the UDF is a revolutionary organisation? -- That is so, according to this. That is if the writer was really referring to the UDF.

And will you read the next paragraph as well? --

30

"In/...

"In the vanguard of this struggle is the working class. Their cherished aim and purpose is to destroy the exploiting monster, that is capitalism. The workers have nothing to lose but their chains. They stand to gain the whole world, the means of production and political power. With these they will earn the right to enjoy all the achievements of material and spiritual culture."

MR JACOBS: Mr Molefe, I put it to you that it is the policy of the UDF to destroy what is called here an exploiting monster, capitalism, which refers also to the Government of this country? -- I have a difficulty in understanding what counsel is putting, that the system of capitalism is synonymous with the Government. 10

Is it a capitalist government in this country? -- Well, there is an apartheid government. I think it is capitalist also.

And this I put to you refers specifically to the Government, the capitalist Government in this country as well? -- Well, I do not understand it in that sense. 20

And do you agree that the word "destroy" is strong language and it does not refer to talking or anything else, but it is strong and it must be destroyed? -- What does that mean? Is counsel suggesting that it means violence?

It means violence? -- I reject that proposition. The word "destroy" has been used many times by people who had nothing to do with violence, and if it is used within the UDF, I would understand it in the context of normal political language. If one calls to mind some of the people who had used this, is when - after the Coloured Representative 30

Council/...

Council had been scrapped by the Government because the Labour Party would not co-operate, in 1980, around 1980 or so, there were statements made, I think by one of the members, Mr Curry at the time, and they said they had achieved a victory by destroying, by destroying the basic structures of the policies of separate development, destroying, but there was no violence there. This is the language that we use. I have used it myself. I have never intended that to be violent.

Mr Molefe, do you agree that the word "destroy" includes 10
violence? -- It may in certain circumstances include violence, but if this document was presented at a meeting of the UDF and by an official of the UDF, and knowing the UDF to be a non-violent organisation, knowing its policies, that this man knows that policy, I would not accept that he meant violence.

COURT: Who wrote this document? This is one Nkenke Stofile. Who is that? -- I believe it would have been Reverend Stofile. I am not sure about the first name.

And who is he? -- Reverend Stofile was the secretary 20
of the Border region at the time.

MR JACOBS: Mr Molefe, I put it to you further that there is nothing in this document to say what is meant by "destroy" here, to explain what is meant, that it is not violent destruction? -- I agree to that proposition. Similarly there is nothing in this document that says that it is a violent destruction.

Then I want you to have a look .. -- One can only attempt to interpret it in the context of the policies of the UDF, the way we understand that. 30

Yes/...

ASSESSOR (MR KRUGEL): Yes, but now, what about, Mr Molefe, destruction in the same context as we have also the fact that is stated here, we are revolutionaries and not narrow nationalists? -- Well, I do not know what he had in mind. He may well be meaning that we are revolutionaries in the sense that we seek fundamental changes, we seek to be incorporated in the society that is free of apartheid, we want meaningful changes rather than the changes that the Government was presenting at the time of the tri-cameral parliament.

10

COURT: What would that then mean in the context of narrow nationalists, as contrasted to narrow nationalists? -- Well, I would understand it to mean that narrow nationalists are those who refuse, who deny other racial groups participation in their organisations, say maybe people like the Black Consciousness movement that says White people have got no role to play in their organisation.

Could revolutionaries in this context mean Marxists? -- Well, if it refers to the UDF I have a difficulty in accepting that. The UDF is not a Marxist organisation, and if one looks at the minutes of the NEC of 21 and 22 July 1984, the UDF there again is saying it cannot adopt a specific economic policy. It is a broad front of organisations and I think EXHIBIT "C59" which is - I think a document containing the recommendations of the NEC and sent by me to regions, makes that position clear also.

20

MR JACOBS: Mr Molefe, do you agree that what is said here, the destruction that must be done here is in the freedom struggle of the UDF, as you have read it from the top to the bottom? -- Well, he is saying so. These are the views

30

of/...

of an individual.

Now I would like you to have a look and read .. -- And I can only understand this to mean, to work towards frustrating the policies of apartheid and creating conditions where a vote would be extended to all.

Mr Molefe, I would like you now to go to page 3, the last paragraph. Read it please? --

"Our struggle is for a new South Africa where racism and class exploitation will be things of the past, where human dignity shall prevail for all. But that new order will be born after a loss of repression and even loss of lives. We must be ready to meet that challenge with an unbreakable will and determination of the oppressed masses. Racist domination and imperialist exploitation must be resisted at all fronts by the youth." 10

It seems like there was another line here, but is not clear.

So Mr Molefe, will you agree now that the freedom struggle depicted in this document shows that it is a violent struggle because it refers here also to the loss of life in the struggle? -- I agree that it refers to the loss of life, but I do not accept that it means it is going to be a violent struggle. We have been involved in a peaceful struggle in this country. Very many people have died, not because they had adopted violent methods, but because the nature of the Government, the system that is in control is such that it can only be maintained by suppressing those who are opposed to it by violent means. We daily read about reports of how children were shot in the townships, how those who protest are shot, how the workers who are on strike/... 20 30

strike are shot. Those people are not involved in a violent struggle. I think the writer was really writing in that context.

Mr Molefe, but it does not say so. It says here that in the freedom struggle of the UDF .. -- Where is the sentence?

MR BIZOS: The document, M'Lord, makes it clear that the person is presenting a paper about the role of the youth in the freedom struggle. It does not purport to speak on behalf of the UDF. And also, M'Lord, I do not know whether 10
Your Lordship will take it as a typing mistake, but the new order will be born after a lot, presumably.

COURT: I read it as "lot".

MR BIZOS: That the new order will be born - presumably also the "e" is also a spelling mistake. The new order will be born after a lot of repression and even a loss of life. That does not suggest a violent struggle, M'Lord. Its meaning is clear in my respectful submission, that even though you may be repressed and you may even lose your life, nevertheless the struggle will continue. That is not 20
an incitement to violence. It is rather that you must be prepared to suffer the violence.

MR JACOBS: I put it to you, Mr Molefe, that the reference here in our struggle and where there is a struggle there must be opponents in the struggle, and there must be a loss of life, that is what is said here? -- What paragraph is learned counsel referring to?

The last paragraph? -- Is that the interpretation or is learned counsel reading?

According to this it is also a possibility. -- What is 30

a/...

a possibility?

The possibility that in a freedom struggle, in the struggle that the UDF is engaged in against the State there are two opposite parties and that there will be loss of life in that struggle? -- Well, once more I do not know if this document refers to the UDF. However, in the struggle there is loss of life, a peaceful struggle, there is loss of life. I have known people who have died who were not involved in a violent struggle. And I do not accept that this person is speaking for the UDF and he is putting across 10 the policy position of the UDF. That is not so.

Will you agree that that is the perception of a person, general secretary, I think he is, of the UDF Border who was appointed in April 1985? -- Firstly I do not know if this name refers to the same person. I do not know if it refers to the person who was the secretary. Secondly I do not accept the interpretation that he means the UDF is involved in a violent struggle. In fact even if he had said that, that would not be the policy of the UDF. He would not be speaking for the UDF. 20

Do you know Reverend Stofile? -- Yes, I know Reverend Stofile.

Do you know his name? -- Yes.

And do you say that his name is not Nkenke? -- I do not know if Nkenke is his name. I know that he is Makenkesi Stofile.

And I would like to put it to you also that he is from April 1985, he was elected - at the National Council meeting in April 1985 he was also elected on the Executive of the UDF? -- Reverend Stofile was elected, Reverend Stofile. I 30

do/...

do not know if this name refers to the same person.

COURT: Have you ever come across any other Stofile in the Border region? -- There are several Stofiles there.

Connected to the UDF? -- I am not sure about their connection with the UDF. I am not sure if apart from the fact that it was at an extraordinary meeting of the UDF, I do not know if the document tells us that the writer was a person connected to the UDF. I do not know if this document indicates that anywhere.

MNR JACOBS: Ek het al so baie mense se name gevra. Ek wil 10
graag die leiding van die Hof vra. Ek dink amper ons het al - die getuie het al verduidelik wie die mense is wat daar verskyn op bladsy 2, paragraph 3 maar kan die Hof my miskien net leiding gee? Ek is nie heeltemal seker nie, Februarie, Abduraman, Gandhi.

COURT: I think Abduraman has been mentioned. I am not sure in what sense, Basil February I do not recall, Gandhi we know of, Cathrada I think we know of, Fischer we know of, First we know of, Aget we have had. I think Abduraman and Basil February we have not had. I am not sure. 20

MR BIZOS: It was mentioned, M'Lord. In fact I recall that Your Lordship took judicial notice of Abduraman because his name appears so often in the law reports.

COURT: Is that the Abduraman?

MR BIZOS: That is the question that Your Lordship asked at the time and the answer was yes, that it refers really to Abduraman who was involved in declaring regulations ultra vires from about 1917 onwards.

COURT: The Railway cases?

MR BIZOS: That is the one. 30

That/...

COURT: That leaves Basil February.

MR JACOBS: Can you tell us who Basil February is? -- I do not know the name.

And then I want to put it to you further, Mr Molefe, do you agree that people may get the perception and understand this document, that violence is intended by the word "destroy" especially where people with the names of Cathrada Fischer and the other people mentioned here are mentioned, because they are all people who were sentenced - except for Gandhi - or most of them, some of them were sentenced for violent acts .. (INTERVENTION) 10

COURT: First and Aget? Were they sentenced?

MR JACOBS: That is why I say most of them.

COURT: I do not think you have got more than half.

MR JACOBS: Let us put it that Cathrada was sentenced, Fischer was sentenced, that First was with the ANC outside the country, and I do not know about Aget. Take that through. -- I do not know if he was with the ANC, but in fact all I can say is that from this one can conclude that there is no position that this person is taking, because one may argue 20 that the inclusion of Gandhi here was intended to promote passive resistance of Gandhi. I think all he is really trying to say is that the African people accept that they must participate in a common struggle with other people from racial groups and he is really mentioning these people as an example of people who were committed to ending apartheid and who were not necessarily Africans.

I would like you to have a look at another exhibit, that is "Cl6". That is in Volume 2. I will just repeat, this was found in the UDF offices Johannesburg and it is a 30

document/...

document headed "State of the Soweto Civic Association". We already had it that the Soweto Civic Association is an affiliate of the UDF? -- That is correct.

Now, on page .. -- However, this is not a policy document of the Soweto Civic Association.

The state of the Soweto Civic Association. -- Yes, I am saying it is not a policy document of the Soweto Civic Association, and if one looks at it, it is not even complete

What do you mean by "complete"? -- That it was still a draft and it was incomplete. When one looks for instance 10
at page 2:

"The paper purports to deal with the following: our theory of organisation and change; how to involve the masses; issues round which to organise; how to develop the awareness of the masses; the lack of activists/organisers; explanation of a civic organisation.."

etcetera. And then you go back, look at the document, the following pages, you would find that not all those aspects that are mentioned there have been covered. You will find theory of organisation, you will find how to involve the 20
masses, and then you find how to identify issues, and that is all. Other things have not been dealt with.

COURT: Point 4, how to develop the awareness of the masses becomes "How do we identify issues". -- Perhaps it may be linked to that.

MR JACOBS: And it is also possible that the others could have been included in other parts? -- No, that is not so.

It is a fact that this was sent to the UDF, in the offices of the UDF? -- It was not sent.

So how did it get to the offices of the UDF? -- This 30

was/...

was a draft by me. I was asked by some members of the SCA to draft something and I was busy drafting it. It had never been discussed and I could not finish it because I was busy doing other things.

So this is your work? -- That is correct.

And as far as - if it is not complete yet but as far as it goes, what the perception in the Soweto Civic Association is on these matters, in this document? -- That depicts my perception. I cannot tie the Soweto Civic Association to this.

10

On page 3, the first paragraph, it is stated there that change will come through the masses. That is your perception? -- That is correct. We are convinced that change can only come about through active involvement by the masses.

And that means by the masses themselves? Is it correct? -- That is correct. I have made this point before that anybody in authority will listen to an organisation if it can substantially prove support and its strength. I think if one reads that whole paragraph, he would understand in what context, that the masses are the makers of history or change will come about through involvement of the masses, was used. With Your Lordship's leave I would like to read the whole paragraph. It says:

20

"Our understanding of how change will come about is completely different .."

Maybe I should start at page 2. I think maybe I should just proceed from page 3. It says:

"Our understanding of how change will come about is completely different from the above. We are convinced

30

that/...

that change can only come about through active involvement by the masses. We need to involve the masses in our programs, for the struggle belongs to the masses, not to us as a small group of activists or so-called leaders. The UDF in its million signature campaign handbook assess that it is the people, not a few leaders, who make history. If on one hand 200 people go and confront a local authority about rent increase, but do it in an unorganised manner, that is one or two individuals at a time, their voice will be ignored, but 10 if on the other hand 200 people, organised residents, confronts a local authority on the same issue, their voice is likely to be listened to."

I think that gives very clearly the context in which that is used.

So it is quite clear that it is active involvement by the masses that is stressed here? -- That is correct, in this context that is set out.

Just to get something else clear. At the start of the paragraph you say "our understanding". Now, you conveyed 20 to the Court that you wrote this letter and it is your perception that is in this. What do you mean now by our understanding? Whose understanding is that? -- Well, I am not alone. The majority of the people, the UDF also believes that, but in any event, this paper was intended that once discussed and adopted, it would then be - if it was finally approved, it would then be circulated. It might well have become some guidelines or a discussion paper of the SCA maybe.

Mr Molefe, then you also said "we need to involve the 30 masses/...

masses". Who are the - "involve the masses in our programs".
-- It is in the context that I have dealt with the first
one, those of us who are involved in organisation, that the
SCA for instance need to involve the masses.

And will you read also the fourth paragraph? --

"Therefore when we talk about preparing people for
change."

MR JACOBS: Read on page 3. -- I am reading page 3.

"When we talk about preparing people for change, the
organise group in this example (I think it should be 10
'has') have experienced something very significant.
They realise that as individuals they are powerless,
but as an organised body with clear demands, tactics
and strategy, they have the power to change their
living conditions. It also indicates to everyone that
the burden of changing the conditions of life does not
rest on the shoulders of individuals. It is the task
of an organised group."

MR JACOBS: So tactics and strategy, they have the power to
change their living conditions. Does that reflect on the 20
masses, the people? -- I do not understand the question.

To what are you referring in this phrase? They have
the power to change their living conditions. -- It refers
to the organised people. It says if they are organised, if
they are a group, they speak with one voice as an organised
group. The authorities will listen to them. The previous
paragraph, the first one on page 3, makes an example of 200
people in an area who all of them have a problem of rent,
but they try to address that problem by going one by one to
the office or going - another one going alone, another one 30
going/...

going with the second one, and then those in authority say, look, you are just mad, you are just alone, this is no problem, we have had no - the rest of the people are not complaining about that. Now, another group says, we have this problem, but we have realised that if we do not show that we are not the only ones who are worried about this problem, we are not going to be listened to, and they say, alright, we go there as 200 people, but we will have someone who will say, here are these people, and then they say all of us are saying this rent is just too much, we cannot afford it. Then whoever is in authority, a sensible person will look at that and accept that there is a problem, and then he would respond accordingly to the problem. 10

Why did you compile this document, Mr Molefe? For what purpose? -- I was asked by members of the SCA to - branches of the SCA to compile it for discussion.

And for what purpose, discuss it for what purpose? -- For the purposes of looking at means and ways of strengthening the organisation, the Civic Association and looking at means and ways of drawing more people into the organisation, how we could improve our methods of organising. 20

And also of organising and mobilising the masses? -- Organising the residents of Soweto, the ordinary people, the masses, yes.

Was it also to be used by other organisations? -- No, it was for discussions in the SCA and it was never discussed. It was never discussed. I do not know, maybe after it had been discussed by the SCA, the SCA might have maybe - if asked by another organisation, maybe it might have shared the ideas here with that organisation. But this paper did not/... 30

not go beyond the stage of the draft. It ended there in the office of the UDF with a lot of typing errors and so on, with some handwriting on it.

Can we go to the next exhibit, EXHIBIT "C75". This was found with Mrs Ramgobin in Durban, Volume 5. Do you know Mrs E Ramgobin? -- I beg your pardon?

Do you know Mrs Ramgobin? -- Which one?

Mrs E Ramgobin, and is she the wife of Miwa Ramgobin? -- I know the wife of Mr Miwa Ramgobin.

Is her name Ellen? -- No, I do not know. I do not know if she is Ellen. 10

And this document, the heading of it is "Congress Perspective on the Constitutional Proposals presented at the South African Institute of Race Relations". The Congress Perspective, will you agree that that is the Indian Congresses in South Africa, in Natal and Transvaal?

COURT: Why ask this witness about this document? What has he got to do with it?

MR JACOBS: I am going to put to him it is a perspective in other organisations of the UDF, what is said. 20

COURT: You can put it to him, that other organisations also think that. Why do you have to refer to the document?

MR JACOBS: I put it to you, Mr Molefe, it is also the perspective in the Transvaal Indian Congress and the Natal Indian Congress, that the change will only come through the masses. -- I do not know about that. I cannot dispute it.

And I put it to you, it is the perspective in the other - these organisations - will the Court bear with me? -- Is it suggested that this document was produced jointly by the Transvaal Indian Congress and the Natal Indian Congress? 30

A congress perspective, does it include both Indian Congresses? Is it a collective name or not? -- I do not know this document. I do not know whether it was produced by the Transvaal Indian Congress or the Natal Indian Congress.

COURT: It looks like the Natal Indian Congress that is being dealt with. -- Yes, I see Natal Indian Congress here, towards the end of page 1.

MR JACOBS: And it is also the perspective then of the people in the Natal Indian Congress that change - that no negotiations can be honoured as equals and only can it be 10 such when it is on the basis of a non-racial South Africa. That is also the perceptive in .. -- I do not understand the question.

It is the perception of the Natal Indian Congress that change can only honourably be negotiated if the objective of such negotiations is to create a non-racial South Africa? -- There is just one word that does not come across clearly to me, the word just before "negotiated".

Will you have a look at page 12, the last paragraph? -- I have read the paragraph. 20

Do you agree? -- I understand here the writer to be saying that his organisation or her organisation, if that is the NIC, can only enter negotiations honourably as equals and if the objective of those negotiations is the creation of a non-racial united democratic South Africa, and obviously he is counterposing that to the question of participation in a system that offers separate freedoms of the people of South Africa, that is a system that divides the people of South Africa. I understand him to be saying that, they are not prepared to accept separate development. 30

And/...

And that there can only be negotiations in order to bring about a new government, a government of the people? -- I do not know if anywhere he is referring to that, but I would assume that if it is a non-racial government it would include all the people of South Africa.

COURT: Why do you bother this witness with this document? What has he got to do with this document?

MR JACOBS: I am just putting to him, he said that it is not a - I am trying to build up an argument and to build up and show him that it is a perception in the UDF - he said 10
UDF is not a violent document. These people are affiliated - a violent organisation and these organisations are all affiliated to UDF, and they have got the perception and I am going to argue at the end that they can altogether - it is all accepted in UDF that change can only come by violent means.

COURT: Yes? -- I want to refer counsel to page 9 of this document, and item 5 of this document at page 9 suggests a method by which a new constitution could be arrived at, and it says: 20

"Methods to be used in search of a new constitution" and the writer enumerates a number of points there. The first point is that for any method to succeed, there must be a commitment from all parties concerned to participate in a process which would (1) create a general democracy and (2) ensure that all the people of South Africa can participate in the process, and he goes on at 5.2 to say:

"The Government must then create the conditions for democratic consultation and organisation to occur. For this to be made possible - 30

1)/...

- 1) repressive legislation must be scrapped;
- 2) jailed and exiled leaders must return;
- 3) all bannings and detentions must be ended."

And in 5.3 he says:

"Having created the conditions for the democratic process to begin, the people of South Africa, wherever they may be, whoever they are, must be consulted on what kind of South Africa they would like, and mandate their organisation and leadership accordingly."

And at 5.4 he goes on to say:

10

"All democratic and authentic leaders should then convene a national convention which will formulate a program for the creation of a democratic non-racial united South Africa based on the will of the people."

And he concludes that paragraph by saying:

"We are acutely aware that this approach can only be successful if ideal conditions exist. Regrettably the reality is quite distant from this ideal."

Now, M'Lord, having read that section, I do not understand the writer of this document to be a person who is bent on violence or committed to a violent policy. It is a person who is concerned about the need for peace in this country, about establishing conditions for peace in this country, and he is presenting in a humble way what he thinks is the method that should be followed, and I believe that every person has got a right to express his own views as to how he thinks the best method to solve the problem is. It may be right, it may be wrong by others, but that is the right that no person should be denied, and it can only be proven to be wrong when it is tested against other better methods

20

30

that/...

that are posited by other people who have also thought about the issue and are concerned about change in a meaningful way.

I put it to you, Mr Molefe, that also the conclusion there, he accepts the fact of a national convention has no possibility of it realising that a national convention to be held, regrettably the reality is quite distant from this ideal. -- Being distant and impossible are two different things. He is not saying it is impossible. All he is saying is that it seems a far, far away thing. It seems we 10 are going to have to wait for some time, but my understanding is that he expects that to come.

And I put it to you further that in this document on page 11 it is stated:

"There can be no peace and freedom in South Africa for all."

That is an accepted fact? -- Before I deal with that question I want to refer once again to page 11 of this document, the paragraph just before "Conclusion". It reads as follows:

"Our unity, organisation, mature consciousness and 20 willingness to struggle, will one day result in meaningful negotiation for the creation of a democracy based on the will of the people in which all shall live in peace and security."

To me this paragraphs makes it patently clear that although the writer sees the national convention being some distant reality, he however - or she however believes that with unity, building organisation and mature consciousness and willingness to struggle, one day will lead to meaningful negotiations. He does not say the violent overthrowal of 30 the/...

the present government. He is all the time looking for what? To negotiations, and he is organising to convince the Government that there has got to be negotiation, and I believe that is the correct position, and I support that position.

ASSESSOR (MR KRUGEL): Let us hope he is wrong about one thing, Mr Molefe. The sixth sentence, I do not like it at all. -- Is it on the same page?

On page 11, yes.

"There can be no peace and freedom for all South Africans." 10

I think that must be a slip. -- It seems to be a displaced statement because it does not show to what it is connected.

It is just funny. -- It is just a strange sentence really.

COURT: Well, can that sentence not be connected to the first portion of 6.4:

"We know that without mobilising, organising, raising the consciousness of our people there can be no peace and freedom for all South Africans." 20

-- I think it is connected to that.

ASSESSOR (MR KRUGEL): There should have been a comma after democracy. -- Yes, I think it is connected with that.

And then the "T" should be a small "t". Then it does make sense. -- It does make sense.

MR JACOBS: And you do agree that until the day of the national convention, even in the far future, that it is an accepted fact then that there can be no peace and freedom?

-- No, he says - I think he says very clearly that unless we organise, unless we mobilise, unless we raise the consciousness/... 30

consciousness of the people to struggle more effectively for democracy, he says unless those things are done, but he believes that if those things are done, finally there will be peace.

Only when the Government is forced to concede to a national convention? -- Well, when the Government is pressured to convene the national convention, or when the Government awakens to the reality that it has got to negotiate meaningfully with the majority of the people.

And before that it is accepted according to this document that there cannot be peace and freedom. 10

COURT: Mr Jacobs, it is no good arguing about the contents of the document with the witness. You can tell him your interpretation that you will argue at the end of the case, that this document supports you, then you can argue it at the end of the case. He is not the author of the document so it is no good arguing the meaning of the document, because I have got to decide the meaning of the document.

MR JACOBS: As the Court pleases.

I would like you to have a look at EXHIBIT "C138", 20 that is Volume 8. We have already identified this document. Again it refers to the Western Cape region of the UDF, this document. Is it correct?

COURT: Yes, Mr Jacobs, it is correct.

MR JACOBS: Now, would you have a look at page 7, the fourth paragraph.

COURT: Of which report? It is at the bottom of the page.

MR JACOBS: Will you start with page 6? -- Is that the page headed "Methods of Struggle"?

COURT: No, page 6 at the bottom you see the numbering, and 30

where/...

where counsel wants you to start is at the bottom of page 6, "The New Deal".

MR JACOBS: No, just before that, at the fourth paragraph. --

"It is often said that we have tried to march too far ahead of our organisations, and that we have not done sufficient groundwork. Yet we must remember that our people will not wait until we believe we have adequately prepared the ground. The anger that is exploding all round the country bears testimony to our people's readiness for mass action and we must be committed to taking this forward." 10

MR JACOBS: Mr Molefe, it refers here to the anger of the masses that must be used and taken forward, and that is the perception of the UDF Western Cape? -- I do not know if it is the perception of the UDF Western Cape. It is the perception of the writer of the document.

This is a report of the - the secretarial report at the annual general meeting. -- That is so. I see that.

And at the annual general meeting the message was conveyed that the anger of the masses - the anger exploding all over the country must be used and must be taken forward. Do you agree to that? -- Well, that is what the document is saying. 20

And I put it to you, the way that it must be used and taken forward is shown on page 14 under the heading of "Methods of Struggle". It is a secretarial report Part 2, and it must be taken forward so that it is taken into the hands of the people, and that is the angry people.

COURT: I am sorry, where are you reading now? Methods of Struggle, page 14. 30

MR JACOBS: Methods of Struggle, yes.

COURT: Yes, what paragraph are you referring to?

MR JACOBS: You can read paragraphs 1, 2 and 3. -- What paragraph am I required to read?

1, 2 and 3 of that, and especially paragraph 3, "The Task of the Front".

COURT: Counsel wants you to read the first three paragraphs. Do you want the witness to read it out loud? He can read it to himself.

MR JACOBS: He can just read it to himself and then only 10
the third paragraph is of importance. -- I have read the section.

And I put it to you that according to that it means that the people must take the struggle, the freedom struggle into their own hands, the masses? -- Yes, but it also says that the people have been mobilised and must be drawn into our organisations. So it means really that that struggle must be taken up by the people who are drawn into organisations, as represented by their organisations, they must take up the struggle, as I understand it. 20

And I would like you to have a look next at EXHIBIT "AB7", that is Volume 1, the sixth document. We have referred to it this morning. It is that press statement and you have already identified the affiliated organisations attached to this document, which are affiliated to the UDF. Will you turn to page 3 of that press statement, and will you read the first paragraph first? --

"We therefore say to Constable Louis le Grange, Viljoen and their adopted babies by the name of councillors, meet these demands or else; we have been long voicing 30
out/...

out these grievances verbally. Now we are taking the first step practically."

MR JACOBS: And read with it the last paragraph as well? -- I think I must read the second paragraph, because the second paragraph explains what they mean by practical action. It says:

"To the people of the Transvaal we request them to unite in action, make this stay-away a success, to show the Botha gang that enough is enough. We also request you to boycott all the businesses owned by the councillors. For students we say, forward with your fight. We as your parents are begging you. We also appeal to taxi owners not to operate between towns and townships, but can operate only around the townships. We further request you to work hand-in-hand with the people, so that we can fight together this ungodly R10 levy imposed upon you without consulting you, and this evil of abolishing mini-buses only because the present Government's company Putco can take them over. We also call upon our people to resist the intended Putco fare increases scheduled to start on 1 December (1/12/1984). This will still affect the Transvaal people. Regarding the present education crisis, various parent committees made attempts to meet Viljoen, the Minister of Education, but he has refused to meet them, but instead he chose to meet his puppet councillors led by Tom Boya and Steve Kame."

Then the last paragraph reads:

"But the call still remains, adapt or die. Meet our demands or face the wrath of the people. The ball is now/...

now rolling on the courts of the authorities, the powers-that-be (the Government) for we are on the offensive, on the march towards a democratic future."

MR JACOBS: Do you agree, Mr Molefe, in this press statement at least it is the perception of quite a lot of the organisations affiliated to UDF that violence is part of the struggle, stating it that the Government must either adapt or die and secondly, or they will face the wrath of the people? -- I do not understand it in that context. I understand the context in which the writers of this are using 10 that, set out in what appears as paragraph 2 of this page, and it sets out kinds of actions, the sort of actions that they expect the community to take up, one being the stay-away, another one being the boycott of businesses, I think refusal to pay increased Putco fares and so on. It is in that context that I understand this, adapt or die to have been used. All he is saying is that you either listen to us or we continue these forms of action, and you are going to suffer as a result of this kind of action, you will lose profits, you will have problems with the employers and so 20 on. I do not understand that to be advocating violence.

MR BIZOS: M'Lord, will we have to prove the origin of the phrase "adapt or die"?

WITNESS: M'Lord, if my recollection is correct, it was first used by the present State President when he was motivating for the acceptance of proposals for the new constitution, and he was saying to members of the Nationalist Party that they should adapt or die.

MR JACOBS: And is it correct that otherwise they must face the wrath of the people? -- Yes, I understand it in the 30 context/...

context that is set out, as to the forms of action to be taken.

And I would like you then to have a look at "A838", it is Volume 3. This was found in the UDF offices in Johannesburg and it is a document with the heading "Mankweng Youth Congress". Now, Mankweng Youth Congress, that is an affiliate of the UDF? -- I am not certain. It may well be an affiliate of Transvaal.

Of Transvaal or Northern Transvaal? -- I do not know if Northern Transvaal has subsequently become a region. 10

Now, in this there is also a reference:

"Revolutionary greetings. Pledge solidarity. MAYCO wishes to pledge solidarity with progressive organisations involved in the national democratic struggle and all oppressed and downtrodden masses of our land."

And the last paragraph as well:

"And through the UDF and other national movements which cannot be mentioned loosely, we vow to stand up and fight side-by-side until our freedom is won. Areas in our region, stand up and rededicate themselves 20 to the noble cause of freedom under the umbrella of the United Democratic Front."

Do you know anything about this document, when it was sent to the UDF offices, Mr Molefe? -- I do not know anything about it. I have never seen it before. I saw it for the first time as an exhibit here, and it does appear like it was really a handwritten scribbled piece of paper and it was typed by somebody, possibly the Security Police after picking it up.

COURT: I wonder whether that is right, because the hand- 30 written part is only in English, whereas the typed portion

is in English and in another language, probably Tswana. --
I may be wrong. I do not know. I may be wrong.

Could you translate this document for me, the second paragraph? -- The two lines?

Yes? -- It says, we are gathered here as people in our thousands to talk about that which we think is not right or is not good and that which we think - no, that which we think is right and that which we think is not right.

And the next one? -- There is a name used here. I do not understand it. It is not in Sotho. 10

Which one? -- Immediately after "80", "mankonyane", I do not know what it means.

ASSESSOR (MR KRUGEL): The calves of Botha? -- I do not know that word. But anyway, it says those "mankonyane", I do not know what it means, of Botha, have they told people that they were voting for oppression. It is a question. Have they told people that their children are called upon to become soldiers to defend apartheid. What they must know is that in the end Black people will govern. That is my translation of the two paragraphs. 20

MR JACOBS: Mr Molefe, this goes also with - there is another exhibit in this regard, "C69" in Volume 5. Just hold that one with you.

COURT: Where was this found?

MR JACOBS: UDF offices Johannesburg. The next document in this "C69", the second document, it is the one in the Black language and it was translated and typed. The written translation and the typed translation are attached. The first document - M'Lord, with your permission, can we refer to them as the first one with the heading "Mankweng Youth 30

Congress/...

Congress".

COURT: It is one document, that is the first one, and we number that 1. That is document no 1. The second document is document no 2, (a) is the translation and (b) is the written translation, document 2(b), and 2(c) is the message of support from - let me start all over again. 2(a) is the original, that is typed; 2(b) is the translation in English but written; 2(c) is the message of support from AZASO, that is the translation in English typed. Then we have - is that the third document and the fourth document? 10

MR JACOBS: Yes, it is the third and fourth document.

COURT: Document no 3 says A C Barclays, and document 4 says "Message of Support".

MR JACOBS: Now, document "C69" that was found in the offices in Johannesburg, UDF offices, and document 2 was also found in the UDF offices in Johannesburg, and so were documents 3 and 4. -- I had not seen all these documents before. I saw them for the first time as exhibits in this case.

In EXHIBITS "A838" and "C69", they are both ..

COURT: Which "C69"? 20

MR JACOBS: "C69(1)" are from the Mankweng Youth Congress.

COURT: Yes, that is accepted, Mr Jacobs, it purports to be so.

MR JACOBS: And both of them refer - both of them send revolutionary greetings? -- I see that.

And is it the perception here also, in the Mankweng Youth Congress that UDF is a revolutionary organisation? -- I do not know if that purports that the UDF is a revolutionary organisation. Maybe the way that this person who wrote this thing wanted to send greetings, but I do not 30

know/...

know.

Do you know whether anything was done about any organisation to - by the UDF to bring it to their notice that UDF is not a revolutionary organisation? -- I know of no organisation that had said that the UDF was a revolutionary organisation. For that reason the matter has never been in issue in the UDF. I hardly know for what purpose these messages were, if they were at all sent, to the UDF, were sent. I had never seen them before.

Mr Molefe, EXHIBIT "C69(2)", and there I must refer to 10
the translated version of that, the typed one that is easier to read, 2(c), brings out the perception clearly that in the freedom struggle there will be bloodshed, in the freedom struggle. -- What section are we reading?

Will you read - have you got the typed portion? -- Yes, I am looking at 2(c).

Just after point 4. -- I think it is written in the same vein as other previous warnings that the new constitution was a recipe for violence. I think the writer here is trying to say that, is really trying to express it. 20

Who would you say are they warning here? -- I think they are warning the Government.

Was this sent to the Government? -- I do not know.

Is this not a message of support, according to the first paragraph, who would you say, to whom was this sent, this message of support? -- It is written as a message of support.

Yes, to whom? -- Well, one may assume that it was sent to - yes, the UDF.

COURT: Could this have been sent to the people's gathering 30

of/...

of the UDF in the Northern Transvaal, on the occasion of that meeting which you addressed? -- It may well be. I do not know. I cannot remember messages being read there.

MR JACOBS: So you cannot remember of any messages being read at that meeting? -- Yes, I cannot remember.

So if this was a message sent to that rally, and the people present there were all the people, the Black people there, how can you regard this then as a warning to the Government? -- No, it was not only Black people there. There were Coloureds, there were Indians and there were 10 White people there present at that meeting, besides - normally people issue warnings through public - through the media, press statements without addressing themselves directly to the Government. We are used to that. It may well be a warning to the Government and a warning to the other people that we have to oppose it, if we do not oppose it, it is laying the basis for increased bloodshed.

And I put it to you that the message is brought clearly to the people at that gathering, if it was read out, that it is an accepted fact that if the Government refuse to - 20 not to put the new constitution and the others into operation, then there will be bloodshed, if they do that? -- The question is not clear.

It was a clear message to all the people gathered there that they oppose the new constitution and if it is put into operation and if it is in operation, that will bring bloodshed? -- I understand it to mean that if the Government goes ahead excluding the majority of the people, that constitution can only increase or bring about bloodshed.

And that was a message conveyed to the people at that 30 meeting/...

meeting? -- Which meeting?

The rally where you were also present? -- Well, I have not said that this message was read at the rally. I do not know. I cannot remember any message read at the rally where I was, and I even remember that some people who were supposed to speak there could not even speak because there was no time.

And also that was an accepted fact in .. -- This message does not say that it was read at the meeting where I was present.

10

And it is an accepted fact and statement by AZASO, an affiliate of UDF, of what the position is? -- What position are we talking about now?

That referring to it that there will be bloodshed? -- Well, these are warnings that people were making at that time. Many people were saying these things. Senior officials of the UDF have issued a similar warning, that the new constitution was a recipe for violence. Many other people have done so.

But my question is that it is an accepted fact in AZASO? -- Well, I do not know how representative this message is of the AZASO view.

20

Is it not so, Mr Molefe, that the message of support is sent by an organisation, by the executive of that organisation? -- The way it was written it is on a scrapbook. These things were written on scraps of paper. It seems like somebody who was there and was not sure - had not even discussed it, thought on the spot that messages should be written, although this AZASO one, there is no indication that there was the original that was not typed. But the others/...

30

others are just like things that people are just writing on the spot.

But this other one was not - I was asking you about the one of AZAPO and that is the one - AZASO and that is the one that is cleanly typed? -- I do not know how representative of the AZASO position is, but I think what they are saying here is merely what many people were saying about the new constitution.

COURT: It looks as if the third document - seems to be addressed to the UDF Northern Transvaal Rally Committee, or 10 it is an account at Barclays for the UDF Northern Transvaal Rally Committee. -- The third document? Yes, I see that.

Or it is just a note of a bank number. -- I think it is just a note of a bank number.

MR JACOBS: I would like you to have a look next at EXHIBIT "A825".

M'Lord, I am going to a new document now. I do not know if it is convenient at this stage.

THE COURT ADJOURNS TO 1987-08-19

20