

RealTime Transcriptions

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

MARIKANA

BEFORE TRIBUNAL

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE FARLAM (RETIRED) - CHAIRPERSON
MR TOKOTA SC
MS HEMRAJ SC

HELD ON

DAY 174

24 JANUARY 2014

PAGES 20637 TO 20768



© **REALTIME TRANSCRIPTIONS**



64 10th Avenue, Highlands North, Johannesburg
P O Box 721, Highlands North, 2037
Tel: 011-440-3647 Fax: 011-440-9119 Cell: 083 273-5335
E-mail: realtime@pixie.co.za
Web Address: <http://mysite.mweb.co.za/residents/pak06278>



<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20637</p> <p>1 [PROCEEDINGS ON 24 JANUARY 2014]</p> <p>2 [09:16] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. I 3 was approached in chambers this morning by Adv Semenza, who 4 requested an extension until Monday as the date for filing 5 statements. In view of the fact that I'm prepared to give 6 him that extension, I give it to everybody else, but it 7 must be understood that the extension is until Monday and I 8 expect all statements to be filed by the end of Monday.</p> <p>9 Brigadier, you're still under oath.</p> <p>10 ADRIAAN MARTHINUS CALITZ: More, 11 Kommissaris. Baie dankie.</p> <p>12 CHAIRPERSON: Mr Gotz.</p> <p>13 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR GOTZ (CONTD.): 14 Good morning, Commissioners, and Brigadier Calitz.</p> <p>15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Good morning, 16 Advocate.</p> <p>17 MR GOTZ: Perhaps we can start with a 18 matter of housekeeping, Chairperson. The exhibits that we 19 dealt with yesterday did not include two additional videos 20 that I would like to rely upon. The first video is one 21 that's been mentioned I think by Mr Mpfou in these 22 proceedings and it's new eTV footage showing a number of 23 things, but also including a small clip of Mr Mathunjwa's 24 second address, and I'd like to be able to introduce that 25 as an exhibit if the –</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20639</p> <p>1 it. So I don't know that you need it at this stage of your 2 cross-examination. Perhaps photocopies can be made, unless 3 they're available already, of the translated transcript, 4 and then we can receive that exhibit.</p> <p>5 MR GOTZ: Then the second video that I 6 would like introduced as an exhibit, Chair, is –</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] 8 response to the point I made?</p> <p>9 MR GOTZ: No, Chair, I agree with that.</p> <p>10 Sorry, I was nodding and perhaps I should place that on –</p> <p>11 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, we will receive 12 that –</p> <p>13 MR GOTZ: Yes, I agree with that.</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: The transcribers can't see 15 you nodding and your nods we won't find on the transcript. 16 Let your yea be yea, your nay be nay, but your nods will 17 not be recorded.</p> <p>18 MR GOTZ: We will make it available, 19 Chair. The second video that I'd like to introduce as an 20 exhibit is in fact material that we have already seen in 21 the Commission. It is however a much clearer copy of the 22 video. So the video that I'm referring to is the Reuters 23 shot of the strikers approaching the TRT line. We've seen 24 that on a number of occasions –</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: If what you're saying to us</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20638</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON: That's been mentioned, and 2 I understood that we were going to see it. Mr Mpfou 3 mentioned it, but then I think in his anxiety to finish 4 reasonably within the time he promised, he didn't show it 5 to us. But obviously we've got to see it. We may as well 6 see it now, and I understood that we were going to get a 7 transcript of it – well, more accurately we were going to 8 get a translation of a transcript of it. I don't know 9 whether that's available yet.</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Chair, I'm not sure what the 11 position is, but in any event, I'm not going to be relying 12 upon that transcript for any purposes of my cross- 13 examination –</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, well let's find 15 out if the transcript is available. I think the evidence 16 leaders were looking into the matter. Mr Budlender, can 17 you help us on that?</p> <p>18 MR GOTZ: I'm told we do have a 19 transcript, Chair, so that can be introduced as an exhibit 20 as well.</p> <p>21 CHAIRPERSON: You know if we see it and 22 we hear it and some of us who are more disadvantaged than 23 others won't be able to follow it and others will, and it's 24 desirable, I would have thought, that we follow the 25 transcripts, a translated transcript, while we're seeing</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20640</p> <p>1 is simply a copy of what we saw before, but a better copy, 2 then I suggest you give us the exhibit number and then we 3 will replace the one you're now going to show us by the one 4 – sorry, we will replace the one we've already got by the 5 one that you're going to introduce –</p> <p>6 MR GOTZ: Chair, might I make a different 7 proposal, and I'll explain the reason for that. The 8 original exhibit is UU3. The material that I want to 9 introduce has a five-second introduction, as it were, which 10 states that the material that is about to be displayed is 11 rather graphic. The consequence of that introduction means 12 that the timing on the two clips is different, even though 13 when one starts the actual content the content is the same. 14 I'm a bit concerned that parties may have relied upon UU3 15 to set times and the like, and for that reason I propose 16 that this new material should not replace UU3 but rather 17 should be made a new exhibit, as a separate one.</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, that makes sense. 19 What is the latest exhibit?</p> <p>20 MR GOTZ: Well, if we introduce the eTV 21 footage, that would be then KK55.</p> <p>22 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, should be –</p> <p>23 MR BUDLENDER SC: Chair, would it not be 24 more convenient to make it UU3.1, so we'll connect the two?</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: Ja, that sounds sensible,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20641</p> <p>1 otherwise they're separated by thousands of pages among the 2 exhibits. We'll make it – what did you say? UU3?</p> <p>3 MR BUDLENDER SC: [Microphone off, 4 inaudible].</p> <p>5 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry?</p> <p>6 MR BUDLENDER SC: [Microphone off, 7 inaudible].</p> <p>8 CHAIRPERSON: No, it's numbered as UU3. 9 Is that right?</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Yes, indeed.</p> <p>11 CHAIRPERSON: So we can either call it 12 UU3 bis for those who prefer that, or we can call it UU3.1. 13 I prefer bis myself, but if I'm in the minority I'll go 14 along with UU3.1. I'm happy to say that the Commissioners 15 are unanimous that it's going to be UU3 bis because there's 16 no continuation from 1, and that makes it clear it's the 17 second – no, for the benefit of Mr Mahlangu and those who 18 are interpreting these proceedings into Xhosa, bis – no-one 19 else needs the explanation – bis is Latin for twice, and so 20 that's what it will be. Could we see UU3 bis please?</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: Do you want us to show that 22 now, Chair?</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: Well, when do you want to 24 show it?</p> <p>25 MR GOTZ: During the course of my cross-</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20643</p> <p>1 of the material in that exhibit –</p> <p>2 CHAIRPERSON: One has seen most of it, 3 but in fairness to the witness, we may have seen it but if 4 he wasn't alerted to it, he hasn't looked at it as part of 5 his preparation, so I think it might be appropriate to – 6 you'll introduce it at the appropriate time, but if the 7 appropriate time is after tea he might be given an 8 opportunity – I take it, it won't be long – to look at it 9 during tea -</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Yes.</p> <p>11 CHAIRPERSON: - so that he can be 12 prepared. Alright?</p> <p>13 MR GOTZ: Thank you, Chair.</p> <p>14 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dankie, mnr die 15 Voorsitter.</p> <p>16 MR GOTZ: Brigadier Calitz, we were 17 dealing yesterday with Major General Mpembe's views on 18 your, should we say limitations or weaknesses in crowd 19 management situations, and Major General Mpembe has told –</p> <p>20 CHAIRPERSON: I don't think "weakness" is 21 an appropriate word in this case. It's really an inability 22 to deal, or disadvantage is the right word, disadvantage to 23 deal with a particular situation.</p> <p>24 MR GOTZ: I'm happy to use the word 25 "disadvantage" -</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20642</p> <p>1 examination. I don't propose to –</p> <p>2 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, okay. We'll you 3 must –</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: - show it in advance.</p> <p>5 CHAIRPERSON: You determine the order of 6 your cross-examination. Has the witness seen it? You've 7 seen UU3. Were you told to look at UU3?</p> <p>8 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, mnr die 9 Voorsitter, ook nie die een van die nuwe eTV "footage" wat 10 ek dink hy het gesê KK55 is die nuwe een. Ek weet ook nie 11 wat is daardie een –</p> <p>12 VOORSITTER: Is dit K-K-K?</p> <p>13 BRIGADIER CALITZ: K-K-K.</p> <p>14 VOORSITTER: 55.</p> <p>15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink dit is die 16 nuwe –</p> <p>17 VOORSITTER: Ja-nee, maar hy is –</p> <p>18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Daar is twee wat hy –</p> <p>19 VOORSITTER: Maar ek dink hy het gesê dit 20 het ons al gesien.</p> <p>21 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, mnr die 22 Voorsitter.</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: Have we not seen the KK55 24 one?</p> <p>25 MR GOTZ: There is a – one has seen most</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20644</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON: But to call it a weakness 2 implies something pejorative, which I don't think you mean, 3 and if you do I won't allow you to do it anyway. So let's 4 carry on.</p> <p>5 MR GOTZ: Major General Mpembe has told 6 the Commission that an understanding of the relevant 7 language is one of the major factors affecting the success 8 or failure of a crowd management intervention. I take it 9 you would agree with Major General Mpembe on that?</p> <p>10 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek het nie die eerste 11 deel gehoor nie. U sê kommunikasie?</p> <p>12 MR GOTZ: Yes, an understanding of the 13 relevant language, so what I'm saying is that the language 14 of the strikers and an understanding by SAPS, or the 15 intervener of that striker, or those strikers' language, is 16 an important factor in the success or failure of the crowd 17 management intervention.</p> <p>18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek stem saam met u.</p> <p>19 MR GOTZ: And I take it you would also 20 agree that an understanding of the culture or belief 21 systems of the strikers in the crowd may also be an 22 important factor affecting the success or favour of the 23 intervention, correct?</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek.</p> <p>25 MR GOTZ: The factors that Major General</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20645</p> <p>1 Mpembe mentions, an understanding of language and an 2 appreciation of culture, were obviously not only important 3 on the 13th, but also in the days following the 14th, the 4 15th, and indeed also the 16th, correct?</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek.</p> <p>6 MR GOTZ: You've given your evidence 7 about your knowledge of the language and understanding, 8 your understanding of the language and culture of the 9 strikers. Colonel McIntosh was in the same position as you 10 were, correct?</p> <p>11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, ek weet nie of 12 Kolonel McIntosh Xhosa verstaan nie, of Fanagalo nie, so ek 13 kan nie vir u sê nie, maar as hy dit nie verstaan nie sou 14 hy in dieselfde posisie gewees het. Dit is korrek.</p> <p>15 MR GOTZ: You have in fact already 16 testified that he didn't understand Fanagalo. Did he have 17 any understanding of the cultural belief systems of the 18 strikers?</p> <p>19 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink my getuienis 20 was dat ek was onseker of hy dit verstaan. Ek weet nie of 21 ek gesê het definitief hy verstaan dit nie, want ek ken hom 22 glad nie so goed nie. Oor die kultuur verskille kan ek nie 23 vir u sê nie. Sy agtergrond, waar hy gewerk het, ek sal u 24 nie daarmee kan help nie. Ek glo Kolonel McIntosh sal vir 25 u meer duidelikheid daaroor kan gee.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20647</p> <p>1 answer, so therefore the assumption you ask us to make may 2 not be correct. I mean if necessary, I don't know how it 3 could be done, but if he's contactable maybe someone from 4 the police legal team could contact him quickly and ask for 5 the information, and if they come back and report that the 6 assumption you want us to make is correct you can carry on, 7 on that basis. But absent information of that kind I think 8 it's a waste of time and I'm not prepared to allow further 9 time to be wasted.</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, the fact that you 11 did not understand the language of the strikers placed you 12 at a disadvantage. One of the disadvantages was manifest, 13 or that disadvantage was manifested, as it were, in the 14 fact that you had to use an interpreter, correct?</p> <p>15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ons het die gebruik 16 van 'n interpreteerder gehad, ja.</p> <p>17 VOORSITTER: 'n Tolk.</p> <p>18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: 'n Tolk. Dankie, mnr 19 die Voorsitter.</p> <p>20 MR GOTZ: You had need of the 21 interpreter. Did you get any sense that Colonel McIntosh 22 had the need for an interpreter?</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: Mr Gotz, you're really 24 wasting time now. I can't see why Mr Pretorius can't go 25 and telephone Colonel McIntosh quickly. I've got an idea</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20646</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON: I don't know if it would be 2 necessary for him to give oral evidence, but if you require 3 this information from him I suggest you send a 4 communication to the evidence leaders indicating what extra 5 information you would like him to be requested to give, and 6 then a supplementary affidavit can be prepared containing 7 that information.</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: Let's proceed on the assumption 9 that he didn't have an understanding of the language, of 10 the relevant language of the strikers, and he also didn't 11 have an understanding of the culture of the strikers. Can 12 we proceed on that assumption?</p> <p>13 BRIGADIER CALITZ: "Assumption," as u sê 14 ons vat dit asof dit so is op daardie dag dan kan ek u vrae 15 daarop beantwoord. Dit –</p> <p>16 CHAIRPERSON: Why must we proceed on what 17 may be an incorrect assumption? It may be a total waste of 18 time to ask a whole series of questions based on something 19 which may not be correct. Time is precious in this 20 Commission. I'm not prepared to allow you to proceed on an 21 assumption which may well be incorrect.</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: Chairperson, we've asked 23 Brigadier Calitz whether he had any indication whether, or 24 had any knowledge of whether or not McIntosh –</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: And he doesn't know the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20648</p> <p>1 that I read somewhere that Colonel McIntosh, or Lieutenant 2 Colonel McIntosh did have some understanding of Fanagalo, 3 and Mr Budlender nods his head, so I think that's probably 4 right. But anyway, be that as it may, Mr Pretorius has 5 been very helpful up to now. I'm sure he can go away, 6 telephone Colonel McIntosh, find out and come back and 7 report to us, and depending what he says you can proceed 8 with this line, but you're wasting time now. Let's carry 9 on with something else.</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, it placed you at a 11 disadvantage in the negotiations, correct?</p> <p>12 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Wat myself aanbetrif, 13 ek het myself verlaat op die tolk wat dan vir ons die 14 inligting deurgegee het.</p> <p>15 MR GOTZ: As far as you are, or from your 16 position you don't know whether the interpreter was 17 correctly conveying what you had said to the strikers, or 18 Colonel McIntosh had said to the strikers, correct?</p> <p>19 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja-nee, soos ek sê, 'n 20 ou het totaal verlaat op – of hy die presiese woorde 21 gebruik het, dit sal ek nie van, vir u kan sê nie, nee.</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: And similarly you don't know 23 whether the interpreter correctly translated what the 24 strikers had told Colonel McIntosh or yourself, correct?</p> <p>25 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Die "flipside" van die</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20649</p> <p>1 "coin," dit is so -</p> <p>2 CHAIRPERSON: Of course there were other</p> <p>3 people in the Nyala and there was a question last week</p> <p>4 about some of them were African policemen -</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek, mnr die</p> <p>6 Voorsitter.</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: And we don't know whether</p> <p>8 they could understand what was being said in Fanagalo,</p> <p>9 which I gather is a mixture of Nguni languages and Sotho</p> <p>10 language. We don't know what they could understand or not</p> <p>11 understanding, but did anybody with you in the Nyala say to</p> <p>12 you, 'Hang on a second, the interpreter is getting it</p> <p>13 wrong; he's interpreting wrongly?' It doesn't necessarily</p> <p>14 mean he was interpreting rightly, but it's a factor to bear</p> <p>15 in mind. Did anybody say to you, 'No, no, that's not</p> <p>16 right'?</p> <p>17 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, mnr die</p> <p>18 Voorsitter, die meeste van die kommunikasie deur die tolk</p> <p>19 was maar Kolonel McIntosh of Adjudant Offisier Nong wat dit</p> <p>20 dan na my toe deurgegee het agter.</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: Perhaps we can move on to a</p> <p>22 different subject, and that's -</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: Very good idea.</p> <p>24 MR GOTZ: Can I ask you to look at</p> <p>25 paragraph 32 to 34 of your statement, Brigadier, which is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20651</p> <p>1 en gesirkel eers oor die groot koppie waar die ander</p> <p>2 persone gesit het, oor daardie gebied, gedeelte oor</p> <p>3 Nkaneng, en toe het ons gaan sit. So dit was nie 'n</p> <p>4 direkte vlug terug nie, nee.</p> <p>5 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, please listen to my</p> <p>6 questions. I said after the helicopter landed, did you</p> <p>7 return immediately to the JOC? So what happened before the</p> <p>8 helicopter landed is completely irrelevant -</p> <p>9 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Oh, sorry, I thought</p> <p>10 you say from after the scene. Ja, that's why I'm saying I</p> <p>11 can't hear you properly. You mean from when we landed to</p> <p>12 the JOC?</p> <p>13 MR GOTZ: Yes.</p> <p>14 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, ek dink ons het</p> <p>15 geland op die skoon oop veld waar die helikopters gestaan</p> <p>16 het. Ek het gestap - ek moet nou vir u eerlik sê, ek kan</p> <p>17 nie presies onthou of ek direk JOC toe was en of ek eers 'n</p> <p>18 draai gemaak het by die CJOC nie. Ek weet daar was 'n</p> <p>19 vergadering aan die regterkant van die JOC - nie 'n</p> <p>20 vergadering nie, so 'n terugvoer waar die personeel besig</p> <p>21 was met 'n vergadering, en ek dink dit is waar ek met</p> <p>22 Brigadier Van Zyl in gesprek gestaan en getree het, miskien</p> <p>23 was ons aan die buitekant vir 'n rukkie en toe ingegaan, as</p> <p>24 ek reg onthou.</p> <p>25 [09:36] MR GOTZ: What you then say in paragraph</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20650</p> <p>1 JJJ107 and it's on page 7 of that exhibit.</p> <p>2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: U wil hê ek moet</p> <p>3 paragraaf hoeveel? 33 tot?</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: Can I ask you to just cast your</p> <p>5 eye over those paragraphs -</p> <p>6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: 33 to?</p> <p>7 MR GOTZ: 32 to 34.</p> <p>8 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sal gou daar</p> <p>9 deurlees. Dit is korrek, daardie drie paragrawe het ek</p> <p>10 weer deur gelees.</p> <p>11 MR GOTZ: Tell me, Brigadier, when you</p> <p>12 returned to the base, as you put it, I assume what you mean</p> <p>13 is that that was, you returned to the JOC?</p> <p>14 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, as</p> <p>15 ek mag vra, as u miskien net bietjie - ek sukkel om u te</p> <p>16 hoor. Miskien my mikrofoon, ek is jammer, anders gaan ek</p> <p>17 die heeltyd vra om te herhaal. Ek hoor nie mooi.</p> <p>18 MR GOTZ: When you say in paragraph 33</p> <p>19 that you returned to the base, I assume what you mean by</p> <p>20 that is you returned to the JOC?</p> <p>21 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek, ja.</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: Did you return to the JOC</p> <p>23 immediately after the helicopter landed?</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, ek dink van die</p> <p>25 toneel waar Generaal Mpembe-hulle was het ons teruggevlieg</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20652</p> <p>1 34 is that, "Whilst at the JOC and approximately 30 minutes</p> <p>2 after my arrival, I was informed that the SAPS members who</p> <p>3 had accompanied Major-General Mpembe, effectively had been</p> <p>4 attacked, but what you don't mention in your statement, nor</p> <p>5 in your evidence in chief is that you received a call from</p> <p>6 Major-General Mpembe while he was still talking to the</p> <p>7 strikers at the railway line. Do you recall that?</p> <p>8 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, ek kan nie sê dat</p> <p>9 ek nou spesifiek daardie oproep kan onthou nie, nee.</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: I would like to take you to the</p> <p>11 evidence that Major-General Mpembe gave on this score, can</p> <p>12 we have a look at the transcript, day 103 and it is page</p> <p>13 11126?</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: While it is being found I</p> <p>15 see Mr Pretorius has returned, are you able to give us any</p> <p>16 information, Mr Semenza, on the topic that was under</p> <p>17 discussion before Mr Pretorius left.</p> <p>18 MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair, Colonel</p> <p>19 McIntosh does not speak Fanagalo but he says he has a fair</p> <p>20 understanding of the culture having worked in various</p> <p>21 townships over his career life.</p> <p>22 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. When you</p> <p>23 finished this point you can go back to the cross-</p> <p>24 examination that you wanted to start on, because I wouldn't</p> <p>25 allow it on, because I wasn't satisfied that the assumption</p>

Page 20653	Page 20655
1 was correct and it now appears it is correct and you'll be 2 able to deal with it, but perhaps you want to finish off 3 this point first?	1 CHAIRPERSON: Perhaps we could see the 2 rest of this page which is on the screen at the moment, 3 that may give us some information on this point, I don't 4 know.
4 MR GOTZ: It is day 103, 11126, if you 5 can find that and it is commencing at line 23.	5 MR GOTZ: Yes.
6 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, what is the exact 7 line on the page that you are referring to?	6 CHAIRPERSON: Can we see beyond? Yes, he 7 says when he spoke to you he gave you the same information 8 which he had given Major-General Mbombo and then perhaps we 9 could continue with the evidence after that? No, it
8 MR GOTZ: Well, I would like if the 9 person controlling these matters can take us to 11126?	10 appears from the evidence thereafter he doesn't give the 11 content of the conversation. Well, unless after line 12 on 12 page 16037 there is something? No, it is not. Yes, Mr 13 Ntsebeza suggests to him that he wanted to put to those in 14 the JOC who knew what his mission was, that there was a 15 need to change deck, as Mr Ntsebeza put it, not to disarm 16 the people there at the railway line and Major-General 17 Mpembe says, no, and then he doesn't agree with what Mr 18 Ntsebeza put to him. I don't know what he says thereafter, 19 that's part of the record we can't see at the moment. Do 20 you have a clear passage where Major-General Mpembe shares 21 to us, because I can't remember I'm afraid, what he said to 22 Brigadier Calitz in the course of that telephone 23 conversation?
17 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, obviously when you've 18 got the reference.	24 MR GOTZ: Chair, this is why I'm asking 25 the brigadier the question because it isn't, I'm afraid,
19 MR GOTZ: - to this reference. Can we 20 then look at 16035?	
21 CHAIRPERSON: Which day is that?	
22 MR GOTZ: It is day 145.	
23 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Page?	
24 MR GOTZ: Chair, I see –	
25 CHAIRPERSON: Would you give him the page	
Page 20654	Page 20656
1 –	1 clear what Major-General Mpembe told Brigadier Calitz.
2 MR GOTZ: - it is 16035.	2 What we do have and I'm afraid, Chair, I don't understand,
3 CHAIRPERSON: 16035. Yes, what line on	3 we've then checked this reference that I had, to transcript
4 16035 do you want to refer to?	4 11126 and our version of the transcript has the passage
5 MR GOTZ: Yes, it may actually be useful	5 that I was referring to, I'm not sure whether we can't look
6 if we go to the end of 16034 so that we can get the content	6 at that again just to make sure that we have the right
7 where the line that I want to refer to, the context, I beg	7 thing.
8 your pardon, where Mr Ntsebeza says to Major-General	8 CHAIRPERSON: But what does that passage
9 Mpembe, "No, do you speak to anyone in the JOC and who, if	9 say, - well, maybe at the same time you can tell us what
10 you did," and then Major-General Mpembe says, "I spoke to	10 your version of the transcript says.
11 Brigadier Calitz and I spoke to General Mbombo and later I	11 MR GOTZ: Yes.
12 spoke to the commanders." The chairperson then comes in	12 CHAIRPERSON: Bring it down to us and
13 and says, "I think the question relates to the telephone	13 then –
14 conversation that you had, so you had one telephone	14 MR GOTZ: So why –
15 conversation with General Mbombo and then another one with	15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, -
16 Brigadier Calitz, is that right? Correct. And was	16 CHAIRPERSON: It is a bit unscientific
17 Brigadier Calitz at the JOC at that stage?" The evidence	17 way of doing it but never mind, put it to the witness and
18 that Major-General Mpembe gave, Brigadier, was that whilst	18 let's see how he responds. We may be on a dwaalspoor but
19 he was interacting with the strikers at the railway line	19 on the other hand this may be an important point, we don't
20 and having listened to them for some time, he then decided	20 know if we've heard the brigadier's answers.
21 that he would telephone Major-General Mbombo and in	21 MR GOTZ: The brigadier wants to say
22 addition he would telephone you and he said, this is not	22 something?
23 the only reference, there is another which we're trying to	23 BRIGADIER CALITZ: No, no, I thought you
24 find, where he says expressly that he spoke to you about	24 just want to go back to your, to the other slide, maybe if
25 these matters.	25 we can just finish what was said on this one and then move

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20657</p> <p>1 to the other one, anderste moet ons terugkom na hierdie een 2 toe, mnr die Voorsitter.</p> <p>3 MR GOTZ: Yes.</p> <p>4 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Hier het hy verwys na 5 160, ag, daardie 11126, ek dink dit is net op die vorige 6 lyn, waar Generaal Mpembe gesê het dat hy met my 7 kommunikeer, ek dink dit is op die ander kantste bladsy 8 waar ons, eerste waar ons begin het.</p> <p>9 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, can we get back to 10 this, sorry, I want to try and cut this as short as 11 possible.</p> <p>12 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek wil net, -</p> <p>13 MR GOTZ: Look at -</p> <p>14 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek wil net vir u iets 15 uitgewys het daar.</p> <p>16 MR GOTZ: I promise you I will return to 17 that, Brigadier.</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: The passage being referred 19 to on 11126, he is being asked about the fact that 20 according to the video he is talking to someone on the 21 telephone, because that's what's put, you're on the 22 telephone, so then he is asked who he was on the telephone 23 to and so on.</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is hoekom ek vra, 25 as ons net na lyn 23 kan kyk.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20659</p> <p>1 few minutes ago, that he conveyed the same information to 2 you as he had conveyed it to General Mbombo. Now he told 3 us that he couldn't remember it but now you've seen what he 4 said. Does it perhaps jog your memory and help you to give 5 us further evidence on this point?</p> <p>6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 7 ja, dit is heeltemal korrek. Op hierdie gedeelte sê hy net 8 na die JOC toe en dan Mbombo, waar my naam gebruik word, 9 was op bladsy 16035 en ek dink dit is die uitklaring wat 10 die advokaat soek.</p> <p>11 MR GOTZ: Indeed, Brigadier.</p> <p>12 BRIGADIER CALITZ: So as ons na daardie 13 lyn toe kan gaan -</p> <p>14 MR GOTZ: Just so that we -</p> <p>15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: - dan sal ek vir u wys 16 in watse sin Generaal Mpembe dit bedoel het en dit sal 17 miskien duidelik word.</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: Never mind the meaning that 19 he had, the context and so forth in which he said these 20 things. The real question is, what is suggested is, he 21 said he spoke to you and what we want to know is whether 22 you now can remember something you couldn't remember 23 before, but these things happen when one's memory get 24 jogged by things. Can you now remember that when you had 25 got back to the JOC you received a telephone call from</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20658</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: Yes, indeed, so if we can go 2 down to line 23. Mr Ngalwana says, "Can you stop there," 3 and what he is referring to there, Brigadier, is the video 4 that's playing. "Is that you seemingly on the telephone, 5 General," and the general responds, "Correct, Chairperson," 6 and then if we can go to the next page, 11127, Mr Ngalwana 7 asks, "With whom were you communicating there," and Major- 8 General Mpembe says, "I was communicating with the JOC and 9 also informed the Provincial Commissioner about the 10 situation that I encountered." Now the importance of the 11 second reference that I gave you is that he tells us that 12 the person that he was communicating with ion the JOC was 13 you, Brigadier, and then Mr -</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: But I understood the 15 witness to say he didn't dispute that, but he couldn't 16 remember it and then we see further on that General Mpembe 17 says, "I informed the JOC, that means I must informed 18 Brigadier Calitz, that the strikers seem not to cooperate 19 the handover of their weapons, precisely the reason I've 20 given to the Commission. So I've taken the decision that 21 we will escort them, the same I did communicate to the 22 Provincial Commissioner and she said to me, I'm the best 23 placed person on the ground to take decisions, and she 24 agreed with me." Now that's his discussion with General 25 Mbombo but he had earlier said in a passage that we saw a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20660</p> <p>1 General Mpembe who said something to you, can you - 2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 3 nee, nie toe ek terug was by die JOC nie, maar dit is 4 hoekom ek u wil wys toe ek wel met hom gesels het en dit 5 sal duidelik wees as ons kan na daardie lyn 14 toe gaan.</p> <p>6 CHAIRPERSON: Well, I think you better 7 show us that and tell us about it.</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, before we move off 9 this page I just wanted you to focus -</p> <p>10 CHAIRPERSON: But, Mr Gotz, I'm not 11 stopping you from taking him further on the page, but let 12 him finish off the point he is trying to make now so that 13 we can understand.</p> <p>14 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink dit sal vir u 15 duidelik wees -</p> <p>16 CHAIRPERSON: Alright -</p> <p>17 BRIGADIER CALITZ: - as ek net kan.</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: Well, it may or may not be 19 clear to us, but if you try to make it clear that's -</p> <p>20 BRIGADIER CALITZ: O, ja, ja, 16035 21 waarna u verwys het op dag 145, lyn 14, dink ek wat ons 22 gelees het, u sal sien daar het hy gesê, as ons 'n bietjie 23 kan opgaan, nee, op, anderkant toe op, stop daar, Generaal 24 Mpembe, "I spoke to Brigadier Calitz and I spoke to General 25 Mbombo and later I spoke to the commanders that were around</p>

Page 20661	Page 20663
<p>1 me. I think the question relates to the telephone 2 conversation you had, so you had one telephone conversation 3 with General Mbombo and the other one with Brigadier 4 Calitz, is that right?" Dit is waar die generaal gesê het, 5 ja, en waar hy my naam gebruik het, "And was Brigadier 6 Calitz at the JOC at that stage? I indicated before he was 7 at the JOC, he was, he did guide me."</p> <p>8 As u kan nou net op daardie stadium sien en dan 9 verder lees, die chairperson sê, "Yes," en toe sê General 10 Mpembe, "And when I arrived he guided me because there was 11 no chopper which was refuelling and when the chopper 12 arrived with Colonel Vermaak then he went back to the JOC, 13 but I refer specifically to him because he was at the JOC, 14 yes." So ek dink die tyd wat hy met my gepraat het hier 15 verwys na die tyd wat ek hom in beduie het.</p> <p>16 CHAIRPERSON: It is not easy to do it, 17 read on, "But I refer specifically to him because he was at 18 the JOC, yes. Now I say, yes, and did you say to him what 19 you also said to General Mbombo?" Now I don't we, - we 20 know what he said to General Mbombo, he reported that, they 21 didn't want to hand over their arms and he was now going to 22 agree to escort them back to the koppie and so on. "Did 23 you say to him what you also said to General Mbombo?" The 24 answer, "The same information, Chairperson."</p> <p>25 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is so –</p>	<p>1 opportunity, a chance."</p> <p>2 That's the end of Mr Ntsebeza's purported 3 quotation from what General Mpembe said and then he 4 continues, "More or less is that how the communication went 5 between you and them?" And Major-General Mpembe says, "It 6 included that they should disarm but in case where they 7 don't voluntarily disarm that is the case, but the main 8 priority was that it could be important for me that they 9 should go there disarmed and we can just escort them. The 10 reason why I wanted to escort them is with the allegations 11 that they put that NUM or securities were shooting at them, 12 but the condition I put to them, that was very clear, 13 unequivocally unarmed." That's what the answer was but 14 anyway the point is if you can't remember the conversation 15 then we're wasting our time, putting to you what General 16 Mpembe said. Does it not jog your memory a bit?</p> <p>17 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, glad nie, Mnr die 18 Voorsitter, nee, ek kan glad nie onthou dat hy my geskakel 19 het nie. Ek glo die records kan miskien daarnatoe wys, 20 maar in die sin wat dit hier gesê is, miskien met die JOC 21 gepraat of met die general, maar sover ek weet hy het nie 22 met my oor hierdie onderwerp nie, nee.</p> <p>23 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, do you recall any 24 conversation that you had with Major-General Mpembe in 25 which the reasons for his decision or the decision that was</p>
Page 20662	Page 20664
<p>1 CHAIRPERSON: So what he says, he spoke 2 to you and you were at the JOC and he reported to you what 3 he reported to General Mbombo, that there had been this 4 discussion with the strikers and they refused to hand over 5 their arms, weapons, but he had decided a decision which 6 was supported by the Provincial Commissioner. He had 7 decided not to try and disarm them there but to rather 8 escort them back to the koppie. That's what he says. Now 9 the question is whether you can remember that?</p> <p>10 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, nee, glad nie, Mnr 11 die Voorsitter, dit is wat ek net wil wys uit hierdie uit, 12 dat die gesprek was net ten tye van die aanduiding gewees 13 en nie toe ek by die JOC was nie, nee.</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry, can we please 15 just see what continuous after line 24 which I've read? Mr 16 Ntsebeza then says, "So if I understand you," that's the 17 next page, we've got to go up, no, no, what we need is 36, 18 Mr Ntsebeza says, "If I understand you, you say to these 19 personalities in the JOC, look, the situation is such, now 20 I have to change the deck a little bit. My mission here 21 was to disarm these people here at this railway line. 22 There has been an exchange of views between us and them, 23 they are not handing their weapons. The suggestion they 24 make about me and us accompanying them to the mountain, I 25 think that's an opportunity that we must give, an</p>	<p>1 taken on the 13th were discussed between you and him?</p> <p>2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Net na die tyd –</p> <p>3 CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt, Mr 4 Budlender, I know you've got details of certain cell phone 5 records, have you got, do they cover the 13th, because, you 6 need not now but you can investigate and tell us, because 7 it may help Mr Gotz with this part of his cross- 8 examination. Sorry, I was interrupting you, Brigadier?</p> <p>9 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, Mnr die 10 Voorsitter, ek wou intendeel dieselfde gevra het, want ek 11 kan dit glad nie onthou nie. Om die vraag te antwoord was 12 dat wel na die tyd het ons daaroor gesels en ek was glad 13 nie bewus daarvan nie, nee.</p> <p>14 MR GOTZ: I'm sorry, Brigadier, I may not 15 have understood your answer in flurry of activity, did you 16 say you had discussed the matter with him and when I refer 17 to the matter I'm talking about –</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: No, I'm sorry, he said he 19 couldn't remember a conversation at all, and when I tried 20 from various angles to see whether his memory have being 21 jogged by the passages in General Mpembe's evidence he said 22 he still couldn't remember.</p> <p>23 MR GOTZ: No, with respect, Chairperson, 24 I'm asking a different question. What I said was, post the 25 events of the 13th, the operation, did Brigadier Calitz have</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20665</p> <p>1 any conversation with General Mpembe in which the reasons 2 for General Mpembe's decision were discussed with General 3 Mpembe?</p> <p>4 CHAIRPERSON: I'll allow that question.</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is wat ek u 6 geantwoord het, Mnr die Voorsitter, wat ek gesê het dat na 7 die tyd het ons wel daardie aand dit bespreek en dit is dan 8 ook so oorgedra, ek dink aan die generale wat besoek het.</p> <p>9 MR GOTZ: Was that a private conversation 10 between you and Mpembe?</p> <p>11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, ek dink dit was 12 bespreek gewees, die feedback wat gegee was van die dag en 13 in daardie vergadering of daardie, as ek dit 'n vergadering 14 kan noem, het ons dan daardie terugvoer gekry van die 15 persone wat daar was.</p> <p>16 MR GOTZ: During that feedback session 17 Major-General Mpembe, I presume, would have explained his 18 conduct on the 13th, correct?</p> <p>19 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek, sover 20 ek onthou wat hy gesê het.</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: And you would have explained 22 the reasons he took the decision that he did, correct?</p> <p>23 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is ook korrek, ja.</p> <p>24 MR GOTZ: Did he tell the people around 25 the gathering or at that gathering that he had taken a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20667</p> <p>1 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, ek kan ook nie 2 onthou dat daar enigets gesê is oor dat hulle dit nodig 3 het vir julle verdediging nie, nee.</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: Did he tell you that they 5 believed that two of their members had been shot dead in 6 the preceding days?</p> <p>7 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, ek kan nie dit, 8 daardie inligting onthou nie.</p> <p>9 CHAIRPERSON: I have difficulty in 10 understanding the value of this cross-examination. The 11 reason I say that is that the conversation between General 12 Mpembe and the strikers representatives is, was videoed. 13 We've seen the video, we received the translation of what 14 was said, it was dealt with in Mr Ntsebeza's cross- 15 examination. I'm not satisfied that any second hand 16 recital by General Mpembe if he could remember what was 17 said and if this witness can accurately remember what 18 General Mpembe said is going to take the matter any 19 further. We have first hand evidence of what was said 20 which is on the video and which has been translated for us 21 and which is set out in exhibits. So what's the point of 22 asking this witness about it?</p> <p>23 MR GOTZ: Chairperson, the point and I 24 don't –</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, perhaps I should</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2066</p> <p>1 decision which he described as one of situational 2 appropriateness, he had listened to the strikers, he had 3 assessed the situation and he had taken a decision to agree 4 to their request that he escort them to the koppie.</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek kan nou nie die 6 presiese woorde onthou soos u dit stel nie, maar die breë 7 strekking was dat hy wel besluit het om die persone dan te 8 escort na die koppie toe.</p> <p>9 MR GOTZ: And did he explain to you what 10 went wrong?</p> <p>11 [09:56] Ek dink op daardie stadium het hulle gesê dat die 12 persone wou weg breek, onder korreksie na die gedeelte van 13 'n nedersetting en dat toe die polisie hulle wou stop was 14 daar geweld uitgebreek waar hulle die polisie aangeval het 15 en verskeie persone dan gedood en beseer is aan beide 16 kante.</p> <p>17 MR GOTZ: Did Major General Mpembe tell 18 the people gathered there why the strikers had told him 19 they did not want to relinquish their weapons?</p> <p>20 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, ek kan nie, ek 21 kan nie die rede daarvoor onthou nie, nee.</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: Did he tell you that the 23 strikers had asked him to permit them to keep their weapons 24 until such time as they had reached the koppie because they 25 needed it for their protection?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20668</p> <p>1 give you an opportunity to answer the point I put to you. 2 What, am I correct in thinking that you're simply asking 3 questions to get a second hand recital of what we already 4 have at first hand, if there's a further reason you have of 5 asking these questions and it's not covered by the material 6 we already have then obviously I'll allow you to ask the 7 question. I was only concerned that we should be ploughing 8 over ground at second hand which we, in respect of which we 9 already have first hand information. Am I not correct in 10 that assumption?</p> <p>11 MR GOTZ: Chair, with respect my next 12 question I think will reveal the purpose of the cross- 13 examination.</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: Ask, let's hear your next 15 question.</p> <p>16 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, do you not think as 17 the operational commander in charge of the operation on the 18 ground and indeed as the person centrally involved in the 19 negotiations that that information ought to have been 20 conveyed to you?</p> <p>21 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, u 22 moet onthou u, u verwarr miskien nou twee dinge. Die 23 provinsiale kommissaris het op daardie stadium die 24 voorvalle boek inskrywing gemaak en sy het aangedui dat 25 General Mpembe my oorhoofs en ek moet oor vat operasioneel.</p>

Page 20669	Page 20671
1 Die voorval op die Maandag was daar nie 'n beplanning voor 2 nie, dit was 'n spontane voorval gewees. So wat betref 3 operasionele bevelvoerder en die beplanning en die 4 negoziates waar als begin het, het actually op die 14de 5 begin. Daardie dag, ek dink Kolonel Merafe sou dan die 6 doel van die operasionele bevelvoerder op die grond gevat 7 het in sy kapasiteit van die senior openbare order 8 polisiéringslid op die grond. So ek wil net die twee 9 onderskeidings vir u wil uitwys.	1 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, ek 2 kan nie die presiese, ek dink ek het verwys daarna waar 3 hulle aan ons aan die begin met hulle kontak gehad het waar 4 hulle dan gesê het dat hulle wil nie met ons gesels nie, 5 maar met die myn oor sekere dinge en dan ook die aanval op 6 hulle lede. Ek dink ek het verwys – 7 CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Gotz, is asking, 8 what I'm interested in as well is more specific than that. 9 We know that it's not true that two people were killed on 10 the Saturday.
10 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, I appreciate the 11 distinction but what I'm putting to you is a different 12 question. I'm saying that as the operational commander but 13 also the person centrally involved in the negotiations with 14 the strikers it was important for you to have an 15 understanding of what had happened on the 13th and critical 16 to that understanding was the reasons that the strikers 17 were carrying the weapons that they were, why they had 18 asked the police to escort them and indeed the fact that 19 they believed that two of their members had been shot dead. 20 Do you not think that that was important information which 21 should have been conveyed to you?	11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek. 12 CHAIRPERSON: That was a story that was 13 spread around, it was repeated even in the book that was 14 published after the commission was set up, but we know the 15 allegation is not true. But there is some suggestion that 16 it was believed at the time by the strikers. The question 17 is whether that belief was communicated to you either by 18 some information you got from some of your colleagues as to 19 what happened on the 13th or whether they communicated it 20 directly to you in the course of your interchanges or 21 exchanges with them?
22 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, u het vir my 23 gevra, die vraag was of Generaal Mpembe dit op daardie aand 24 bespreek het en ek kan vir u duidelik sê dat ek kan nie 25 onthou op daardie stadium nie. Die volgende dag, die 14de	22 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 23 dankie, ek dink die inligting wat ons dan ingewin het 24 gedurende die JOCCOM vergaderings was wel gedeel, ek kan 25 nie presies onthou of dit misdaad intelligensie of die
Page 20670	Page 20672
1 het die inligting begin inkom van misdaad intelligensie en 2 al die plekke en toe het ons 'n JOC gestig en dit is waar 3 dit bespreek is en waar dit oorgegee is aan die 4 onderhandelaars en waar die beplannings begin het waarna u 5 verwys nou. 6 MR GOTZ: Well I'm not sure that I 7 completely understand that information, but let's, that 8 answer. Brigadier, when you commenced the negotiations 9 with the strikers the following day on the 14th were you 10 aware of certain factors, for instance that they believed 11 that two of their members had been shot dead, that they 12 were carrying the weapons they had told Mpembe for their 13 own protection. Was that information in your mind? 14 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 15 waarvan ons wel bewus was en dit is die inligting wat deur 16 gegee is, is van die insidente wat die Vrydag, die Saterdag 17 en die Sondag vooraf gebeur het so daardie detail inligting 18 is wel met ons gedeel op daardie dae toe die beplannings 19 opgetrek is. 20 CHAIRPERSON: Is it correct that the 21 strikers themselves when you and Lieutenant Colonel 22 Macintosh were in conversation with them, did they at any 23 point during those conversations repeat this allegation 24 that two of their members had been killed by NUM members on 25 the Saturday?	1 sekuriteitsmaatskappy af kom nie dat daar wel sulke 2 bewerings was en ek het wel ook in, as ek nou reg, onder 3 korreksie verwys daar in my, ek praat heeltemal onder 4 korreksie, die verklaring wat ek gemaak het vir die cordon 5 and search wat sou plaasgevind het dink ek het ons, ons het 6 ook daaraan verwys van die twee persone wat gedood was, wat 7 actually dan nie so was nie. So daardie inligting was wel 8 met ons gedeel. 9 CHAIRPERSON: Perhaps I can jog your 10 memory on this, exhibit GGG13, it's the statement that you 11 made which we, I think it's your first statement, the one 12 you made on the 19th of August. In paragraph 7 you talk 13 about the negotiations and around about the middle of the 14 paragraph you say later, "the five came right up to the 15 Nyala, one of them had a green blanket wrapped around him, 16 climbed onto the bulbar of the Nyala vehicle and spoke to 17 Lieutenant Colonel Macintosh. This person informed him 18 that they want to speak to the mine management about their 19 wages and the killing of their people and they don't want 20 to talk to the SAPS. So what we can see from that, sorry. 21 What we can see from that is that certainly the so-called 22 killing, the alleged killing of their people was raised. 23 Can you remember that? 24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, ja 25 as u onthou wat ek nou net getuig het, ek het net gesê

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20673</p> <p>1 onder korreksie en ek wou dit gesoek het. Dit is presies 2 waarna ek verwys het, toe hulle gesê het hulle wil nie met 3 die polisie onderhandel nie maar met die myn management oor 4 hulle geskille van lone en dan ook die dreigemente en die 5 killings van hulle persone. So, maar dit is die verwysing 6 wat ek -</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, but did they give any 8 more, did they give any more detail about the killing of 9 their people, in other words the allegation was, we've 10 heard this a number of times in the course of the evidence 11 before this commission, the allegation that they made was 12 that on that occasion on the Saturday morning when a number 13 of strikers, about 3 000 marched towards the NUM office and 14 shots were fired by members of NUM. We know two people 15 were injured. But the allegation was that two people were 16 killed by NUM members on that occasion. Was that 17 allegation ever conveyed to you as far as you can recall?</p> <p>18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 19 ja, nie die detail van hulle kant af nie. Maar wel deur 20 misdaad intelligensie. Ons het dit gehad dat daar vyf 21 wounded persons were found and dan drie persone gewond 22 gedurende die optog. Dit was Saterdag die 11de. Dit is 23 hoe die inligting deurgekom het na ons toe. Maar van mnr 24 Noki af self net daardie woorde gewees.</p> <p>25 MR GOTZ: You see, Brigadier, the concern</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20675</p> <p>1 maar dat hulle nie die rede gegee het vir die wapens omdat 2 hulle wil teen NUM verdedig het nie nee. Daardie rede is 3 nie aan ons gegee nie. Ons het wel herhaaldelik vir hulle 4 gesê dat dis 'n onwettige byeenkoms en die wapens moet 5 neergelê word en, en, en. So ons het nie verdere daarop 6 kommunikeer nie.</p> <p>7 MR GOTZ: You, despite the fact that you 8 know that their members had not been killed, you don't 9 convey to them your knowledge that they are in fact in 10 hospital, correct?</p> <p>11 CHAIRPERSON: Ja, I don't think that's a 12 fair question. The witness hasn't told us when he 13 discovered, my recollection is that we only ascertained in 14 this commission after it had begun that that allegation of 15 two people had been killed was unfounded. There was for a 16 long time there was, it was believed I think by the police, 17 according to the evidence that there may be some substance 18 in it but what, but attempts were being made to find out 19 who the two people were. So the question presupposes that 20 the witness knew at the time he spoke to the strikers that 21 the information is incorrect and that assumption on which 22 the question is founded doesn't appear to be correct. 23 Perhaps you should ask him whether it's correct first 24 before asking questions based on an assumption which has 25 not yet been established.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20674</p> <p>1 that I have is that this seems to have been a repeated 2 statement made by the strikers. It was made to Mpembe on 3 the 13th namely that, Major General Mpembe had been told 4 that they were carrying their weapons because they needed 5 them for their protection believing that two of their 6 members had been killed. We see from this statement, 7 paragraph 7 that they conveyed the same information to you. 8 It was a repeated statement and it was a concern that was 9 repeatedly put to SAPS.</p> <p>10 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, dit is hoekom ek 11 sê dit is die inligting. Die meer detail daarom het ons 12 nie ontvang nie en dit kon nooit bevestig word van daardie 13 twee persone wat gedood is.</p> <p>14 MR GOTZ: But what we -</p> <p>15 CHAIRPERSON: We now know the two people 16 weren't killed. But the question is whether it was 17 believed by the strikers that they had been. That's the 18 point Mr Gotz is busy with and flowing from that was the 19 further allegation by the strikers that the reason that 20 they were hanging onto their weapons was because, to defend 21 themselves against NUM. The question is whether that 22 information was conveyed to you, whether you were aware of 23 it at any stage?</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, nee, die eerste 25 gedeelte dat daar wel persone wat hulle beweer is gedood,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20676</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, I had understood 2 that you had crafted an email, that you had crafted an 3 email which you refer to in your statement, and I'm trying 4 to find it where you had indicated that the two people had 5 not in fact been killed but had been sent to hospital and 6 you name the hospitals. If you'll bear with me, I can find 7 it in your statement. But I had understood that you knew 8 that the two people had been injured but not killed.</p> <p>9 CHAIRPERSON: Well let's ask him about 10 that. Did you know that no one was killed on the Saturday 11 morning, that two strikers were injured and were taken to 12 hospital, do you know that?</p> <p>13 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 14 nee ons het geweet daardie bewering is gemaak en dit is die 15 enigste en ons het later wel in hindsight uitgevind daar is 16 wel nie twee persone gedood nie. Die email waarna die 17 Advokaat verwys was nie deur my opgestel nie. As u net 18 die, dit sal volg en ek dink dis ingehandig as 'n bewyssku¹ 19 dit is 'n email wat ek ontvang het van Kaptein Govender wat 20 die, kan ek sê misdaad intelligensie offisier is by 21 Marikana polisie stasie en die is die eerste email wat met 22 my gekommunikeer was wat ek ontvang het van hulle rondom 23 die situasie daar en die rede hoekom ek die email ingesit 24 het is dat dit is die spesifieke woorde en die beskrywing 25 waarop ons dan die versoek na die NATJOC toe gestuur het.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20677</p> <p>1 Ek dink ek het dit ontvang en omrent 8 minute later het ek 2 daai selfde email deur gestuur NATJOC toe. So dit was die 3 doel van daardie email dat hulle die strekking kon sien, 4 die bewering wat gemaak word asook die ernstigheid van die 5 situasie en dan laat hulle uit daardie standpunt uit dan 6 vir ons ekstra personeel stuur. So dit was die doel van 7 die email waarna u verwys.</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: Yes, indeed, Brigadier. You 9 refer to this email in paragraph 27 of your statement, 10 exhibit JJJ107 and that commences on page 5 and you'll see 11 that in paragraph 2 you specifically refer to the incident 12 or rather the email specifically refers to the incident. 13 It records that both were shot in the back near the spinal 14 area, the victims were taken to Andrew Saffy Hospital for 15 medical attention.</p> <p>16 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, dit is die 17 presiese email wat ek na verwys het en u sal sien dis in 18 italic gedruk en in my statement include en as jy dan na 19 die, dis ingegee as exhibit, ek ken nie die exhibit nommer 20 nie, sal u dan kan volg presies die email, wanneer ek dit 21 ontvang het en aangestuur het en my presiese woorde aan die 22 NATJOC dat weens hierdie email die ernstig van die aard en 23 dat ons het hulp nodig in terme van meer mannekrag.</p> <p>24 MR GOTZ: So you did know that they had 25 not been killed, you received information via email before</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20679</p> <p>1 couldn't obtain, he couldn't establish, he couldn't obtain 2 confirmation of the fact that these, the two people, that 3 two people had been killed. That's my understanding of his 4 evidence. You're suggesting that he knew that the two 5 people who were allegedly killed were the same as the two 6 people who were actually injured, that's the basis on which 7 the question is asked and I understood him to say precisely 8 the opposite, that he thought that there were two other 9 people who had been killed, they could never get 10 confirmation about this. Am I summarising your evidence 11 correctly or have I got it wrong?</p> <p>12 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is heeltemal 13 korrek, mnr die Voorsitter. As u kyk van die Vrydag, die 14 Saterdag, die Vrydag was daar twee persone ge-injure 15 during, kom ons sê rivals tussen unies, die Saterdag vyf 16 persone gewond, toe weer later drie persone gewond. So 17 daar's verskeie persone wat gewond is en wat gerapporteer 18 is aan die polisie in hierdie tydperk en dan die bewering 19 van twee persone wat dood is. So u kan nooit sê die twee 20 persone wat dood is, is spesifiek waarna hulle verwys nie. 21 So ek stem saam met u, mnr die Voorsitter.</p> <p>22 COMMISSIONER TOKOTA: Sorry, Brigadier, 23 let me just find out, if you had, let's assume that you had 24 known that people had been killed on that Saturday would it 25 have made any difference as to whether the carrying of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20678</p> <p>1 the 14th, correct?</p> <p>2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, dit kon nie 3 bevestig word nie, onthou daar was 'n bewering gewees en 4 hierdie woorde was die Kaptein wat ek sê die intelligensie 5 offisier op die grond opgestel is. So dit kan na twee 6 ander persone verwys word wat dan ook vermoor is. So op 7 daardie stadium ek dink die speurders het dit probeer 8 opvolg en ons kon dit nooit bevestig van twee persone wat 9 oorlede is nie.</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: No, Brigadier, these are the 11 two victims that the strikers believed had been shot and 12 killed. Were you not aware of this?</p> <p>13 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, ek 14 verstaan nou nie, u vra het hulle vir my gesê, ek sê ja 15 julle het vir my laat weet en toe verwys hy na die email en 16 ek het vir u gesê oor ek die email verstaan het en 17 aangestuur het.</p> <p>18 MR GOTZ: But you were in possession of 19 information which at the very least pointed strongly to the 20 fact that they had not been killed.</p> <p>21 CHAIRPERSON: I understand him to say 22 that he didn't know it was the same people. He said there 23 was information two people had been injured that were in 24 hospital, there was information two people had been dead, 25 were dead. He thought they were two other people but he</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20680</p> <p>1 pangas and spears there was justified in the circumstances?</p> <p>2 [10:15] BRIGADIER CALITZ: Kommissaris, nee, 3 definitief nie. Ek kan verwys, ek het so vinnig gesoek toe 4 die Voorsitter verwys het na GGG, in my paragraaf JJJ – my 5 "consolidated statement," paragraaf 48, het ek ook gesê 6 "Negotiations, informed the five men as well as the 7 strikers," dit is nadat hulle ons ingelig het van die 8 persone wat gedood is, "that the gathering is illegal and 9 the carrying of the weapons is illegal and that SAPS does 10 not want any confrontation with them but wanted to resolve 11 this peacefully." So die dra van die pangas sou definitief 12 dan geen relevansie gehad het nie. Dit sou nog steeds dit 13 'n onwettige byeenkoms gemaak het waar gevaelike wapens 14 glad nie toegelaat word nie. So dit sou ek dan, soos ons 15 wel aan hulle oorgedra het, Kommissaris, dit is wat ons aan 16 hulle oorgedra het.</p> <p>17 MR GOTZ: Major General Mpembe considered 18 it important to find out why the strikers were carrying 19 pangas and other weapons, correct?</p> <p>20 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink dit is wat ek 21 op die video gesien het na die tyd.</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: And once he had been informed 23 about that he took a decision based on that knowledge.</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink die "decision" 25 wat, waarna u verwys is om hulle te escort na die koppie</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20681</p> <p>1 toe was vir hom 'n veiliger opsie op daardie stadium. Ek 2 weet nie of daar genoegsame mannekrag was om die persone te 3 ontwapen daar waar hulle was nie. Ek dink daar was 'n 4 geskil oor opinies –</p> <p>5 CHAIRPERSON: There were 70 people under 6 the command of Major General Mpembe. There were about 200 7 people who were strikers. So that's one aspect of the 8 matter. The other one was if they could have, if an 9 attempt had been made to disarm them, even if there had 10 been 200 policemen or 300 policemen, the other problem was 11 whether it could have occurred in circumstances where there 12 would have been no bloodshed, and Major General Mpembe told 13 us – I don't know if he told you – that he was afraid that 14 if he tried to disarm them there at the railway line, there 15 would have been what he called another Tatane incident and 16 there would have been, at least one person and probably 17 more would have been killed, and that's why he said – or I 18 don't know whether he told you that, but he told us that – 19 that he applied the doctrine of situational appropriateness 20 which is set out in the policy document on Public Order 21 Policing. That's what he told us, but I don't know if he 22 told you that.</p> <p>23 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, dit is korrek, 24 mnr die Voorsitter. Dit is wat ek net wou gesê het wat ek 25 verstaan het uit sy getuenis uit en ek dink daar was nog</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20683</p> <p>1 out the reason why they were carrying the weapons, or was 2 it irrelevant to you?</p> <p>3 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, dit was nie 4 irrelevant nie. Ek dink die onderhandelinge het die hele 5 dag aangegaan. Ek het nou nie sekonde vir sekonde 6 neergeskryf wat met die onderhandelinge gesê word nie, maar 7 dit was belangrik gewees en dat Kolonel McIntosh het met 8 hulle onderhandel. Hulle het gesê hulle het die wapens en 9 dan het ons vir hulle verduidelik dit is onwettig, dis 'n 10 onwettige byeenkoms en hulle moet dit neersit, want onder 11 geen omstandighede volgens my is meegedeel dat hulle het 12 die wapens in hulle besit om hulle te beskerm teen NUM nie. 13 Daardie inligting, nee, het ek nie gehad nie.</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: If they'd told you that 15 they had the weapons in their possession to protect 16 themselves against NUM, would you have offered them police 17 protection against NUM?</p> <p>18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, as 19 ek nou in "indsight," ek kry nou die inligting en ek moet 20 die "call" maak, sou ek nog steeds vir hulle gesê het dat 21 die polisie is daar om hulle te beskerm, sowel as die NUM 22 mense. Daar sal wel moet onderhandelinge gewees het. Ek 23 sou dit deurgegee het JOC toe sodat die nodige leier 24 elemente tussen NUM en AMCU bymekaar kan kom en dan die 25 beweringe dan uitsorteer, en ons sou hulle definitief</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20682</p> <p>1 iets gewees ook die spoorlyn wat ook, die trein wat gebruik 2 word en die tye en hy was onseker, as ek kan –</p> <p>3 CHAIRPERSON: Ja, there were other 4 subsidiary reasons, but I –</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: - as ek kan reg 6 onthou.</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: I would have thought the 8 Tatane one was the best. But can I ask you this before Mr 9 Gotz continues? If you had known that this reference to 10 two people who'd been killed, if a number was given or 11 simply people had been killed, was actually based on a 12 misunderstanding and was a reference to the two people 13 who'd been shot but not killed by NUM members on the 14 Saturday, would you have conveyed that to the strikers and 15 said, 'No, no, none of your people were killed. They're 16 lying in hospital.' Would you have conveyed that to them 17 if you had known that they were talking about the same 18 people?</p> <p>19 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Beslis so, mnr die 20 Voorsitter, want dit is die doel van onderhandeling en dit 21 is hoe jy 'n vertrouensposisie bewerkstellig met, tussen 22 twee groepe. Dit sou definitief oorgedra gewees het.</p> <p>23 MR GOTZ: My final question on this line, 24 Brigadier, when you commenced negotiations with the 25 strikers on the 14th, did you consider it important to find</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20684</p> <p>1 verseker het. Ek dink iewers in die paragrawe het ons wel 2 vir hulle gesê ons wil hierdie hele ding "peacefully 3 resolve" en ons wil nie "violence" hê nie; die polisie is 4 nie daar om enige konfrontasie uit te lok nie. So 5 definitief met ons teenwoordigheid daar en van die 14de af 6 kan u sien die insidente het afgeneem. So daar was wel 7 polisiebeskerming gewees en 24 uur, so deur die nag was 8 daar ook patrollies gewees.</p> <p>9 CHAIRPERSON: It sounds from what you say 10 as if you assumed that when you were speaking to the 11 strikers' representatives you were actually speaking to 12 AMCU members as such, you talked about inter-union rivalry 13 and inter-union violence and talked about AMCU. Did you 14 think that these people who you were talking to were all 15 AMCU members and that this was in effect an AMCU strike?</p> <p>16 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, ek 17 sal nie sê almal was AMCU nie, maar weens die inligting wat 18 ons gehad het en van Misdaad Intelligenste het dit geblyk 19 dat die meerderheid van die persone dan wel AMCU lede was.</p> <p>20 CHAIRPERSON: They may have been AMCU 21 members coincidentally. The question was whether it was an 22 AMCU strike which, or was the strike by rock drill 23 operators, some of whom were members of AMCU? There's a 24 distinction between the two, isn't there?</p> <p>25 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Daar is beslis, mnr</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20685</p> <p>1 die Voorsitter.</p> <p>2 MR GOTZ: Brigadier Calitz –</p> <p>3 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr Gotz, before you carry on, may I ask you, in order to understand the relevance of some of these questions you ask, is it your case that if the police had told them that these people hadn't died, that they would then have handed over their arms and they wouldn't have considered it necessary to keep them to protect, allegedly to protect themselves?</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Chair, our case is, we put it no higher than it would have made a difference in the negotiations because what we do see, Chair, and I'm afraid I'm sharing evidence as it were, what we do see even on the 16th is the strikers making reference to the fact that two of their members have been killed. So between the 14th and the 16th they still have not been told that two of their members have not been killed, and they are concerned about it right up until Mr Mathunjwa gives his first address –</p> <p>19 CHAIRPERSON: I understand the relevance now. You may proceed.</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, can I ask you to have a look at paragraph 23 of –</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: Before he looks at paragraph 23, or whatever the paragraph is you're referring to, Mr Semenya has turned on his light.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20687</p> <p>1 allegedly killed were the two people who had been wounded, 2 and that's why he wasn't able to convey it. So that's 3 point has been dealt with, but you then went on to say 4 something further, but I think let's find out. Mr Semenya, 5 are you now on the same page as Mr Gotz? Do you now 6 understand the point that he's making?</p> <p>7 MR SEMENYA SC: No, he then continues to 8 say even on the 16th that information was withheld from the 9 strikers, and I'm saying at that stage there would have 10 been also fatalities on the Monday of those AMCU members.</p> <p>11 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, yes. No, perhaps 12 putting words in Mr Gotz' mouth, Mr Gotz would say there's 13 a difference. The people who were killed on the Monday, 14 some of them were members of the police service; that's not 15 relevant. As far as the strikers were concerned they were 16 killed by the police, well, two of them. We don't know 17 about the third, but the thrust of Mr Gotz' questions 18 relates to the alleged desire of the strikers to retain 19 their weapons to defend themselves not against the police 20 who were responsible for the killings, were responsible in 21 the physical sense for the killings on the Monday, but 22 against NUM who they alleged were responsible for earlier 23 killings on the Saturday. If I misstated your point, Mr 24 Gotz, I apologise. Did I get it right?</p> <p>25 MR GOTZ: No, that is absolutely correct,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20686</p> <p>1 MR SEMENYA SC: I could not follow the last response, Chair, because by the 16th there were already fatalities that had happened the Monday.</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: Sorry, Chair, I don't understand the objection.</p> <p>6 CHAIRPERSON: No, it's not an objection. What Mr Semenya says, he doesn't understand the point you're making and he gives a reason why he doesn't understand it, and presumably he'll say he would like to understand it so that he can follow the evidence, and if he doesn't understand it, it should be made clear. So perhaps you could explain it again so that Mr Semenya can follow the point you're making.</p> <p>14 MR GOTZ: Chairperson, you had asked a question about whether or not it's our case that if the strikers had been informed of the fact that two of their members had not been killed, that would have made any difference, and I said indeed it is our case and we had understood on the basis of the emails that Brigadier Calitz was in possession of information that the strikers had not been killed, and it is our case that if Brigadier Calitz had conveyed that to the people with whom he was negotiating, it would have made a difference.</p> <p>24 CHAIRPERSON: He answered that to some extent by saying he didn't know the two people who were</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20688</p> <p>1 Chair, and just to correct one further point; I had simply said that it appears from the videos that we've seen that the strikers were still not aware of the fact - on the Thursday, the 16th, they were still not aware of the fact, and I put it no higher than that when I address the question.</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: Alright. You know, that raises all sorts of questions to which we obviously don't know the answers. I mean either the statement that people had been killed was a lie, or it was genuinely believed, or it was true, what their genuine belief was earlier on but some of them had visited the people in the hospital in the meanwhile and knew that they hadn't been killed. We don't know the answer to any of those questions. All you can say is they persisted in the statement that people had been killed. Whether that was a truthful statement made in the sense of what they genuinely believed, or whether it was something that they were repeating even though they knew it was false, is a matter in respect of which we have no evidence at this stage, and I doubt if we ever will have.</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: Does that clear things up for my learned friend? Thank you. Brigadier Calitz, let's move on to paragraph 23 of your witness statement. You say in your witness statement at paragraph 23 –</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr Gotz, forgive me.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20689</p> <p>1 There's one other point I want to put to you before you 2 move on. Would it really have made a difference if they 3 had been told, as you say they should have been told if 4 Major Calitz had known that these two people hadn't been 5 killed, they'd just been seriously injured and were lying 6 in hospital, if it is true that they wished to retain their 7 weapons to protect themselves against NUM, if that's true, 8 that need would still have existed even if the people 9 concerned hadn't been killed but had merely been seriously 10 injured? Isn't that so?</p> <p>11 They'd been shot. They might well have died. It 12 may well be that you will argue at the end of the case that 13 we must recommend that consideration must be given to 14 prosecuting the NUM members who fired without giving a 15 warning or anything of that kind, prosecuting them for 16 attempted murder, but does it make a difference, did they 17 need to keep their weapons to protect themselves against an 18 actual killing? Because there had only been an attempted 19 killing which was unsuccessful, albeit the victims were 20 seriously injured, they didn't need to keep their weapons. 21 That sounds like a non-starter, that point. What do you 22 say to that?</p> <p>23 MR GOTZ: Chair, it's difficult for me to 24 give evidence. It's certainly not our case that there 25 would have been a difference between the two. What I'm</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20691</p> <p>1 I don't think that I'm going to be finishing today, so I 2 may come back to it in the light of the answers that you've 3 –</p> <p>4 CHAIRPERSON: Are you not going to finish 5 before the end of the day?</p> <p>6 MR GOTZ: It is very unlikely, Chair.</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: Because you did tell me 8 earlier what your estimate of the length of your cross- 9 examination would be but anyway, how long do you think 10 you'll be now, can you give us a revised estimate?</p> <p>11 MR GOTZ: Chair, I'll certainly be up 12 until teatime on Monday.</p> <p>13 CHAIRPERSON: Which teatime, morning or 14 afternoon?</p> <p>15 MR GOTZ: No, morning tea, Chair.</p> <p>16 CHAIRPERSON: Well, that –</p> <p>17 MR GOTZ: I apologise for that –</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: No, no, I understand –</p> <p>19 MR GOTZ: Chair, the things are going 20 slower than I anticipated –</p> <p>21 CHAIRPERSON: I understand, you've got to 22 do your job as you see it, you've got to ask the questions 23 you consider necessary and it doesn't help you to be 24 heckled all the time from the chair, so carry on.</p> <p>25 MR GOTZ: I wouldn't put it as strongly</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20690</p> <p>1 probing with the Brigadier is the extent of information 2 that was shared during the course of the negotiations and 3 testing as a result the quality of those negotiations, what 4 substantively was conveyed during the course of those 5 negotiations with the Brigadier.</p> <p>6 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, perhaps we can 7 investigate that in depth after we adjourn, the tea 8 adjournment has been taken, but we won't take the tea 9 adjournment until Mr Budlender has said something.</p> <p>10 MR BUDLENDER SC: Chair, you asked 11 whether we have the cell phone records of the 13th of 12 August. We don't have it. The records we have commence on 13 the 14th.</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, that was my impression 15 also. Alright, well fortified by that extra information 16 we'll take tea and you will then proceed with the line that 17 you're busy with now after tea. Is that right?</p> <p>18 [COMMISSION ADJOURS] COMMISSION RESUMES]</p> <p>19 [10:51] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes, 20 Brigadier, you're still under oath.</p> <p>21 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dankie, Mn die 22 Voorsitter.</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: Mr Gotz?</p> <p>24 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, I may come back to 25 this issue in the light of some of your answers, I'm afraid</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20692</p> <p>1 as that, Chair.</p> <p>2 CHAIRPERSON: No, but I can, carry on, Mr 3 Gotz.</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, can I ask you a few 5 questions relating to the interactions between yourself and 6 Lonmin and Mr Sinclair in particular? Now I understand 7 that Mr Mpofu has dealt with this quite extensively and in 8 a sense I'm just filling in some of the gaps that he did 9 not deal with and we will rely on the evidence that Mr 10 Mpofu extracted. So can I ask you to look at Exhibit 11 JJJ192 which is the transcript of the meeting of the 14th of 12 August between Lonmin and the Provincial Commissioner?</p> <p>13 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Is that in my bundle 14 under which point?</p> <p>15 MR GOTZ: It is, - sorry, I wouldn't have 16 prepared this bundle for you, Brigadier, you may have to 17 ask –</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: It is an exhibit already, 19 you see? If you look at the screen you'll see the first 20 page of the document that's being referred to and it's been 21 referred to already during the course of your cross- 22 examination. It is JJJ192, is the conversation which 23 was clandestinely recorded at the offices of Lonmin on 24 Tuesday, the 14th, a conversation between Provincial 25 Commissioner Mbombo who is described as SAPS Commissioner</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20693</p> <p>1 and Mr Mokoena and I think Mr Sinclair also took part and 2 also I think Mr Cardy as well, but anyway people from 3 Lonmin on the one side and Provincial Commissioner Mbombo 4 on the other. Do you remember reading that document?</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, glad nie, 6 Kommissaris, dit is hoekom ek vra. Dit sou dalk in sy 7 bundel gewees het, as ek geweet het hy gaan daaruit vra –</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: Chair, we expressly refer to 9 this document in our –</p> <p>10 CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry, Mr Gotz says you 11 were given a list of exhibits that would be referred to and 12 you were also given documents which were not yet exhibits 13 which are in a red file with the tabs that we went through 14 yesterday, but there was a list given to you which 15 contained references to the exhibits to which your 16 attention was drawn and Mr Gotz says that this one, JJJ192 17 was one of them, but if you haven't seen it, well, then the 18 fault is not Mr Gotz' but we'll have to proceed as best we 19 can.</p> <p>20 BRIGADIER CALITZ: MnR die Voorsitter, 21 nee, ek sit met die lys hier, dit bestaan uit vier bladsy 22 uit en dit is definitief nie op hierdie lys nie.</p> <p>23 MR SEMENYA SC: It is not on ours either, 24 Chair.</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20695</p> <p>1 grateful to receive that information.</p> <p>2 MR GOTZ: So, Brigadier, -</p> <p>3 CHAIRPERSON: What is the page?</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, if you can look at 5 page 14 of that document?</p> <p>6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sal dit maar op die 7 screen volg, ek het nou nie die dokument by my nie.</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, I don't want to ask 9 you questions about it now,-</p> <p>10 BRIGADIER CALITZ: No, no, it is fine, ek 11 wil net op die, bladsy 14?</p> <p>12 CHAIRPERSON: Will it take the elements 13 of surprise away from your cross-examination if you tell 14 him what passage on page 14 you're referring to, say if he 15 is spending an anxious half an hour reading the page over 16 and over again?</p> <p>17 MR GOTZ: It probably would, Chair, but 18 can I ask you simply to read from page 14 through to the 19 end of the document and I –</p> <p>20 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sal so maak, ja.</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: It –</p> <p>22 CHAIRPERSON: 14 to 18, it won't take too 23 much of your time.</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sal 14 tot 18 lees, 25 dankie daarvoor, Advokaat.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20694</p> <p>1 MR SEMENYA SC: It is not on ours as 2 well.</p> <p>3 CHAIRPERSON: Well, Mr Gotz, I assumed in 4 your favour erroneously that it was included.</p> <p>5 MR GOTZ: No, I must apologise for that, 6 Chair, I –</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: Well, in view of –</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: - something that I –</p> <p>9 CHAIRPERSON: No, -</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Can I refer the brigadier to –</p> <p>11 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, these things happen 12 in the best regulated cases, I'm afraid. I'm not sure 13 whether this is in that category, but in view of the fact 14 that you were going to be cross-examining until morning 15 teatime on Monday, it may be appropriate to leave this 16 point over until Monday morning and the brigadier can spend 17 some of his weekend studying this document and also 18 possibly it might be sensible to check at the end of the 19 day were there any other documents that were left out of 20 this so that the brigadier can also read them if there are 21 any. Is that a suggestion that finds favour with you?</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: It does with one qualification, 23 Chair, it might assist the brigadier if I refer him to the 24 page that I want to ask questions about.</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: I'm sure he would be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20696</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: Okay, Brigadier, to turn again 2 to a document with which you are familiar, it is your 3 witness statement, JJJ107, I would like you to look at 4 paragraph 23 of your witness statement. Now, Brigadier, 5 you say in that paragraph that you also instructed Captain 6 Sefiki to ensure that the Operations Board is kept up to 7 date with regard to who the group commanders were and what 8 their contact numbers are. This was to advise anyone 9 seeking information to know who to contact and where. The 10 Operations Board was also to contain information of the 11 details of the deployment and the description of how the 12 personnel and resources were to be deployed. Do you see 13 that, Brigadier?</p> <p>14 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sien dit, MnR die 15 Voorsitter.</p> <p>16 MR GOTZ: One of the pieces of 17 information which was on the JOC board was a page relating 18 to Mining Security postings and can I show you that, a 19 photograph of that board? It is Exhibit HHH60. You'll see 20 that that document or that photograph is of the board which 21 is headed "Mining Security postings, 16 August 2012," and 22 it then contains a list of names. It also reflects 23 information regarding what weapons or arms the relevant 24 people are carrying, which vehicles they're driving and we 25 understand that it also indicates where in the vicinity</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20697</p> <p>1 those people were posted. Do you see that, Brigadier?</p> <p>2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sien dit, mnr die</p> <p>3 Voorsitter.</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: You do accept that this was</p> <p>5 part and parcel of the JOC board on the 16th of August?</p> <p>6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter,</p> <p>7 ja, dit is eintlik waarop ek u aandag wil wys, paragraaf 23</p> <p>8 van my verklaring en as u in die voorvalle boek inskrywing</p> <p>9 gaan kyk is dit die JOC wat gestig is die 12de. Dit was</p> <p>10 die Sondag gewees toe ons net daar aangekom het, so dit was</p> <p>11 die klein JOC, as u weet hoe lyk die perseel by, ek glo u</p> <p>12 weet by Middlekraal is daar 'n klein kamertjie waar hulle</p> <p>13 hul radio's en beheer kamer en daar was 'n JOC board waar</p> <p>14 ek vir Kaptein Sefiki dan gesê het, vir die deployments wat</p> <p>15 op daardie dag en dan sou volg, daardie JOC board, sodat as</p> <p>16 die mense daar aankom dan kan hulle dit volg. Ek weet nie</p> <p>17 of u weet op watter stadium en waar hierdie foto geneem is</p> <p>18 nie, volgens my kennis sou hierdie gewees het nadat die JOC</p> <p>19 geskuif het en daar 'n ander JOC bevelvoerder aangestel</p> <p>20 gewees het wat dan totaal beheer oor daardie sou geneem</p> <p>21 het. So, -</p> <p>22 CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure that you're on</p> <p>23 the same point as Mr Gotz. You were talking about the</p> <p>24 document on 12, I take it, which is the police docket, is</p> <p>25 that correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20699</p> <p>1 suggesting to the brigadier that the police, that that</p> <p>2 contained writing by the police and I don't put that</p> <p>3 proposition to him.</p> <p>4 CHAIRPERSON: No, if it is a police</p> <p>5 document you can tell us but it looks to me like a Lonmin</p> <p>6 document, it refers to Lonmin staff, I take it, Lonmin</p> <p>7 vehicles, is that right?</p> <p>8 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit –</p> <p>9 CHAIRPERSON: And the positions on the</p> <p>10 Marikana property on which Lonmin are mining –</p> <p>11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: As ek dit –</p> <p>12 CHAIRPERSON: - where different people</p> <p>13 are going to be posted because that's what the heading is,</p> <p>14 "Mining Security postings." So I take it these people are</p> <p>15 - part of the Security officers, are members of the</p> <p>16 Security staff of Lonmin and this says where they were</p> <p>17 supposed to be posted on the 16th. I take it that's what</p> <p>18 the document is, if I'm wrong you can correct me or Mr Gotz</p> <p>19 can.</p> <p>20 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, dit is hoe ek dit</p> <p>21 ook verstaan het, mnr die Voorsitter.</p> <p>22 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, okay, Mr Gotz, are</p> <p>23 you happy with that?</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Wat in die polisie –</p> <p>25 MR GOTZ: Yes, and perhaps to further</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20698</p> <p>1 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Watter document verwys</p> <p>2 u na?</p> <p>3 CHAIRPERSON: You're talking about the</p> <p>4 Operations board, is that a sort of a black board on which</p> <p>5 writing was done in chalk or one of these –</p> <p>6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit was die Sekuriteit</p> <p>7 se, ek dink dit was 'n wit bord –</p> <p>8 CHAIRPERSON: Ja –</p> <p>9 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Hierdie white –</p> <p>10 CHAIRPERSON: A white board, yes.</p> <p>11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink so.</p> <p>12 CHAIRPERSON: And the markings on that,</p> <p>13 the writing on that, was that what one would call Lonmin</p> <p>14 writing or was that police writing?</p> <p>15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, nee, dit is om</p> <p>16 aan te dui ons –</p> <p>17 CHAIRPERSON: It was police writings?</p> <p>18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Polisie, ja.</p> <p>19 CHAIRPERSON: Now I don't think it is</p> <p>20 suggested, if I'm wrong Mr Gotz will correct me, I know, I</p> <p>21 don't think it is suggested that this document that we're</p> <p>22 looking at now is a police document. It is a Lonmin</p> <p>23 document, is that right, Mr Gotz?</p> <p>24 MR GOTZ: Well, I'm trying to establish</p> <p>25 the origins of the document. I have no basis for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20700</p> <p>1 assist, perhaps we can give some context to where this</p> <p>2 board was located in the JOC, we have photographs which</p> <p>3 were taken by Captain Van Heerden. The relevant</p> <p>4 photographs are HHH34 and 35 and perhaps we can just simply</p> <p>5 put that up on the screen, those photographs up on the</p> <p>6 screen so that we can get further information regarding</p> <p>7 the, so it will be HHH34, I beg your pardon, I'm told it is</p> <p>8 35 and 36, I'm not sure why mine, - sorry, is there a</p> <p>9 concern that they don't have the relevant exhibit?</p> <p>10 CHAIRPERSON: That the witness was</p> <p>11 referred to?</p> <p>12 MR GOTZ: Chair, -</p> <p>13 CHAIRPERSON: If it is a document he was</p> <p>14 referred to you can carry on, but if it isn't then it falls</p> <p>15 in the same category as the document we referred to earlier</p> <p>16 in which case you can deal with it the way we decided that</p> <p>17 one will be dealt with. I mean alternatively I could lend</p> <p>18 him my copy of HHH35 and 36 because they're just</p> <p>19 photographs.</p> <p>20 MR GOTZ: Yes, -</p> <p>21 CHAIRPERSON: But –</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: They're simply photographs and,</p> <p>23 Brigadier, perhaps I can ask the questions in an abstract</p> <p>24 way. Have you prior to have seen the photograph that is</p> <p>25 reflected as HHH60, have you seen that document, - sorry,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20701</p> <p>1 had you seen that JOC board before?</p> <p>2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnri die Voorsitter, 3 nee, ek sal nie sê spesifiek hierdie board nie, nee, dit is 4 hoekom ek u gevra het wanneer die foto geneem is. Volgens 5 my sou dit gewees het die groter JOC wat in daardie tyd 6 geskuif was en waar totaal ander JOC personeel aangestel 7 was.</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: Yes, and in response to that I 9 said, let's look at the background, there were photographs 10 taken by Captain Van Heerden on the 16th.</p> <p>11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, hierdie is 12 definitief die geskuifde JOC, dit is nie waar ek vir 13 Kaptein Sefiki opdrag gegee het nie, by Middlekraal is 14 daar 'n klein Sekuriteitskamer. Hierdie is wat ons dan na 15 die JOC verwys, maar dit is 'n aangrensende, hoe kan ek sê, 16 lapa, 'n grasdak lapa waartoe die JOC geskuif was. U sal 17 onthou later toe Brigadier Pretorius en die personeel gekom 18 het, toe het die generale in opdrag, want hulle het die JOC 19 geskuif en waar hulle aangestel is as die JOC personeel 20 waar hulle dan hulle hul eie reels en regulasies en goeters 21 neergesit het en dit is dan waar die JOCCOM vergaderings 22 gehou was.</p> <p>23 MR GOTZ: Can you explain to the 24 Commission, Brigadier Calitz, why in a JOC which is 25 established by the SAPS do we find a board which indicates</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20703</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: Chair, -</p> <p>2 COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I seem to recall 3 more than one photograph dealing with the charts or the 4 boards inside the JOC, this is not the only photograph that 5 we've been shown. I'm just not sure where they are, but 6 they do show more than one board up.</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: Well, we have the good 8 fortune that Advocate Pillay has returned from abroad and 9 she is normally the one who immediately puts us on the 10 track of the relevant exhibits, perhaps we can take 11 advantage of her return and ask her if she can help us. 12 Can you help us, Ms Pillay?</p> <p>13 MR GOTZ: Chair, I have no need for Ms 14 Pillay, as kind as her help may be, my evidence is twofold, 15 Chair. The first is that this photograph is one of several 16 which is taken by Captain Van Heerden on the day and that 17 was established during the evidence of, the cross- 18 examination of Scott. The second piece of evidence is 19 HHH36 which shows the JOC board and shows the photograph in 20 the far corner and so I was hoping that we would see HHH, -</p> <p>21 CHAIRPERSON: Maybe copy -</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: It may be, Chair, -</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: I've looked on HHH36 and I 24 couldn't find it, hence my situation to Mr Semenya's 25 objection but if it is in fact there then I'll be happy to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20702</p> <p>1 Mining Security postings for the 16th of August which 2 contains information and details of the deployment and 3 indeed a description of the personnel and resources that 4 were being deployed by Lonmin?</p> <p>5 MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, perhaps before 6 that, Mr Gotz may want to tell us why he comes to the 7 conclusion it was in the police JOC, this document?</p> <p>8 CHAIRPERSON: I've looked at HHH, I think 9 it is HHH35 and 36, I can't see that Security posting 10 there.</p> <p>11 MR SEMENYA SC: Yes.</p> <p>12 CHAIRPERSON: You see the foundation of 13 the question, the assumption on which the question is based 14 is that this was in the police JOC. Now if that assumption 15 is established to be correct obviously the question can be 16 asked but unless and until it is established I don't think 17 the question is a proper one. Now unless when that exhibit 18 was admitted, received, it was established that it was a 19 picture of a notice that was up in the police JOC, or the 20 room that had been allocated to the police from, I think it 21 is the 13th onwards, the 13th or it may even be the 14th 22 onwards, for the enlarged police JOC, unless it is 23 established that that document was there, the question 24 doesn't arise. Now haven't you got to establish that first 25 before you can ask the question?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20704</p> <p>1 allow you to proceed.</p> <p>2 MR GOTZ: I understand that they may be 3 given a copy -</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Are you in 5 possession of a photograph that shows both boards, Mr Gotz?</p> <p>6 MR GOTZ: Not in -</p> <p>7 COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: No?</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: In my head, Commissioner 9 Hemraj, but not, - we understand that that is being done at 10 this moment and we would like to show -</p> <p>11 CHAIRPERSON: Let's -</p> <p>12 MR GOTZ: - HHH36 -</p> <p>13 CHAIRPERSON: Let's bate our breath, if 14 that's the correct verb, while it is being shown to us.</p> <p>15 MR GOTZ: This is actually HHH35, but 16 Commissioner, can you, - now is it possible to brighten 17 that up a little bit? Sorry, can we have HHH36?</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: The question is, this is 19 36?</p> <p>20 MR GOTZ: Yes, Chair.</p> <p>21 CHAIRPERSON: HHH36?</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: Correct.</p> <p>23 [11:11] CHAIRPERSON: On HHH36 there is a 24 gentleman at the back, further of the way into the 25 photograph in the middle, speaking on the telephone and</p>

		Page 20705	Page 20707
1	behind his right shoulder is clearly a large piece of paper	1	opdrag gegee het dat die bord daar opgesit word, dit sal ek
2	with some writing on it and behind his left shoulder	2	nou nie vir u kan sê nie. In enige, ek praat van 'n
3	there's something, I think it's just a refrigerator which	3	normale operasie waar ons dan 'n "joint operational centre"
4	is blank, but perhaps we could go to the right again,	4	sal ons dan al die rolspelers se kontak details en hulle
5	please. Who is that? Can you recognise that –	5	roepseine en hulle toerusting, ensovoorts, sal dan
6	MR GOTZ: Can we pan to the right?	6	"reflect" in 'n gewone operasionele situasie.
7	That's the left.	7	CHAIRPERSON: Can I ask you this; do you
8	CHAIRPERSON: Brigadier, can you	8	know what that room was used for before it was made
9	recognise that person on the photo?	9	available to the police for the enlarge JOC centre?
10	BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, mnr die	10	BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, glad nie, mnr die
11	Voorsitter, ek –	11	Voorsitter.
12	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, let's go further	12	CHAIRPERSON: When you went into it for
13	to the right.	13	the first time did it appear to be a room that had been
14	BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit lyk soos 'n	14	unused by Lonmin, or were there signs of it having been
15	polisie offisier.	15	used by Lonmin, and if so, for what purpose?
16	CHAIRPERSON: Let's go further to the	16	BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, ek
17	right. Now there's something. There's a piece of paper	17	het laat daar aangekom die aand en die toerusting, van die
18	there with writing on it in – it's white paper with writing	18	goed was alreeds daar. So ek sou nie sê dit is ongebruik
19	on it in red. Can that please be enlarged? Can we zoom on	19	nie, maar dit lyk ook soos 'n lapa met 'n gedeelte, so waar
20	it, because that might be the document that's been referred	20	miskien lesings of funksies kan aangebied word. Ek sal nie
21	to.	21	sê, Lonmin sal dalk beter vir ons kan sê.
22	MR GOTZ: Can you confirm that that is	22	MR GOTZ: There appears to be a bar in
23	the board behind –	23	the corner. Is that a correct assessment?
24	CHAIRPERSON: Yes, that is the document.	24	BRIGADIER CALITZ: As u verwys na die
25	So you're right, Mr Gotz, I apologise. The assumption on	25	toonbank, ja.
		Page 20706	Page 20708
1	which your question is based is established and you can ask	1	MR GOTZ: Brigadier Calitz, it couldn't
2	the question.	2	possibly be that that poster that we see containing
3	BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit lyk inderdaad soos	3	security postings predated your arrival and use of that
4	die dokument, dit is korrek.	4	room.
5	MR GOTZ: So it is a board, can we call	5	BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, maar ek het nie
6	it that, which appears in the police's JOC and given the	6	dit gesê –
7	date and indeed the timing of Captain Van Heerden's	7	CHAIRPERSON: I don't think you're
8	photographs we know that it was taken on the 16th. So again	8	suggesting that, are you? Presumably if it's a posting for
9	I ask my question; can you explain why we find in the JOC	9	the 16th it would have been put up either in the morning of
10	on the 16th a board which shows the deployment of Lonmin	10	the 16th or possibly late on the 15th.
11	personnel with arms, and a description of where they are to	11	BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit kan gewees het,
12	be deployed?	12	mnr die Voorsitter, ja. Dit is hoekom ek sê –
13	BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, ek	13	CHAIRPERSON: And inasmuch as it appears
14	sal net vir u my mening kan gee, ek glo die JOC	14	to relate to Lonmin staff, it would have been put up by
15	"commander," Brigadier Pretorius sal beter weet of daar	15	some Lonmin official, not by the police. Is that also
16	opdrag gegee is dat dit moet gedoen word. As ons bietjie	16	right?
17	kan uit zoom uit die foto uit dan wil ek net vir u wys dit	17	BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek. Ek glo
18	is waar die CCTV – okay, stop net daar – daardie blou	18	nie die polisie sal hulle "postings" kan detail, neerskryf
19	stoelie met die persone wat u sal sien een het 'n kruis op	19	nie, nee.
20	die rug wat 'n "reflection" is, dit is die	20	CHAIRPERSON: You can't tell us anything
21	sekuriteitpersoneel wat daar sit, en dit was hulle posisie	21	about how that piece of paper got affixed to the wall
22	gewees in die gesamentlike operasionele sentrum. Dit is	22	there?
23	die CCTV kameras wat gemonitor is. So hulle was dan deel	23	BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ongelukkig nie, mnr
24	van die "joint operational centre." Die bord, of die	24	die Voorsitter.
25	"deployment" sien ek dan is reg bo hulle opgesit. Wie	25	CHAIRPERSON: Presumably it's a question

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20709</p> <p>1 that Lonmin people can be asked when they come and give 2 evidence.</p> <p>3 MR GOTZ: Yes, it may well be, but 4 Brigadier, were you aware of where the security personnel 5 were deployed, as it were, on the 16th? Quite apart from 6 the questions of whether you were aware of this board, were 7 you aware of where the security personnel were deployed?</p> <p>8 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, ek sal nie vir u 9 kan sê met detail dat ek weet waar hulle "ge-deploy" was 10 nie. Ek weet 'n gedeelte van die personeel van Lonmin was 11 by "forward holding area" 1 saam met Generaal Naidoo. Ek 12 dink dis die nooddienste personeel, maar of dit al daardie 13 persone insluit sal ek nie vir u kan sê nie.</p> <p>14 MR GOTZ: You see, what I find a bit 15 strange about your answer, Brigadier, is when you were 16 giving evidence-in-chief there was a question which 17 elicited an answer from you in which you referred to the 18 deployment of "Lonmin sekuriteitspersoneel op sekere plekke 19 op die myn" as a key aspect of the cooperation that you 20 received from Lonmin during that period. Can I take you to 21 that passage? It's 17435 on day 155. So it's day 155 and 22 it's 17435. Can we go up just a little bit to get the 23 context, to 17434, line 18, so go down to line 18. Mr 24 Semenza puts to you that the other criticism is that you 25 should not have used an interpreter, a Fanagalo interpreter</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20711</p> <p>1 is u antwoord.</p> <p>2 MNR GOTZ: Wat is die antwoord, die 3 antwoord vir wat, Brigadier? I'm asking you a question 4 about –</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: U het gevra, ek dink –</p> <p>6 MR GOTZ: Yes?</p> <p>7 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Wil u eers klaar vra 8 of kan ek antwoord soos ek verstaan het?</p> <p>9 MR GOTZ: I've just, you've asked me to 10 complete the sentence and I've done so.</p> <p>11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Okay, mnr die 12 Voorsitter, ja, die eerste opmerking sal ek nou nie 13 persoonlik vat oor die 110% nie. Ek dink ons is, mnr die 14 Voorsitter het al gesê ons gaan nie weer daaroor gaan nie. 15 So ek vra maar net dat ons wegblý van –</p> <p>16 CHAIRPERSON: That's a joke that's been 17 made, it's been recycled so often I think we can put it in 18 the cupboard and leave it there.</p> <p>19 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja. Nee, ek wil net 20 verhoed dat ons nie wedersyds sarkasme toepas nie, dan gaan 21 ons lank hier sit. Die ander deel wat ek vir u wil wys is 22 dat die perseel wat hulle vir ons beskikbaar gestel het, en 23 dit was van aankoms daar gewees, is die Middlekraal 24 perseel, nie net die JOC nie, maar ook die JOC wat geskuif 25 het.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20710</p> <p>1 from the "enemy camp," and you'll recall that that causes 2 you some confusion around who we're talking about in the 3 "enemy camp," and once it's clarified by the Chairperson on 4 17435 that what is being spoken about is Lonmin you say at 5 line 14, "Nee, eerstens, nee" –</p> <p>6 CHAIRPERSON: Could we have line 14, 7 please?</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: Line 14, "Nee, eerstens, nee, 9 ons het dit glad nie gesien as die woorde wat gebruik is, 10 'enemy camp.' Nee, nee. Mnr Sinclair het ek op meer as 11 een geleentheid getuig dat hy het honderd persent 12 samewerking gegee." I note he doesn't get the 110% grade, 13 but he certainly gets 100%. And then you give three 14 examples of the level of cooperation – "samewerking" is 15 cooperation – between SAPS and Lonmin. The first that you 16 give is that they provided you with the "perseel," which is 17 the JOC. Second you say, "Die wyse waarop hulle, hulle 18 inligting met ons gedeel het," and thirdly you say, "Die 19 sekuriteitspersoneel wat op sekere plekke op die myn 'ge- 20 deploy' is..." Do you see that, Brigadier?</p> <p>21 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, lees net bietjie 22 verder ook.</p> <p>23 MNR GOTZ: - "wat dan deel van hulle, 24 hulle werk, natuurlik."</p> <p>25 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja ek dink dit, daar</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20712</p> <p>1 Die wyse waarop hulle inligting met ons gedeel 2 het, dit was die sekuriteitspersoneel wat dan vir ons op 3 verskeie geleenthede op CCTV kameras gewys het waar persone 4 is en hoe hulle bewegings is, en dan die laaste deel is wat 5 dan, die sekuriteitspersoneel wat op sekere plekke op die 6 myn "ge-deploy" het.</p> <p>7 So, en dan wat ek vir u gesê het lees verder, wat 8 dan deel van hulle, hulle werk is natuurlik. Met ander 9 woorde die mynpersoneel het nog steeds voortgegaan met 10 hulle werk. Ek dink ek het op 'n stadium getuig dat by die 11 smelters was daar draad gesteel en daar was op 'n stadium 12 voertuie wat aan die brand gesteek is op 'n ander plek. So 13 dit is waar die mynpersoneel en, nog steeds hulle werk 14 gedoen het en daardie inligting van hulle is met ons 15 gedeel. So daar was 'n wedersydse samewerking gewees 16 tussen ons en beslis mnr Sinclair wat dan die Lonmin 17 sekuriteit verteenwoordig het.</p> <p>18 MR GOTZ: Of course the reply is not just 19 to Mr Sinclair, and your comments relating to the level of 20 cooperation, or "samewerking," if that's not a perfect 21 translation, extend to Lonmin as a whole, other people 22 within the Lonmin company, correct?</p> <p>23 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, ek sal nie saam 24 met u stem nie. My getuenis het gegaan oor wat ek hier 25 gesê het. Ek het gesê mnr Sinclair het ek op meer as een</p>

Page 20713	Page 20715
<p>1 geleenthed getuig dat hy – hy, nie hulle nie – het 100%</p> <p>2 samewerking gegee van die begin af, en dan die ander naam</p> <p>3 wat genoem was wat ook baie betrokke was, was mnr Dirk</p> <p>4 Botes. So dit is die twee persone wat ek persoonlik mee</p> <p>5 saamgewerk het en wat ek geglo het is in beheer van die</p> <p>6 sekuriteitpersoneel.</p> <p>7 MR GOTZ: Perhaps we're</p> <p>8 misunderstanding –</p> <p>9 BRIGADIER CALITZ: O ja, daar was nog 'n</p> <p>10 derde persoon, ek dink mnr Henry Blaauw, as ek onder</p> <p>11 korreksie – dit is die drie persone wat met ons geskakel</p> <p>12 het, of met my.</p> <p>13 CHAIRPERSON: Before Mr Gotz goes further</p> <p>14 on that, he says you dealt directly with these three people</p> <p>15 you mentioned, but apart from that, over and above that you</p> <p>16 got cooperation from Lonmin. They made facilities</p> <p>17 available to you, not just those three people, but Lonmin</p> <p>18 as such made facilities available to you, shared</p> <p>19 information, did various things which indicated that they</p> <p>20 were cooperating with you in the work that you were trying</p> <p>21 to do there, and that's the point he's concerned with.</p> <p>22 It's not only limited to the three; he's asking in the</p> <p>23 broader sense, as I understand the question, the nature of</p> <p>24 the cooperation you got from Lonmin as a whole, if one can</p> <p>25 put it like that. Is that right, Mr Gotz?</p>	<p>1 100% samewerking. Ons het nooit gesukkel met inligting</p> <p>2 nie. Hulle het al hulle inligting met ons gedeel, waar die</p> <p>3 "key" punte is, ensovoorts. So operasioneel ja.</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: Did you share your plans with</p> <p>5 Lonmin personnel?</p> <p>6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink ons het al</p> <p>7 hieroor getuig, mnr die Voorsitter. Die Lonmin personeel,</p> <p>8 veral Dirk Botes was teenwoordig met baie van die fases.</p> <p>9 Waar dit gegaan het oor detail taktiese operasies was hulle</p> <p>10 nie teenwoordig nie.</p> <p>11 MR GOTZ: It's quite hard to escape the</p> <p>12 conclusion that this was effectively a joint operation</p> <p>13 between you and – you as SAPS – and Lonmin, Brigadier.</p> <p>14 Would you like to respond to that?</p> <p>15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, in soverre sal ek</p> <p>16 nie sê "joint operation" nie. Dis 'n "joint operational</p> <p>17 centre" waar die inligting gedeel is. Dit sal my antwoord</p> <p>18 wees.</p> <p>19 MR GOTZ: Will you at least accept that</p> <p>20 Lonmin was integrally involved in SAPS' operation?</p> <p>21 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, ek weet nie</p> <p>22 heeltemal wat die woord behels. My getuenis is dat waar</p> <p>23 ons hulle operasioneel nodig gehad het en waar die versoeke</p> <p>24 gerig was, soos u gesê het, die helikopter, die inligting</p> <p>25 oor waar die "key" punte is, daardie inligting is met ons</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20714</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: Yes, indeed. So to refer to</p> <p>2 one or two other examples, the people who were operating</p> <p>3 the CCTV cameras, the Coin Security helicopter. Now of</p> <p>4 course that wasn't necessarily being flown by a Lonmin</p> <p>5 person, but the fact is that that was something that was</p> <p>6 made available to you whenever you needed it, correct?</p> <p>7 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, ek wil weereens</p> <p>8 net vir u sê ek het die heetylde – ek stem saam met mnr die</p> <p>9 Voorsitter, "obviously" werk mnr Sinclair vir Lonmin, so</p> <p>10 dit sal seker dan met die goedkeuring van sy seniors ook</p> <p>11 wees. Ek verskil glad nie daar nie, maar die CCTV kamera</p> <p>12 "feedback" het gegaan na mnr Botes of na mnr Sinclair toe</p> <p>13 en hulle het dan met ons gekommunikeer. Die helikopter se</p> <p>14 versoeke, dit het deur mnr Sinclair gegaan. So dit was die</p> <p>15 skakelpersone, hy of mnr Botes. Ek het self nooit met</p> <p>16 enige van die ander, kan ek sê Lonmin personeel iets mee</p> <p>17 gereel waarvan ek bewus is nie.</p> <p>18 MR GOTZ: Can I simply put this to you,</p> <p>19 Brigadier; there seems to us on this evidence that we've</p> <p>20 dealt with to have been quite a high level of mutual</p> <p>21 cooperation between SAPS and Lonmin personnel during the</p> <p>22 period 14 August to 16 August 2012. Would you agree with</p> <p>23 that?</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek kan getuig op die</p> <p>25 operasionele gebied en operasioneel het ek gesê daar was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20716</p> <p>1 gedeel en daar was goeie samewerking gewees. Dit is</p> <p>2 korrek.</p> <p>3 MR GOTZ: And then, Brigadier, I will</p> <p>4 simply put the evidence which I would like you to read</p> <p>5 during the weekend – sorry, you'd made a note of this</p> <p>6 already, I just want to contextualise it – which is the</p> <p>7 meeting of the 14th between Lonmin and the Provincial</p> <p>8 Commissioner, and we'll deal with that as well, and that</p> <p>9 forms part of –</p> <p>10 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sal dit deurgaan,</p> <p>11 baie dankie, Advokaat.</p> <p>12 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, can we move on to a</p> <p>13 separate subject, and that is the alleged threats that were</p> <p>14 made by the strikers on the police. Can we start with</p> <p>15 this; would you agree with me that a threat is really a</p> <p>16 statement of intention to inflict some harm on somebody</p> <p>17 else if that somebody else doesn't comply with a request?</p> <p>18 So to put it in plain English, it's a statement by person X</p> <p>19 that person Y will be harmed in some way if he or she does</p> <p>20 not do what X wants him to do.</p> <p>21 CHAIRPERSON: Do you need the last part?</p> <p>22 If I say to you I'm going to kill you, isn't that a threat?</p> <p>23 If I say to you I'm going to kill you, and I don't say what</p> <p>24 you must do to make sure I don't kill you, I just say I'm</p> <p>25 going to kill you, isn't that a threat, a matter of</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20717</p> <p>1 language?</p> <p>2 MR GOTZ: Well, I'd like to have –</p> <p>3 CHAIRPERSON: No, it's a matter of</p> <p>4 language now. You know you're asking the witness what a</p> <p>5 word means and I'm putting to you the word doesn't mean</p> <p>6 everything you say it means because the statement "I'm</p> <p>7 going to kill you" is in itself a threat. That's correct,</p> <p>8 isn't it? I know you're not under oath; you don't have to</p> <p>9 answer the question.</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Chair, this is the difficulty</p> <p>11 that I have, because I would suggest not, but I'd like to</p> <p>12 hear the Brigadier's answer to that question –</p> <p>13 CHAIRPERSON: No, no, no, you're asking</p> <p>14 him the meaning of a word and I don't think the word means</p> <p>15 that and I think the dictionaries support me and don't</p> <p>16 support you. So I suggest you move on to your next point.</p> <p>17 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, let's take a</p> <p>18 practical example; if somebody says "I don't want you</p> <p>19 here," is that a threat?</p> <p>20 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek.</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: If somebody says, "Go away, we</p> <p>22 don't want you here," on your understanding of the word</p> <p>23 "threat," is that a threat?</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sal dit so sien,</p> <p>25 ja, veral as dit in die lyn van die persoon is en jy sê dit</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20719</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON: I don't consider myself</p> <p>2 just, I didn't want to allow myself to be prejudiced by</p> <p>3 anything that's not before the commission.</p> <p>4 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter,</p> <p>5 ja, ek wil net verwys dan waar 'n media persoon gesê het</p> <p>6 dat 'n swart dame het, met die media wat ingery het en</p> <p>7 hulle het 'n blanke media persoon opgelaai wat 'n vervoer</p> <p>8 probleem gehad het en hulle sê toe hulle nader gekom het,</p> <p>9 en dit is haar eie woorde het die groep ook vir hulle gesê</p> <p>10 gaan weg, ons soek jou nie daar nie maar sy het getuig dat</p> <p>11 sy gehoor het iemand sê daar's 'n blanke man hulle gaan hom</p> <p>12 dood maak en die media het getuig dat hulle moes wegjaag</p> <p>13 daar. Dit is op video. Ons kan dit kry en ons kan dit</p> <p>14 speel. So dit is wat ek vir u sê gaan weg ons soek jou nie</p> <p>15 daar nie het konsekwensies, as hulle nie sou weggegaan het</p> <p>16 daardie volgende stadium die media dame nie het sy erken op</p> <p>17 die video dat sy so bedrieg gevoel dat hulle moes wegjaag.</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: Mr Calitz, Brigadier Calitz</p> <p>19 sorry forgive me, Brigadier Calitz, I don't think we should</p> <p>20 get to involved in the semantic debates. The truth is if I</p> <p>21 say I don't want you here, that's not a threat. But it</p> <p>22 could be an implied threat if in the circumstances I was</p> <p>23 conveying to you what I'd do to you if you didn't go. So</p> <p>24 you can have direct threats, express threats and implied</p> <p>25 threats and depending on the circumstances the statement I</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20718</p> <p>1 vir die polisie, as die polisie se teenwoordigheid daar is</p> <p>2 en 'n persoon kom na 'n polisieman toe en sê "U as 'n</p> <p>3 polisie, ek soek jou nie hier nie, gaan weg," dit is logies</p> <p>4 dis 'n dreigement.</p> <p>5 MR GOTZ: Surely it's simply a statement</p> <p>6 of fact. The person is expressing their views. Why is it</p> <p>7 a threat on the police, Brigadier?</p> <p>8 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, ek</p> <p>9 kan net sê wat my opinie daarop is. Ons kan na die</p> <p>10 woordeboek toe gaan. Daar is baie dreigemente – daar is</p> <p>11 baie voorbeelde. As ek, dit kom vinnig tot my gedagte –</p> <p>12 kom ons vat nie 'n Marikana – of ja wel, 'n Marikana</p> <p>13 voorbeeld maar nie direk op ons nie. U sal onthou dat in</p> <p>14 "hindsight" het ek gesien daar was die – u sal onthou laas</p> <p>15 jaar met die, ek wil nou nie sê herdenking nie, die jaar</p> <p>16 van die 16de –</p> <p>17 CHAIRPERSON: There was a commemoration</p> <p>18 of the anniversary of the events of the 16th of August.</p> <p>19 BRIGADIER CALITZ: - was daar 'n program</p> <p>20 op eTV wat herhaadelik vir ek dink 'n week of twee gespeel</p> <p>21 is met die titel, "The Marikana Massacre." Ek dink almal</p> <p>22 van ons in hierdie saal het dit gesien, waarop hulle -</p> <p>23 [11:30] CHAIRPERSON: I didn't see it but -</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dis goed so, mnr die</p> <p>25 Voorsitter.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20720</p> <p>1 don't want you here would, could be an implied threat but</p> <p>2 in other circumstances it wouldn't be a threat, that must</p> <p>3 be right. So I don't think we should waste further time on</p> <p>4 that. What Mr Gotz, is leading up is when words of that</p> <p>5 kind were said to the police in those particular</p> <p>6 circumstances he would contend they didn't amount to</p> <p>7 threats. Now can you recall those words being used to the</p> <p>8 police by some of the strikers, we don't want you here.</p> <p>9 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter,</p> <p>10 beslis. Ek het getuig in my verklaring daaroor in JJJ107</p> <p>11 waar hulle verskeie kere gesê het hulle soek ons nie. Op</p> <p>12 die 15de en die 16de tydens die onderhandelingsproses, ek</p> <p>13 kan u my paragrawe aanhaal as u dit wil hê waar hulle dan –</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: We've read your statement,</p> <p>15 you don't have to read it again.</p> <p>16 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter,</p> <p>17 waar hulle daar dan ook gesê het we don't want you here,</p> <p>18 ons wil nie met julle praat nie, ons wil met die myn</p> <p>19 personeel en jy weet as 'n persoon vir u sê ons soek jou</p> <p>20 nie daar nie en hy is gewapen met 'n spies of 'n panga dan</p> <p>21 is dit 'n dreigement. Dit is nie laat jy dit ligtelik</p> <p>22 opneem van 'n vreedsame groepie wat nou sit en rugby kyk en</p> <p>23 jy kom sit langs hulle, hulle sê gaan sit op 'n ander plek,</p> <p>24 wel dit sal ook op die einde van die dag op 'n konfrontasie</p> <p>25 uitloop.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20721</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, in fact you 2 identified I think in your evidence-in-chief, you were 3 counting and at the end of the count you had counted what 4 you called 6 threats and I do want to put it to you that at 5 least half of those were not threats at all, even on the 6 most expansive understanding of the word. Let's look at 7 what you say about the so-called first threat which you say 8 occurred on the 15th of August. It appears at, on day 153 9 at page 17187 and the line is from line 19. Mr Semenya, my 10 learned friend says to you Mr Noki again comes to the 11 Nyala, this is approximately 2 o'clock and he makes it 12 plain that the police are not wanted there anymore. 13 Brigadier Calitz, "dit is korrek, mnr die Voorsitter. Hy 14 wou glad nie met ons praat nie en ek het dit ook verstaan 15 as die eerste dreigement direk aan ons wat hy gesê het dat 16 hy soek nie die, nie meer die polisie se teenwoordigheid 17 daar nie." So all that Mr Noki says on this version is we 18 don't want to talk to you, he probably said in the same 19 context we want to talk to management, we don't want you 20 here anymore. Why do you interpret that as a threat on the 21 police, Brigadier?</p> <p>22 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek het daarna verwys 23 in paragraaf 63 van my verklaring wat ek dan vir u gelees 24 het. The group approached the Nyalas in a horseshoe 25 formation, Mr Noki informed us that they did not want to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20723</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: Oh 118. I beg your pardon, I'm 2 slightly dyslexic, Chair. 3 CHAIRPERSON: I'm really not sure if you 4 are or not, if you are I'll express my sympathy. If you're 5 not, let's just carry on. 6 MR GOTZ: I beg your pardon, Chair. 7 CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure whether you 8 really are dyslexic but if you are I express my sympathy to 9 you. But shall we just carry on. 10 MR GOTZ: Sorry, Chair, I do have a 11 tendency to do this, although I haven't been diagnosed as 12 being dyslexic. Just to clarify but thank you, Chair. It 13 says, "the representatives stated that they wanted the 14 telephone number of the commander of the operation and if 15 present he or she should come forward as they wanted to 16 provide him her with a telephone number of the Advocate 17 Shapiro. Then it goes on to say the representatives were 18 informed that the request will be forwarded to the JOC. At 19 this point one of the representatives became very 20 aggressive and stated that the police should not be there 21 and that the people in the hippos, referring to the 22 armoured vehicles would die there and not one Nyala would 23 leave that ground. Now, Brigadier, that I don't think we 24 would quarrel would constitute a threat." But the problem 25 is that there's no evidence that this was ever said on the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20722</p> <p>1 speak to the police and they did not want the police there, 2 Colonel Macintosh repeatedly told them through the public 3 address system of our Nyala that the police presence are 4 there for peaceful purpose and a desire to dissolve this 5 peacefully. Dit is wat ek vir u na verwys het as die 6 eerste dreigement deur daardie gewapende groep wat gesê het 7 hulle wil nie met ons praat nie en hulle soek nie die 8 polisie daar nie. So dit is wat ek as die eerste 9 dreigement beskou.</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Is this your clear recollection 11 of the, of what transpired that Mr Noki came to the vehicle 12 and said we don't want to talk to you any more please go 13 away?</p> <p>14 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek, ja.</p> <p>15 MR GOTZ: Can we by way of contrast look 16 at exhibit L on slide 188.</p> <p>17 CHAIRPERSON: 188 on my copy of the L is 18 a photograph of events which took place around about 15:35, 19 I think you're got the wrong reference.</p> <p>20 MR GOTZ: Let me just find it. Chair, 21 I'll read the reference. It's in relation to Wednesday the 22 15th of August 2012 where it says the representatives stated 23 that they wanted the telephone number of the commander of 24 the operation.</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: That's 118,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20724</p> <p>1 15th.</p> <p>2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Daar was getuienis 3 daaroor en daar's verklarings daaroor en ek glo daar sal na 4 my ook verklarings in wees.</p> <p>5 CHAIRPERSON: Brigadier Calitz, you 6 described a few moments ago what you said was the first 7 threat. Die eerste dreigement. Now this is obviously the 8 first threat you're aware of. But were you in the Nyala at 9 the relevant time when this event that's described in slide 10 118 took place which appears if one has regard to slide 117 11 to have been at 10:15 in the morning on the 15th, were you 12 in the Nyala at that time?</p> <p>13 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek, mnr die 14 Voorsitter. Dit was nie die eerste dreigement nie, ek dit 15 was die tweede of die derde.</p> <p>16 CHAIRPERSON: Oh I see. Now what you, 17 sorry, I'm sorry. What you described early as the eerste 18 dreigement, the first threat when did that happen?</p> <p>19 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is met ons eerste 20 kontak.</p> <p>21 CHAIRPERSON: Was that on, was it on the 22 14th I don't know -</p> <p>23 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Die 14de.</p> <p>24 CHAIRPERSON: Was it on the 15th?</p> <p>25 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink dit was die -</p>

	Page 20725		Page 20727
1 CHAIRPERSON:	The Wednesday.	1 which you say enables you to find an argument in this	
2 BRIGADIER CALITZ:	Mnr die Voorsitter,	2 regard, or it may just be genuine confusion that's got to	
3 ja.		3 be cleared up. If you look at paragraph 47 of his	
4 CHAIRPERSON:	The 14th -	4 consolidated statement. That appears to be a reference of	
5 BRIGADIER CALITZ:	Ek dink die 15de, ja,	5 something on page 10 of his consolidated statement appears	
6 ek praat onder korreksie.		6 to be reference to something that happened on the Tuesday.	
7 CHAIRPERSON:	The 15th was the Wednesday,	7 But there is some confusion but we'll obviously get	
8 the 14th was the Tuesday. According to exhibit L the event		8 clarified during this part of your cross-examination.	
9 to which Mr Gotz is now referring you in slide 118 took		9 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, I was hoping that	
10 place around about 10:15 on the morning on Wednesday the		10 you would be able to provide some clarification.	
11 15th. Now the incident to which you referred to earlier		11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sal vir u tye kry.	
12 which you call the first threat what time did that happen		12 Ek wil net deur my verklaring, die paragrawe maar ek het	
13 and on what day?		13 dit aangeteken wanneer die Advokaat Shapiro incident	
14 BRIGADIER CALITZ:	Die eerste incident	14 plaasgevind het. Ek sal dit vir u definitief kry.	
15 waarna ons verwys het, dit was op die 15de rondom 2 uur die		15 MR GOTZ: Can I offer some assistance in	
16 middag. Dit is wat ek in my evidence-in-chief getuig het.		16 that regard and that's the occurrence book which is, some	
17 CHAIRPERSON:	The problem with that is	17 people know it off by heart, it's FFF25.	
18 you see is that this one, this alleged incident referred to		18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Page, which page?	
19 in the slide took place so exhibit L says in the morning of		19 MR GOTZ: There's several. It's page 16	
20 the Wednesday at about 10:15. So that would have preceded		20 and 17. If you can look first of all at items 178 and 179.	
21 the event which you describe as the first threat which you		21 CHAIRPERSON: What are you referring to	
22 say happened at about 2 o'clock in the afternoon on the		22 in the occurrence book?	
23 Wednesday.		23 MR GOTZ: It's –	
24 BRIGADIER CALITZ:	Nee, mnr die	24 CHAIRPERSON: FFF25 but which entry on	
25 Voorsitter, hierdie een van -		25 which day?	
	Page 20726		Page 20728
1 CHAIRPERSON:	So that's not -	1 MR GOTZ: 178 and 179 and these are	
2 BRIGADIER CALITZ:	Die een van Shapiro	2 entries for the 15th of August.	
3 het ek in my verklaring, ek probeer dit net vinnig kry, dan		3 CHAIRPERSON: I see.	
4 sal ek vir u sê die hoeveelste een was dit gewees. Die		4 MR GOTZ: 178 is recorded as having	
5 volgende dreigement –		5 happened at 10:20 and 179 at 10:25. You'll see that item	
6 CHAIRPERSON:	All I'm saying to you is	6 178, Brigadier, have you got it?	
7 what you told us about a few minutes ago is the first		7 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja.	
8 threat couldn't have been at 2 o'clock in the afternoon if		8 MR GOTZ: You'll see that 178 refers to	
9 this incident referred to in slide 118 took place at 10:15		9 the interchange in relation to the lawyer, Aubrey Shapiro.	
10 the same morning.		10 I suspect it gets it the wrong way round but be that as it	
11 MR SEMENYA SC:	Chair –	11 may 179 refers to negotiations, Chopper 2 reports that	
12 MR GOTZ:	Brigadier, it's correct that	12 these people were negotiating with Papa1 moving back to the	
13 you don't [inaudible] the Chairperson's question.		13 group and they want mine management to come and talk to	
14 CHAIRPERSON:	Before he answers my	14 them as they cannot say or discuss anything to the police	
15 question. Mr Semenya wants to make a comment.		15 and they can't lay down their weapons and they want mine	
16 MR SEMENYA SC:	Chair, in leading the	16 manager. What the occurrence book does not record is	
17 witness I did not understand him to be given us a sequence		17 anything remotely resembling a threat on the police at that	
18 of threats but the number of threats and say this is the		18 -	
19 first threat and the second threat. Not that they came in		19 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Okay.	
20 a particular chronology.		20 MR GOTZ: In the morning.	
21 CHAIRPERSON:	Yes, because there's	21 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, nee ek het dit	
22 another problem and that is you look at the consolidated		22 gekry in my verklaring. Ek het so vinnig daar deur ge-	
23 statement of the witness there is a possibility that this		23 scan. Waarna ek die eerste dreigement verwys het was	
24 is something that happened on the Tuesday, the 14th. So		24 paragraaf 63 maar die een van Advokaat Shapiro is in	
25 there's a bit of confusion here. It may be it's confusion		25 paragraaf 58 van my verklaring. Ek sal dit net vir u lees.	

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20729</p> <p>1 "Mr Noki came forward and said that they were not going to 2 speak to the SAPS anymore and they wanted to speak to the 3 mine management through their attorney Shapiro. He walked 4 back to the group, a short while later the group 5 approximately 300 men changed their mood, showed greater 6 aggression by clapping their weapons together, start 7 singing and moving up and down as a tight unit". Hier het 8 ek verwys dit is nie 'n dreigement nie maar hier het ek 9 gesê dit is 'n mood change wat ek gesien het.</p> <p>10 CHAIRPERSON: What day were you talking 11 about?</p> <p>12 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit was die 15de 13 gewees.</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: What time?</p> <p>15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek het hom as 11:30, 16 ek sien in die VB was 10:20. So paragraaf 58 van my 17 verklaring, mnr die Voorsitter.</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.</p> <p>19 COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: According to your 20 statement that's not the first interaction in the 21 negotiations with the strikers?</p> <p>22 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, nee, dit het 23 later gekom, dit was na die attempts gewees waar ons die 24 mense probeer convince het om hulle wapens neer te sit. 25 Daar was 'n vorige, die eerste aankoms was op die 14de</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20731</p> <p>1 daardie woorde op 'n latere geleentheid op die 16de. 2 CHAIRPERSON: I understand that but the, 3 what is said here in slide 118 of exhibit L where it's 4 stated that that threat was uttered the same time that 5 Advocate Shapiro's name was mentioned during the discussion 6 about Advocate Shapiro. That statement in exhibit L you 7 can't confirm as being correct?</p> <p>8 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, mnr die 9 Voorsitter, dit lyk as of dit maar net 'n opsomming was 10 deur die persoon wat dan die presentation gedoen het, nee. 11 Dit is nie die, in die een insident gesê nie.</p> <p>12 CHAIRPERSON: So one can't rely then on 13 slide 118 as being an accurate statement of what happened 14 in the discussions at about 10:15 on the Wednesday the 15th 15 between the police negotiating team on the one hand and the 16 group of five strikers on the other, is that correct?</p> <p>17 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is hoekom ek sê ek 18 dink die presentation is miskien 'n samevatting van die 19 inligting wat later plaasgevind het.</p> <p>20 CHAIRPERSON: But you haven't answered my 21 question. The question was would it be fair to say that we 22 can't rely on the accuracy of what is contained in slide 23 118 as being what was said during the discussions between 24 the police negotiating team on the one hand and the five 25 strikers on the other.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20730</p> <p>1 gewees. So hierdie was 'n volg op gewees. U sien waar die 2 change of mood gekom het, waarom hulle gesê het hulle wil 3 nie meer met ons praat nie, dit is nadat ons hulle ingelig 4 het dat, paragraaf 56 "Mr Noki again insisted to speak to 5 mine management in response Colonel Macintosh informed him 6 that mine management was not willing to speak to them if 7 they disarmed and returned to work for a two year wage 8 agreement which the unions had and the strike was 9 unprotected. This appeared to make Mr Noki agitated and 10 aggressive". So weens daardie terugvoer in paragraaf 56 11 het mnr Noki dan vorentoe gekom in paragraaf 58 in my 12 verklaring en gesê dat hulle wil nie meer direk met ons 13 praat nie, hulle wil nou deur hulle Advokaat praat en dit 14 was nie 'n dreigement gewees nie. Dit was net die mood 15 change wat toe dadelik opgemerk is van die groep. As dit 16 miskien vir u duidelikheid gee.</p> <p>17 MR GOTZ: You can't confirm the statement 18 in exhibit L that during the discussion in relation to 19 mister, Advocate Shapiro one of the representatives became 20 very aggressive and then said to people in the hippos, 21 referring to the armoured vehicles, that they would die 22 there and not one Nyala would leave that ground. You can't 23 confirm that?</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nie op daardie stadium 25 van mnr Shapiro, daardie dreigement is wel gemaak met</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20732</p> <p>1 [11:50] At 10:15am or thereabout on Wednesday, the 15th of 2 August 2012. We can rely in particular on the last 3 sentence of the first bullet on slide 180. That didn't 4 happen at 10:15 during that exchange –</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek –</p> <p>6 CHAIRPERSON: - between the police 7 negotiating team and the strikers, the leaders, at 10:15 on 8 the Wednesday, the 15th, that –</p> <p>9 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Die laaste –</p> <p>10 CHAIRPERSON: Do you agree with me what I 11 put to you?</p> <p>12 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Die laaste sin in 13 paragraaf 1, u is korrek, mnr die Voorsitter.</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: Okay, thank you.</p> <p>15 MR GOTZ: Can we while we're on the 16 Operation's occurrence book, I beg your pardon, also look 17 at the entries in relation to 14:00 and you'll find that at 18 page 17, entries 195 and 196. It says, "Papa1 reporting 19 that they were informed that the groups are going to form a 20 C-shape and come closer to the police vehicles." I think 21 what that's supposed to record is that the group approached 22 you in a horseshoe formation.</p> <p>23 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, daardie groep, ja, 24 dit is 'n horseshoe, 'n C-shape, dit is omtrent, ja, 25 dieselfde.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20733</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: And then at 14:05, entry 196 2 you'll see "Chopper 1 reporting that the guy with the green 3 blanket, the negotiator of the group went to the back of 4 the group and he is busy talking to them," and you can – 5 CHAIRPERSON: There is obviously a word 6 missing there, I suspect the word "members" is missing in 7 front of the words, "of the group," in other words it 8 should probably read, "Chopper 1 reporting that the guy 9 with the green blanket, the negotiator, and members of the 10 group went to the back of the group and he is busy talking 11 to them."</p> <p>12 MR GOTZ: I think – 13 CHAIRPERSON: That's probably right, 14 isn't it, - 15 MR GOTZ: Probably – 16 CHAIRPERSON: - Brigadier? 17 MR GOTZ: But do you see, Brigadier, that 18 – 19 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sien hom so, mnr 20 die Voorsitter. 21 MR GOTZ: There is no – 22 CHAIRPERSON: I don't think what you said 23 got recorded if Mr Gotz spoke over to you. What do you say 24 to the question I asked you? 25 BRIGADIER CALITZ: U het gesê daar is 'n</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20735</p> <p>1 recorded? 2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek kan glad nie vir u 3 sê waarom dit nie in die voorvalle boek is nie. Daar 4 was 'n konstante kommunikasie tussen ons en die JOC gewees, 5 so ek kan nie vir u daar antwoord, waarom dit nie in die VB 6 is nie, nee. 7 MR GOTZ: You see I want to put it to you 8 that it wasn't a threat, all it was, was at most a 9 statement by Mr Noki that he didn't want to talk to you 10 anymore, he wanted to talk to mine management and he didn't 11 want the police there, and that is not a threat, Brigadier. 12 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink ek het u reeds 13 daarop geantwoord, ja. 14 MR GOTZ: And I must put it to you that 15 we will argue that in fact there was no threat that was 16 made on the 15th by the strikers. 17 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek hoor wat u sê en ek 18 verskil van u. 19 MR GOTZ: Can we move then to what you 20 refer to as the second threat and perhaps I can take you to 21 paragraph 81 of your statement where you say a number of 22 things but in the second sentence, can we start there? You 23 say, "Mr Noki and one of the five men approached our Nyala 24 and told us that they did not want us there and went back 25 to the koppie singing and displaying aggression." Now,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20734</p> <p>1 woord – 2 CHAIRPERSON: There is obviously a word 3 missing from entry 196 and I suggest it is probably the 4 word "members" in front of the words "of the group" in the 5 second line, do you agree with that? 6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 7 ja, dit is seker dan die members of die groep, busy talking 8 to them, daar kan dalk 'n terugvoer wees. Ek is nie seker 9 wat die Chopper 1, ek kan nie recall presies wat hier gesê 10 is deur die Chopper nie. 11 MR GOTZ: There is no mention in the 12 occurrence book of any threat on the police, Brigadier, do 13 you see that? 14 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek, dit wat u nou vir 15 my gewys het daarop sien ek nie, nee, dat daar is 'n 16 dreigement aangeteken in die VB nie, nee. 17 MR GOTZ: Do you not think that if the 18 police had felt that they were threatened, that that would 19 have been recorded in the occurrence book at that time? I 20 can understand, Brigadier, let me just finish, I can 21 understand the events of the 16th, particularly late in the 22 afternoon when many things were happening, things may not 23 have been accurately recorded but on the 15th when this is 24 the only event that is occurring, do you not think that if 25 a threat had been made on the police it would have been</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20736</p> <p>1 Brigadier, five minutes ago you said that the fact that 2 they went back to the koppie singing and displaying 3 aggression does not constitute a threat in relation to the 4 events on the 15th. What makes that a threat if Mr Noki 5 comes to you and says, they do not want you here? 6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: If you see the word 7 "singing and displaying aggression" – 8 MR GOTZ: No, Brigadier, you said five 9 minutes ago in relation, and the record will reflect this, 10 in relation to events on the 15th that the mere fact that 11 they were singing and displaying aggression did not 12 constitute a threat on the police. 13 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Sover dit my geheue 14 betref het ek gesê dit is waar ons 'n "mood change" gesien 15 het in die groep. 16 MR GOTZ: Indeed in relation to that 17 event. 18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, die "mood change" 19 en hier het hulle definitief 'n aggressie getoon deur die 20 kap van die wapens en die manier waarop hulle opgetree het, 21 so dit is die verskil van die twee. 22 MR GOTZ: Again we'll argue that the mere 23 fact that Mr Noki comes to you and says, we do not want you 24 here, does not constitute a threat. Perhaps we can get 25 some, if you wish to respond to that feel free to do so? I</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20737</p> <p>1 think you have given us your views but if there is anything 2 else –</p> <p>3 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, nee, -</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: - you want to add?</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek wou net terwyl u op 6 paragraaf 81 is, na Nyala6 toe gegaan het en dan ook vir 7 hulle gesê het, "remove the barbed wire, he is not going to 8 ask again," so daardie woorde dui definitief daarop dat 9 daar sal iets gebeur indien dit nie gehoor gegee word nie, 10 so dit is in dieselfde paragraaf 81 waarna ek verwys het.</p> <p>11 MR GOTZ: We get the sense from your 12 witness statement that this statement was made, first of 13 all in response to or shortly after the arrival of the 14 barbed wire at the scene and we understand that from 15 paragraph 79 of your statement where you described the 16 arrival of the barbed wire.</p> <p>17 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, ek sê in paragraaf 18 80, het ons dan aangekom rondom tienuur waar daardie groep 19 dan, omtrent 600 mense "arriving at the koppie heavily 20 armed," was die inligting gewees wat ons van die observasie 21 pos gekry het, so dit was met ons aankoms gewees relatief 22 dieoggend van die 16de.</p> <p>23 MR GOTZ: My proposition to you was that 24 this threat, alleged threat let's call it, occurred shortly 25 after the arrival of the barbed wire.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20739</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: Are you sure that you've got 2 the timing of this correct, Brigadier?</p> <p>3 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Die tyd wat ek gegee 4 het, die enigste tyd wat ek hierna verwys het, "shortly 5 before 10 and upon our arrival at the koppie," die "shortly 6 before 10," daar was 'n report gewees van die observasie 7 pos, op die toering, dat daardie persone dan gewapen was en 8 daarna het ek nie weer 'n tyd gegee van ons arrivering op 9 die koppie nie, so die tyd waarna hier verwys was, was van 10 die persone wat aankom, ek weet nie of daar 'n VB is 11 daaroor nie, ek kan kyk.</p> <p>12 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, I want to try and 13 cut this short, the –</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: Is there something in the 15 occurrence book, it might be helpful if he finds it because 16 it would enable you to proceed with your cross-examination.</p> <p>17 Have you found the entry in the occurrence book?</p> <p>18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 19 ja, ek het so vinnig geblaai, ek sien 'n inskrywing op 20 bladsy 22.</p> <p>21 CHAIRPERSON: At what time?</p> <p>22 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Inskrywing 978 op 23 9:45, OP1, dit is, "Observation post 1 reported that 600 24 people arriving at the koppie, heavily armed, a lot of the 25 people still coming from the eastern side," so die VB –</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20738</p> <p>1 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek het vir u gesê dit 2 is na die aankoms van die oggend wat ons daar aangekom het, 3 dit is korrek.</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: You also put a time to this as 5 10am, do you see that in paragraph 80?</p> <p>6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, daardie een verwys 7 na die plus minus 600 gewapende persone wat op pad was, van 8 die oostekant af, van die koppie. Dit sal nou van Nkaneng 9 se kant af wees.</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, a small point, that 11 the barbed wire only arrived on the scene some 40 minutes 12 later and in fact was only fully rolled out 50 minutes 13 after 10am.</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: But it wasn't, - it was 15 only rolled out in the afternoon.</p> <p>16 MR GOTZ: I beg your pardon, I beg your 17 pardon.</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: Pre-positioned, I think 19 what you mean?</p> <p>20 MR GOTZ: Yes, in other words, let me be 21 clear, the barbed wire Nyalas arrived on the scene some 40 22 minutes after 10am and the barbed wire vehicles were only 23 prepositioned, I have it at 10:44.</p> <p>24 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Okay, ek verstaan nie 25 u vraag, wat is u vraag aan my?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20740</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON: Ja, but the Nyalas hadn't 2 gone there yet with the wire trailers, had they?</p> <p>3 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, so dit is, - nee, 4 dit is die tyd waarna ons verwys –</p> <p>5 CHAIRPERSON: If you read on there are 6 some entries later on at the next page you might look at. 7 Look at the next page of the OB, the occurrence book. You 8 see you say in your statement in paragraph 81, you talk 9 about this explanation about the, you talk about the story 10 that Mr Noki wanted you people to remove the barbed wire, 11 that means the barbed wire trailers, and you say the threat 12 was relayed to the JOC by you. Now if you look at the 13 occurrence book, which we were looking at a minute ago, you 14 will see that there is an entry which was made in the JOC 15 about that incident but the time is different from the time 16 you've given us. Could we see a bit more of the occurrence 17 book, please?</p> <p>18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Daardie inligting is 19 gemaak om 11:20.</p> <p>20 CHAIRPERSON: Well, that's the point, 21 isn't it? So what, so it does look as if, I mean unless 22 they put the, and they may be an entry in the occurrence 23 book at the wrong time, but that's a but unlikely because 24 as Mr Gotz says, there wasn't a big flow of report coming 25 in that had to be converted into entries in the occurrence</p>

Page 20741	Page 20743
1 book. So the probabilities are that 11:20 is more or less 2 a correct time and if that's correct, entry 998, then that 3 indicates that the time you gave us previously is totally 4 wrong, at 10:30, it can't be right.	1 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Paragraph? 2 MR GOTZ: 79, in respect of the timing. 3 You refer expressly there to the arrival of the barbed wire 4 and that paragraph can't be correct.
5 MR GOTZ: Ten o'clock. 6 CHAIRPERSON: Not so?	5 COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Paragraph 80, Mr 6 Gotz? 7 MR GOTZ: No, - 8 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Yes, 79.
7 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 8 nee, ek – 9 CHAIRPERSON: There is confusion – 10 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek het nie 'n tyd 11 gegee nie – 12 CHAIRPERSON: Either the occurrence book 13 is wrong, I mean that entry, do you agree with me, that 14 entry, 998, refers to the incident you described in 15 paragraph 81 of your consolidated statement.	9 MR GOTZ: No, I refer to paragraph 79, 10 the first sentence, Commissioner. 11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, dit is 100%, 79 12 verwys van die tyd wat ons daar aangekom het of wat 13 geobserveer was en dan paragraaf 80 verwys na die 14 inskrywing wat in die VB gemaak is deur die observasie pos. 15 Dit het niks te doen met die arrivering van die Nyalas nie 16 en dan 81 is rondom 11:20, so dit is wat daar gebeur het 17 rondom daardie dreigement op Nyala 6.
16 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek. 17 CHAIRPERSON: Which you say you actually 18 reported to the JOC. 19 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek. 20 CHAIRPERSON: So that entry clearly 21 relates to that, because you agree with that? 22 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek. 23 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, and the 24 probabilities are that the entry was made more or less 25 contemporaneously in the occurrence book by Brigadier	18 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, I am going to argue 19 that the level of confusion in your recollection of these 20 events says a lot about whether or not these events 21 actually did occur, because paragraph 79 which you 22 confirmed to me occurred before ten o'clock, could not have 23 occurred before, because it refers to the barbed wire. We 24 know that the barbed wire only arrived 45 minutes later and 25 –
Page 20742	Page 20744
1 Pretorius or whoever was making the notes in the occurrence 2 book at that time, is that correct? 3 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink dit is omrent 4 dieselfde tyd, dit sou die regte tyd gewees het. 5 CHAIRPERSON: That's right. 6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek, mnr die 7 Voorsitter. 8 CHAIRPERSON: Now you told us earlier in 9 answer to Mr Gotz' question that this incident took place 10 at 10:30 and what I'm saying to you is, it seems to what we 11 now see by reference to the occurrence book that your time 12 is wrong, that there is a bit of confusion at least 13 relating to the time of this incident, will you agree with 14 that? 15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 16 nee, ek verskil, miskien moet ons dan net gaan luister, ek 17 kan nie onthou dat ek getuig het dat hierdie incident om 18 10:30 plaasgevind het nie, ek dink die tyd wat ek verwys 19 het waar, ek sê die enigste waarna ek 'n tyd verwys het was 20 "shortly before 10" en dit was die berig wat ons van die OP 21 pos af gekry het, so ek het nie gesprek oor 'n tyd wanneer 22 die Nyalas daar aangekom het nie. 23 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, will you at least 24 concede that paragraph 79 of your statement is hopelessly 25 incorrect?	1 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, u 2 sien ek het nie gesê dat paragraaf 79, die uitrol van die 3 draad het gebeur voor tienuur nie. Ek wil graag sien waar 4 sien u dit want ek het dit glad nie genoem in my verklaring 5 nie. Die verwysing na paragraaf 80 is 'n totale ander 6 verwysing, nie na die arrivering van die draad nie, nee. 7 MR GOTZ: Well, can you tell us where 8 paragraph 79 must be located in the chronology, because you 9 say in paragraph 80 "shortly before 10am and upon our 10 arrival at the koppie certain things happened." Where does 11 79 then fit in? 12 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, 79 is beslis waar 13 ons die aankoms gesê het van die Nyalas, so as dit in 14 kronologiese volgorde moet wees kan 80 dan voor 79 geplaas 15 word, maar ek het vir u gesê dit is waarop ons die boodskap 16 gekry het, dat daar persone nog op pad is, "on our arrival 17 at the koppie." Ek het nie vir u gesê oor die uitrol van 18 die draad nie, wanneer die draad daar aangekom het nie. 19 MR GOTZ: I then asked you expressly, 20 Brigadier, are you saying that this alleged threat by Mr 21 Noki occurred shortly after the arrival of the barbed wire? 22 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Die dreigement van mnr 23 Noki op ons het wel gebeur nadat die draad, toe hulle pre 24 ge-positioneer was. 25 MR GOTZ: Sorry, Chair, I beg your

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20745</p> <p>1 pardon, can you repeat that, Brigadier?</p> <p>2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Sé weer?</p> <p>3 MR GOTZ: Can you just repeat your answer</p> <p>4 to that question, Brigadier?</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek sê mnr Noki het na</p> <p>6 ons toe gekom en hy het gevra wat is die doel van die draad</p> <p>7 waarop Kolonel McIntosh dit wel vir hom verduidelik het,</p> <p>8 later, "The commander of Nyala 6 and explained to Mr Noki</p> <p>9 over the public address system the purpose of the wire was</p> <p>10 for the safety of the police and the media personnel. The</p> <p>11 explanation was loud for every striking group to hear," dit</p> <p>12 is die laaste deel van 81.</p> <p>13 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, quite apart from the</p> <p>14 questions of confusion relating to timing, there also seems</p> <p>15 to be some kind of confusion as to what happened with Nyala</p> <p>16 6 and can I ask you to look at paragraph 81 of your</p> <p>17 statement again?</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr Gotz, I've been</p> <p>19 asked, it has been suggested to me that we should take a</p> <p>20 comfort break at this stage.</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: I would –</p> <p>22 CHAIRPERSON: And may I suggest we do</p> <p>23 that and then you can, refreshed and comforted you can</p> <p>24 proceed with this part of your cross-examination? You will</p> <p>25 be refreshed and comfortable and so will the witness.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20747</p> <p>1 as "dreigement 2 en dreigement 3." Do you recall that?</p> <p>2 Should we take this as one threat or two threats, alleged</p> <p>3 threats?</p> <p>4 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, ek dink ons moet</p> <p>5 dit net opbrek. Dit is nie dieselfde geval nie, so ek</p> <p>6 moet nou teruggaan en gaan kyk waarna het ek verwys as</p> <p>7 dreigement 2 en waar het ek verkieks as dreigement 3. Ek</p> <p>8 kan dit nie so uit my kop uit onthou nou soos u dit noem</p> <p>9 nie, nee. Wat ek wel hier verwys het is paragraaf 81;</p> <p>10 nadat ons daar aangekom het en die uitrol van die draad het</p> <p>11 mnr Noki wel die dreigement gemaak dat hy soek ons nie daar</p> <p>12 nie en hulle het verdere aggressie getoon. Later het daar</p> <p>13 nog 'n dreigement gewees op die draadkar van Nyala 6 en</p> <p>14 daardie bevelvoerder het dan daardie dreigement aan ons</p> <p>15 oorgedaan dit is ook wat ons dan beskryf het waar Kolonel</p> <p>16 Vermaak die lugfoto geneem het, waar ek gekontak is deur</p> <p>17 die JOC, daardie hele getuienis rondom daar, daardie</p> <p>18 incident. So dit het nie gelyktydig gebeur soos wat dit</p> <p>19 hier wil voorkom dit hier staan nie, nee.</p> <p>20 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, again you've</p> <p>21 referred to the statement by Mr Noki that he does not want</p> <p>22 you there as a threat. I must just put this to you; I want</p> <p>23 to play you a short clip and the exhibit KKK56 can be found</p> <p>24 and played, not in its entirety. KKK56 is on the disc that</p> <p>25 will be new eTV footage, or eTV footage, new.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20746</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: Thank you, Chair.</p> <p>2 [COMMISSION ADJOURS COMMISSION RESUMES</p> <p>3 [12:24] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes.</p> <p>4 Brigadier, now that you've got your jacket on, you're still</p> <p>5 under oath.</p> <p>6 ADRIAAN MARTHINUS CALITZ: Dankie, mnr</p> <p>7 die Voorsitter.</p> <p>8 CHAIRPERSON: Mr Gotz.</p> <p>9 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR GOTZ (CONTD.):</p> <p>10 Thank you, Chair. Brigadier, we were dealing with</p> <p>11 paragraph 81 of your statement in which you describe in the</p> <p>12 first sentence – I beg your pardon, the second sentence,</p> <p>13 that "Mr Noki and one of the five men approached our Nyala</p> <p>14 and told us that they did not want us there, and went back</p> <p>15 to the koppie singing and displaying aggression. They</p> <p>16 moved towards Nyala 6 where they informed the police that</p> <p>17 they must remove the barbed wire. Mr Noki informed the</p> <p>18 police that he was not going to ask them again." And then</p> <p>19 you say, "The commander of Nyala 6," note the word</p> <p>20 "commander," "then reported this to me," and then you read</p> <p>21 through to the end of the paragraph and you say, "The</p> <p>22 threat was relayed to the JOC by me." Now what I want to</p> <p>23 put to you, Brigadier, is you describe this in your witness</p> <p>24 statement as one threat on the police. In your evidence-</p> <p>25 in-chief you say there are two threats. You describe this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20748</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off,</p> <p>2 inaudible] –</p> <p>3 MR GOTZ: No, no, no –</p> <p>4 CHAIRPERSON: KKK56?</p> <p>5 MR GOTZ: Well, yes. We made it an</p> <p>6 exhibit earlier this morning, Chair.</p> <p>7 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, ek</p> <p>8 dink dit is die een wat ons gevra het dat indien daar vrae</p> <p>9 op gevra word en hy het gesê ons gaan dit nie vandag</p> <p>10 hanteer nie, ek sal geleentheid kry om daarna te kan kyk.</p> <p>11 So ek weet nie of ons – maar ek sal daarna kyk en, maar ek</p> <p>12 dink ek moet in geheel seker maar die hele een kyk en die</p> <p>13 tye en die goeters voor ek daarop kan antwoord.</p> <p>14 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, that's quite right –</p> <p>15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit was nie aan my</p> <p>16 voorsien nie.</p> <p>17 CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry, my notes are</p> <p>18 wrong. I've got KKK55 as being the video of Mathunjwa's</p> <p>19 second address, and then I've got UU3 bis as the replaced</p> <p>20 version of UU3. I haven't got KKK56, and what is KKK56?</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: Product of my undiagnosed</p> <p>22 dyslexia, Chair. You're entirely correct.</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: It's 55?</p> <p>24 MR GOTZ: 55.</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, okay. Alright, so</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20749</p> <p>1 anyway, Mr Gotz, you heard the Brigadier saying he'd like 2 to see this first, and he was entitled to be told about it 3 beforehand, and he'd like to look at it before Monday and 4 deal with it then. Have you any objection to that?</p> <p>5 MR GOTZ: Brigadier –</p> <p>6 CHAIRPERSON: Particularly as I think if 7 it's Mathunjwa's address we do need the translation as 8 well, don't we, to follow it. I understand you're probably 9 relying more on gestures and people's bearing and so forth 10 than the actual words, but still –</p> <p>11 MR GOTZ: Yes.</p> <p>12 CHAIRPERSON: - it's probably wisest to 13 look at the video with the translation in front of us, 14 wouldn't you think?</p> <p>15 MR GOTZ: Chairperson, I wasn't in fact 16 going to refer to that at this moment, but I'm happy to 17 leave this point –</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON: Look, I don't want to make 19 your cross-examination difficult, or perhaps more difficult 20 than it is. I understand the points you're dealing with 21 are of importance and you must be given an opportunity to 22 do full justice to them, but I hope you don't regard 23 yourself as being hampered if the matter stands over till 24 Monday.</p> <p>25 MR GOTZ: And to assist the Brigadier, we</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20751</p> <p>1 says, "Mr Noki had said they don't want the police there 2 and they explained" – I think there may be a mistake there 3 – "explained why the police are there, is there any 4 information given around the barbed wire?" What you then 5 say is, "Mnr die Voorsitter, ja, ek dink dit het gekom na 6 die Nyala 6 dreigement op Nyala 6 waar die bestuurder van 7 die voertuig dan vir ons meegedeel het van die dreigement." 8 You'll recall, Brigadier, that I asked you to –</p> <p>9 CHAIRPERSON: Perhaps we should translate 10 that. What the sentence you read reads, "Mr Chairman, yes, 11 I think it came after the Nyala 6 threat to Nyala 6 where 12 the driver of the vehicle then informed us of the threat." 13 That's a translation of the sentence you read.</p> <p>14 MR GOTZ: Do you see that, Brigadier?</p> <p>15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek, ek sien 16 dit.</p> <p>17 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, in paragraph 81 of 18 your statement you said it was the commander of the Nyala 19 that reported it to you, not the driver. The driver and 20 the commander are two different people.</p> <p>21 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, dit is korrek, ja.</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: The commander of Nyala 6 was a 23 Lieutenant Mhlongo and the driver was a Constable Malatsi, 24 and to give the reference, we know that from JJJ135, page 25 3, where it's recorded that they are two separate people,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20750</p> <p>1 will give the time references. It's a rather long clip and 2 so I'm not sure that he needs to deal with the entire, 3 review the entire clip. We'll give him the relevant parts 4 to look at –</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, dis reg, dankie, 6 mnr die Advokaat.</p> <p>7 MR GOTZ: Thank you, Chair. Brigadier, 8 can we look at what you say in your evidence-in-chief in 9 relation to these matters? And it's to be found at day 152 10 on page 17216.</p> <p>11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Page?</p> <p>12 MR GOTZ: 17216.</p> <p>13 BRIGADIER CALITZ: That cannot be day 14 152.</p> <p>15 MR GOTZ: It's page –</p> <p>16 CHAIRPERSON: We've now got page 17216. 17 What line are you referring to?</p> <p>18 MR GOTZ: 17216.</p> <p>19 CHAIRPERSON: What line are you referring 20 to?</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: It's your evidence commencing 22 on line 13.</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.</p> <p>24 MR GOTZ: Perhaps we can read from line 9 25 where Mr Semenya puts what Mr Noki says to you. Mr Semenya</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20752</p> <p>1 Mhlongo and Malatsi. Now Brigadier, you'll appreciate that 2 you are providing hearsay evidence in this regard? You 3 didn't hear this so-called "dreigement" personally. It's 4 therefore hearsay evidence, correct?</p> <p>5 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is wat hulle aan 6 my meegedeel het, so dit sal hoorsē wees. Dit is korrek.</p> <p>7 MR GOTZ: We will argue –</p> <p>8 MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, we don't contend 9 that it is hearsay evidence when it is not offered for the 10 truthfulness of its contents, but a report received by the 11 witness. It's not hearsay at that level.</p> <p>12 CHAIRPERSON: The fact that the witness 13 received the report is a direct fact which can be proved by 14 giving the report. Whether the report is tendered, 15 evidence is given to prove the truth of the report is 16 another matter, and then that involves the question of 17 hearsay. Your point is that inasmuch as an attempt is 18 being made to prove that a threat was made, that would be 19 hearsay, but insofar as the evidence is tendered merely to 20 indicate that this report was made to the witness, it would 21 not be hearsay. So that's the distinction to which Mr 22 Semenya refers. Obviously you accept that, I take it.</p> <p>23 MR GOTZ: Indeed. Indeed, Chair. On 24 either point through, Brigadier, you'll accept that, I 25 think that the Commissioners should be very reluctant to</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20753</p> <p>1 accept any of this evidence when you can't even reflect 2 accurately whether it's the driver or the commander of the 3 vehicle that reported this to you, and this is compounded, 4 Brigadier, by the fact that neither Malatsi or Mhlongo have 5 filed witness statements. We do not have witness 6 statements for them –</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: Well, you know that the 8 time for filing witness statements comes to an end on 9 Monday and it may well be that there will be statements 10 from them, but all you can say is that up to now statements 11 haven't been filed from them. That's correct, isn't it?</p> <p>12 MR GOTZ: Indeed, Chair. There's no 13 confirmation on record at this point, Brigadier, of a 14 threat having been made on Nyala 6.</p> <p>15 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Al wat ek vir u kan sê 16 is ek glo daardie verklarings sal verkry word en dit sal 17 ingegee word. Dit is die boodskap wat oorgedra is, die 18 "commanders," en ons het dit bespreek en met Kolonel 19 Makhubela ook bespreek.</p> <p>20 MR GOTZ: And Brigadier, you accept that 21 there's an inconsistency in your evidence in relation to 22 who gave you the information?</p> <p>23 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, ek dink in my 24 getuienis het ek gesê die drywer het dit gerapporteer. Ek 25 sien in my verklaring het ek gesê "commander." Dit kan</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20755</p> <p>1 is dat ons vir mnr Noki oor die luidspreker dan verduidelik 2 het die doel van die draad en probeer om die situasie weer 3 kalm te kry.</p> <p>4 MR GOTZ: And again I'll put it to you, 5 Brigadier, that that doesn't constitute a threat.</p> <p>6 Brigadier –</p> <p>7 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, 8 nee, ek verskil van u. As dit die woorde is wat hulle 9 gebruik het en gesê het hulle moet die draad wegvat en 10 hulle gaan hulle nie weer vra nie, is dit duidelik 'n 11 dreigement.</p> <p>12 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, the other – perhaps 13 it's not an inconsistency, but can we have a look at what 14 exhibit L says on this? You'll find that, if I've got it 15 correctly, on slide 160.</p> <p>16 CHAIRPERSON: I didn't catch the slide 17 number.</p> <p>18 MR GOTZ: I beg your pardon, Chair –</p> <p>19 CHAIRPERSON: What is it?</p> <p>20 MR GOTZ: It's slide 160.</p> <p>21 CHAIRPERSON: 1-6-0?</p> <p>22 MR GOTZ: Yes, 1-6-0.</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid your problem is 24 affecting you again. 160 is a photograph. May I suggest 25 that you –</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20754</p> <p>1 beide die drywer, as ek nou moet terugdink, ek kan nie 2 onthou of dit presies oor die radio gesê is en toe het ons 3 dit buitekant die voertuie met die "commander" bespreek. 4 So dit was in ieder geval die een wat die boodskap ontvang 5 het en ek het dit verder met die bevelvoerder en ook sy 6 bevelvoerder, Kolonel Makhubela, bespreek. So dit, ek stem 7 nie saam met u nie.</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: Well, I'm not sure I understand 9 your answer. Who gave you the information? Was it the 10 driver or the commander, or both?</p> <p>11 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek dink aanvanklik het 12 ek die boodskap gekry dat dit van die drywer af kom. Soos 13 ek vir u sê, ek kan nie onthou of dit op die radio was nie. 14 Ons het dit toe gaan opvolg en verder met die bevelvoerder 15 bespreek. Die bevelvoerder het wel vir my gesê, die 16 offisier, dat daar was daardie dreigement gewees. Maar of 17 die drywer dit aan hom gerapporteer het, dit kan ek nou nie 18 vir u sê. Ek dink dit was oor die radio gewees.</p> <p>19 MR GOTZ: And again, Brigadier, at its 20 highest the way in which this so-called threat has been 21 described is Mr Noki coming to the Nyala and saying "We 22 don't want the police there."</p> <p>23 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, ek kan net vir u 24 getuig oor wat die bevelvoerder vir my gesê het. Ek het 25 nie self daardie dreigement gehoor nie. Wat ons opvolg was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20756</p> <p>1 MR GOTZ: No, no, Chair –</p> <p>2 CHAIRPERSON: - ask either Ms Barnes or 3 Ms Lewis to read these numbers for you. I mean to be fair, 4 it's a genuine problem you've got.</p> <p>5 MR GOTZ: No, Chair, in this respect, 6 with respect, I do want to refer to this slide.</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: I see. Okay, okay.</p> <p>8 MR GOTZ: You see, Brigadier, what 9 exhibit L, slide 160 says is that at 10:56 protesters are 10 formed up near Nyala 6 which was moved back to avoid it 11 being isolated, and that's all we find on the question of a 12 threat on Nyala 6 in exhibit L. Exhibit L doesn't refer to 13 threats being made which are reported to you of Mr Noki 14 coming to the vehicle. It presents a different picture. 15 It says that what happened was that the protesters formed 16 up as a group near Nyala 6, which was then moved back to 17 avoid it being isolated.</p> <p>18 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Nee, ek sien wat die 19 opsksrif sê.</p> <p>20 MR GOTZ: The inconsistency is this, 21 Brigadier; I'm not sure that, perhaps I'm the only one that 22 sees this. The inconsistency is this. Exhibit L seeks to 23 represent that Nyala 6 was moved back out of the way 24 because it was isolated. It doesn't record any threat. 25 Your evidence says that the reason that Nyala 6 was moved</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20757</p> <p>1 was because they were threatened by Mr Noki.</p> <p>2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is wat oorgedra</p> <p>3 was aan my, ja, en verder is hierdie foto's gestuur na die</p> <p>4 JOC toe en die JOC het dan daardie besluit geneem en met</p> <p>5 ons meegeedeel.</p> <p>6 MR GOTZ: I'd like you to appreciate what</p> <p>7 I'm attempting to do, Brigadier. You know, you've come to</p> <p>8 this Commission and you've made allegations about multiple</p> <p>9 threats made inter alia by people who are part of my, or</p> <p>10 members of my client. When I look at the objective</p> <p>11 evidence, and when I try to piece together what actually</p> <p>12 happened, nothing makes sense. There are a number of</p> <p>13 inconsistencies between the versions and I simply cannot</p> <p>14 work out the timing of these matters on the basis of the</p> <p>15 available evidence, and we are going to argue that very</p> <p>16 little of this evidence must be taken seriously by the</p> <p>17 Commission in the light of a number of inconsistencies.</p> <p>18 MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, those broad</p> <p>19 statements don't help us understand and get an informed</p> <p>20 answer from the witness.</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: Chair, I'm entitled to put what</p> <p>22 my argument is going to be. I'm highlighting the</p> <p>23 inconsistencies in the evidence –</p> <p>24 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt you.</p> <p>25 You say that no threats were made at all. Is that your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20759</p> <p>1 translation at the relevant portion reads, Speaker, "These</p> <p>2 police, if they claim that they have safety, they must go</p> <p>3 and apply safety to that white man/boss who sent them here,</p> <p>4 they must leave us here and bring this white man/boss. We</p> <p>5 do not leave this place without what we want, they must</p> <p>6 leave immediately. A police officer from the homelands, if</p> <p>7 he/she was fetched to come here we'll be left here. He/she</p> <p>8 will not enter that hippo," is that relevant, and then</p> <p>9 there is laughter.</p> <p>10 CHAIRPERSON: The next sentence, "We will</p> <p>11 finish them here," – sorry, no, it is further, "We will</p> <p>12 finish them here, they must leave here." Now doesn't that</p> <p>13 sound like a threat?</p> <p>14 MR GOTZ: Chairperson, what I'm testing</p> <p>15 is the evidence that Brigadier Calitz has given.</p> <p>16 CHAIRPERSON: No, no, I understand that,</p> <p>17 I understand that.</p> <p>18 MR GOTZ: He hasn't given any evidence –</p> <p>19 CHAIRPERSON: I understood what you were</p> <p>20 doing –</p> <p>21 MR GOTZ: - in relation to these events.</p> <p>22 CHAIRPERSON: You were interrogating the</p> <p>23 allegations he made about threats, but I asked you, is it</p> <p>24 your case that there were no threats and you said you</p> <p>25 didn't know, so that's why I referred you to this exhibit</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20758</p> <p>1 case?</p> <p>2 MR GOTZ: Chairperson, to be quite</p> <p>3 honest, I don't know. You will appreciate –</p> <p>4 CHAIRPERSON: Have you looked at exhibit</p> <p>5 OO9?</p> <p>6 MR GOTZ: Perhaps you can simply – the</p> <p>7 reference doesn't in fact make a –</p> <p>8 CHAIRPERSON: OO9, if I remember the</p> <p>9 reference correctly, is a translation of the soundtrack of</p> <p>10 a video that was made during Mr Mathunjwa's first address,</p> <p>11 I think, near the end, which formed the basis of cross-</p> <p>12 examination I think by Mr Semenza of Mr Mathunjwa when he</p> <p>13 gave evidence, and someone is clearly heard saying on that</p> <p>14 tape, referring to a senior policeman who came from the</p> <p>15 homelands who'd be killed, and making further other threats</p> <p>16 as to what would happen. I haven't got it in front of me,</p> <p>17 but that's my recollection of it. I don't know whether Mr</p> <p>18 Semenza has it, or his junior has it on their laptop;</p> <p>19 perhaps they can read it to us, because that appears to be</p> <p>20 – I'm not suggesting that it destroys the validity of the</p> <p>21 cross-examination that we've been listening to this</p> <p>22 morning, but it is evidence, prima facie at least, of a</p> <p>23 threat having been made. Mr Semenza, have you got it in</p> <p>24 front of you?</p> <p>25 [12:44] MR SEMENYA SC: I do, Chair. The</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20760</p> <p>1 which appears to indicate that what looks suspiciously like</p> <p>2 a threat was made to the police on the occasion when Mr</p> <p>3 Mathunjwa delivered his first address, I think, and that's</p> <p>4 evidence before us. We have the, I presume that is the</p> <p>5 Xhosa on the left hand side?</p> <p>6 MR GOTZ: Yes.</p> <p>7 CHAIRPERSON: And we have a translation</p> <p>8 on the right, so that is evidence before us. So, there was</p> <p>9 at least one threat and you have succeeded in showing, I</p> <p>10 think, this is a prima facie view, succeeded in showing</p> <p>11 that there is, at the lowest perhaps, an element of</p> <p>12 confusion in the present evidence, dates, I mean times</p> <p>13 don't correspond, there are contradictions and so on</p> <p>14 and that evidence is obviously that you've elicited, to</p> <p>15 which you've drawn is very important, but the point that I</p> <p>16 raised is still a relevant one, were there any threats of</p> <p>17 any kind at all and your answer was, you don't know. Well,</p> <p>18 no you do know. Shall we carry on?</p> <p>19 MR GOTZ: Brigadier, - thank you, Chair.</p> <p>20 Brigadier, this isn't an incident which you testify and I'm</p> <p>21 questioning you in relation to your evidence in relation to</p> <p>22 the threats. I do want to highlight a few other</p> <p>23 inconsistencies because it doesn't end in relation to this,</p> <p>24 Brigadier, but I can simply put this to you, is that you</p> <p>25 will appreciate that there is a difference between a single</p>

Page 20761	Page 20763
<p>1 threat being made and what you refer to as six threats.</p> <p>2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: MnR die Voorsitter,</p> <p>3 daar is seker 'n verskil tussen 1 en 6, ek stem saam met u,</p> <p>4 toe ek, in my getuienis in chief het ek gesê dit is soos ek</p> <p>5 dit waargeneem het en ek het vir u verduidelik die eerste</p> <p>6 dreigement, ons hoef nie weer daaroor te gaan nie, die tyd</p> <p>7 wat mnR die Voorsitter sê daar is time confusion, ek dink</p> <p>8 ons sal terugkom daarnatoe miskien net om te verduidelik</p> <p>9 dat paragraaf 80 en daardie, dit verwys na iets anders.</p> <p>10 Dit verwys nie na die deployment van die karre nie, so ek</p> <p>11 stem nie saam met die time confusion nie en dan oor Nyala 6</p> <p>12 het ons gewys daar is 'n VB inskrywing om 11:20, waar ek</p> <p>13 duidelik gesê het daar is daardie woorde geviter aan Nyala</p> <p>14 6, wat dan so ge-record is in die VB. So op hierdie</p> <p>15 stadium is dit feitlik deurgegee, so ek weet nie waar is</p> <p>16 die onduidelikhed nie.</p> <p>17 CHAIRPERSON: There is time confusion in</p> <p>18 the sense that Exhibit L suggests that Nyala 6 was moved at</p> <p>19 10:56 and the occurrence book suggested it was moved at</p> <p>20 11:20, so that's the time confusion. Whether it is</p> <p>21 significant confusion, where it takes us at the end is a</p> <p>22 different question, but you can't say there wasn't any time</p> <p>23 confusion. I mean that's contradicted by what we see, but</p> <p>24 anyway you and Mr Gotz can continue with this conversation.</p> <p>25 Mr Gotz, have you got further questions for the witness?</p>	<p>1 BRIGADIER CALITZ: MnR die Voorsitter,</p> <p>2 ja, weereens ek dink dit is maar die persoon wat dit</p> <p>3 geskryf het en as hy die woordjie "6" uitgelaat het na die</p> <p>4 Nyala, dit was die enigste groep, ag, die enigste Nyala wat</p> <p>5 ons dan sien in slide 160 waarnatoe die groep beweeg het en</p> <p>6 waar die groep gedreig het, so ek kan nie vir u 'n</p> <p>7 verduideliking gee waarom daar nie die syfer "6" na die</p> <p>8 Nyala is nie.</p> <p>9 CHAIRPERSON: Mr Gotz, the problem with</p> <p>10 this point is that we do know that Nyala 6 was moved</p> <p>11 because we know that from other photographs and we may have</p> <p>12 to apply a bit of circumstantial evidence here but the</p> <p>13 indications are that something happened in relation to</p> <p>14 Nyala 6 which caused Nyala 6 to be moved. It is true, there</p> <p>15 isn't a note in the occurrence book which already sends up</p> <p>16 a warning sign, don't rely too exclusively on the</p> <p>17 occurrence book but never mind, Nyala 6 was moved and there</p> <p>18 is an entry that people towards the Nyala. It doesn't say</p> <p>19 which one, but if you put the two together you might get</p> <p>20 the answer, but anyway, it doesn't help to say that nothing</p> <p>21 happened in relation to Nyala 6 because clearly something</p> <p>22 did. What exactly it is, whether this involved a threat,</p> <p>23 these are obviously matters that we must investigate and</p> <p>24 you may well wish to contend at the end that a threat</p> <p>25 hasn't been proved in respect of that, but that's a matter</p>
Page 20762	Page 20764
<p>1 MR GOTZ: Well, Chair, just with respect</p> <p>2 a correction, Exhibit L doesn't in fact refer to the</p> <p>3 movement of Nyala 6. It –</p> <p>4 CHAIRPERSON: It shows an error. Come</p> <p>5 on, it shows, there is a yellow red tangle around Nyala 6</p> <p>6 and then there is an arrow which points to another spot and</p> <p>7 in fact other videos show that Nyala 6 was moved from the</p> <p>8 place we see on slide 160 to the place where the head of</p> <p>9 the arrow is to be seen. So it doesn't say in the legend</p> <p>10 at the top that it was moved, but those of us who look at</p> <p>11 the arrow and its direction you can clearly see that what</p> <p>12 is being conveyed is it was moved, so not let's waste time</p> <p>13 on a non point. Shall we move onto a more substantial</p> <p>14 points?</p> <p>15 MR GOTZ: The chairperson has highlighted</p> <p>16 and I was going to as well, the occurrence book which</p> <p>17 records at 11:20 something that you report to the JOC.</p> <p>18 Let's look at that, it is FFF25, at 11:20 and it's entry</p> <p>19 998. You'll see it says there, "Situation report. Papa1</p> <p>20 reported that the group is moving towards the Nyala. The</p> <p>21 group leader asked the police official to remove the wires</p> <p>22 and said he is not going to ask them again as he is also</p> <p>23 aggressive. About 3,500 people gathered." There is</p> <p>24 nothing in the occurrence book about Nyala 6 being</p> <p>25 threatened, Brigadier?</p>	<p>1 we'll deal with at the appropriate time.</p> <p>2 MR GOTZ: Chairperson, I was just about</p> <p>3 to go onto evidence which I would like to show the</p> <p>4 brigadier, which demonstrates the photographs taken with</p> <p>5 Vermaak's Pentax as well as his BlackBerry, there are two</p> <p>6 photographs, but particularly a Vermaak photograph which</p> <p>7 was taken at 11:22 which at that point showed –</p> <p>8 CHAIRPERSON: Shall we see it, shall we</p> <p>9 see it, let's have a look at it?</p> <p>10 MR GOTZ: Yes, Chair.</p> <p>11 CHAIRPERSON: If you want to show it and</p> <p>12 it is relevant, then let's see it. It is an exhibit</p> <p>13 already, I take it?</p> <p>14 MR GOTZ: Just for record purposes,</p> <p>15 Chair, the image that we had on screen from Exhibit L is</p> <p>16 also taken from Vermaak's Pentax camera. It is 4501 in</p> <p>17 Exhibit JJJ10 taken at Vermaak's Pentax time 10:55, which</p> <p>18 is ETV time 10:44:16 and then if the brigadier can have a</p> <p>19 look in that folder at image 4524, if it can be put on the</p> <p>20 screen, image 4524. Now this photograph was taken at</p> <p>21 Vermaak Pentax time 11:22:24 which his ETV time 11:20:42.</p> <p>22 You can see, Brigadier, that there is a Nyala with barbed</p> <p>23 wire in the top left hand corner of the photograph, the</p> <p>24 furthest to the left. You'll confirm, Brigadier, that that</p> <p>25 is Nyala6?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20765</p> <p>1 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek, die 2 heel linkerkantste een soos ons nou na die foto kyk. 3 MR GOTZ: So by 11:20 Nyala6 has not been moved. What we find is – 5 CHAIRPERSON: It will of course explain why the occurrence book entry at 11:20 doesn't record that Nyala 6 has moved yet, but it is quite clear that it hadn't moved by 11:20. We know it moved later. 9 MR GOTZ: We do know that it moved later, what is unclear to us is precisely when it moved because it is at this point that Vermaak appears, returns and lands. 12 The next photograph in the series, 4525, is the first photograph that Colonel Vermaak takes in the afternoon. 14 CHAIRPERSON: We see a Nyala close to the kraal which presumably is Nyala6. I haven't counted them but I take it, it is Nyala 6. 17 MR GOTZ: Do you confirm that that does show that Nyala 6 has been moved and the timing of this, - sorry, let me ask the question. Will you confirm, Brigadier, that that shows that Nyala 6 has now moved? 21 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, dit is korrek. 22 Wat is die tyd van die foto? 23 MR GOTZ: It is Vermaak Pentax time 24 15:34:14 which I have as 15:32:32, and we haven't seen, Brigadier, and perhaps you can refer us to something which</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20767</p> <p>1 presumably be demonstrated by photographs or videos or – 2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ek glo so, mnr die 3 Voorsitter. 4 CHAIRPERSON: - the timing of telephone calls and cell phone calls. 6 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Dit is korrek. 7 CHAIRPERSON: So that's a matter that the SAPS team can look into, you can only testify from your own knowledge which you have done so far. 10 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Korrek. 11 CHAIRPERSON: It is after or just before one o'clock, Mr Gotz, so when it is convenient for the purpose of your cross-examination, let me know and we will take the, not the lunch adjournment but the weekend adjournment – 16 MR GOTZ: Chair, - 17 CHAIRPERSON: - and we'll resume on Monday, but it is for you to determine when it will be appropriate for purpose of your cross-examination for us to do that. 21 MR GOTZ: Chair, just to, the brigadier asked the timing of the photograph on Exhibit L, I did actually give that earlier but let me repeat it. It is Vermaak Blackberry time 10:55:58, which is ETV time 10:54:16. So at the very least what we can say is that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20766</p> <p>1 does indicate when Nyala 6 was in fact moved because none of the photographs that we've seen does indicate that. I may have missed something, I'm happy to accept that there is a lot of material there, but certainly on the basis of the material that I've seen in the exhibits and elsewhere, there is no indication of when exactly Nyala 6 was moved.</p> <p>7 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Mnr die Voorsitter, ons het daaroor getuig en as u gaan kyk na die foto van slide 160, ek weet nie wat is die ETV tyd van daardie foto nie, dit is omtrent min of meer, sou ek sê wanneer die dreigement plaasgevind het, toe het die drywter dit deurgegee, die bevelvoerder het dit kom bespreek, daardie dreigement is deurgegee JOC toe, so ek weet nie, 'n ou moet versigtig wees want anderste more gaan u sê ek het gesê dit het spesifiek daardie tyd beweeg, maar dit sou enige tyd gewees het in die volgende, seker 'n halfuur of 'n uur want die foto's wat Kolonel Vermaak gestuur het kan 'n mens sekerlik sien die foto, wanneer hy dit gestuur het of die foto geneem het. Daardie foto is in die JOC ontvang, dit is in die JOC bespreek. Ek het 'n telefoonoproep ontvang wat ons miskien ook na kan kyk, en dan is daardie gesprek met Kolonel Makhubela, so daar sou seker 'n goeie halfuur, uur omtrent verloop het en dan die posisieonering van daardie voertuig. So –</p> <p>25 CHAIRPERSON: This is a matter that can</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20768</p> <p>1 between 10:44:16 and 11:20 Nyala 6 had not been moved.</p> <p>2 BRIGADIER CALITZ: Ja, ek sal sê teen daardie tyd kan 'n mens dan vasstel dat, ek het gesê omtrent 'n halfuur, dit is die kommunikasie en die inligting wat op die grond gedeel is en ons wat JOC toe geskuif het, so dit is baie moontlik, dit is korrek.</p> <p>7 MR GOTZ: Thank you, Chair, and I'll take the weekend to try and shorten my cross-examination.</p> <p>9 CHAIRPERSON: - if you did that, on the other hand I don't expect you to leave anything important out because I can understand the significance of this cross-examination and it hopefully will assist us to arrive at the truth ultimately in relation to the issues that you've been covering. We will now adjourn until Monday morning at nine o'clock.</p> <p>16 [COMMISSION ADJOURNED]</p> <p>17 .</p> <p>18 .</p> <p>19 .</p> <p>20 .</p> <p>21 .</p> <p>22 .</p> <p>23 .</p> <p>24 .</p> <p>25 .</p>

20639:3,15 20652:12	20763:19 20764:5	unequivocally	20697:8 20720:10	20678:11 20689:19
20656:3,4,10		20663:13	20721:23 20726:3	video 20637:20
20692:11		unfounded 20675:15	20727:12 20728:22	20639:5,19,22,22
transcripts 20638:25		unies 20679:15	20728:25 20729:17	20657:20 20658:3
translate 20751:9		unions 20730:8	20730:12 20744:4	20667:13,20
translated 20638:25		unit 20729:7	20753:25	20680:21 20719:13
20639:3 20648:23		unprotected 20730:9	verklarings 20724:3,4	20719:17 20748:18
20667:20		unscientific 20656:16	20753:16	20749:13 20758:10
translation 20638:8		unsuccessful 20689:19	verkry 20753:16	videoed 20667:12
20667:13 20712:21		unused 20707:14	verlaat 20648:13,20	videos 20637:19
20749:7,13 20751:13		use 20643:24 20647:14	verloop 20766:23	20688:2 20762:7
20758:9 20759:1		20708:3	Vermaak 20661:12	20767:1
20760:7		useful 20654:5	20747:16 20764:6,21	vier 20693:21
transpired 20722:11		uttered 20731:4	20765:11,13,23	view 20637:5 20694:7
trein 20682:1		uur 20684:7 20725:15	20766:17 20767:24	20694:13 20760:10
tried 20664:19		20766:16,23	Vermaak's 20764:5,16	views 20643:17
20681:14		UU3 20640:8,14,16	20764:17	20662:22 20718:6
TRT 20639:23		20641:2,8,12,15,20	vermoor 20678:6	20737:1
true 20671:9,15		20642:7,7 20748:19	verseker 20684:1	vinnig 20680:3
20688:11 20689:6,7		20748:20	versigtig 20766:14	20718:11 20726:3
20763:14		UU3.1 20640:24	version 20656:4,10	20728:22 20739:19
truth 20719:20		20641:12,14	20721:17 20748:20	violence 20684:3,13
20752:15 20768:13		V	versions 20757:13	vir 20645:13,23,24
truthful 20688:16		validity 20758:20	verskeie 20666:15	20648:13,21
truthfulness 20752:10		value 20667:10	20679:17 20712:3	20651:16,23
try 20657:10 20660:19		vandag 20748:9	20720:11	20657:14 20659:15
20662:7 20739:12		various 20652:20	verskil 20714:11	20660:14 20667:3
20757:11 20768:8		20664:20 20713:19	20735:18 20736:21	20669:9,22,24
trying 20654:23		vasstel 20768:3	20742:16 20755:8	20672:4 20675:1,3
20660:12 20676:3		vat 20646:14 20668:25	20761:3	20677:6 20678:14,15
20698:24 20713:20		20711:13 20718:12	verskille 20645:22	20678:16 20681:1
Tuesday 20692:24		VB 20729:16 20734:16	versoek 20676:25	20683:5,9,20 20684:2
20725:8 20726:24		20735:5 20739:10,25	versoekе 20714:14	20697:14,14
20727:6		20743:14 20761:12	20715:23	20701:12 20706:14
turn 20696:1		20761:14	verstaan 20645:12,13	20706:17 20707:2,21
turned 20685:25		vehicle 20672:16	20645:20,21	20709:8,13 20711:3
tussen 20679:15		20722:11 20751:12	20678:14,16	20711:21,22 20712:2
20682:21 20683:24		20753:3 20756:14	20681:25 20699:21	20712:7 20714:8,9
20712:16 20735:4		vehicles 20696:24	20711:8 20721:14	20718:1,20 20719:9
20761:3		20699:7 20723:22	20738:24	20719:14 20720:19
twee 20642:18		20730:21 20732:20	verteenwoordig	20721:23 20722:5
20668:22 20669:8		20738:22	20712:17	20726:4 20727:11,14
20672:6 20674:13		veiliger 20681:1	vertrouensposisie	20728:25 20730:16
20676:16 20678:5,8		veld 20651:15	20682:21	20734:14 20735:2,5
20679:14,19,19		veral 20715:8 20717:25	vervoer 20719:7	20737:6 20738:1
20682:22 20713:4		verb 20704:14	verwar 20668:22	20744:15,17 20745:7
20718:20 20736:21		verdedig 20675:2	verwys 20657:4	20751:7 20753:15
tweede 20724:15		verdediging 20667:3	20660:21 20661:15	20754:13,15,18,23,24
twice 20641:19		verder 20661:9	20670:5 20671:2,6	20755:1 20761:5
two 20637:19 20640:12		20710:22 20712:7	20672:3,6 20673:2	20763:6
20640:24 20667:5		20754:5,14 20757:3	20676:17 20677:7,17	visited 20688:12
20669:19 20670:11		verdere 20675:5	20678:6,15 20679:20	vlug 20651:4
20670:24 20671:9		20747:12	20680:3,4,25 20698:1	voertuie 20712:12
20673:14,15 20674:5		verduidelik 20683:9	20701:15 20707:24	20754:3
20674:15 20675:15		20745:7 20755:1	20719:5 20721:22	voertuig 20751:7
20675:19 20676:4,8		20761:5,8	20722:5 20725:15	20766:24
20676:11 20678:11		verduideliking 20763:7	20728:23 20729:8	volg 20676:18
20678:23,24,25		vergadering 20651:19	20737:10 20738:6	20677:20 20695:7
20679:2,3,4,5,8		20667:10 20669:15	20739:4,9 20740:4	20697:15,16 20730:1
20682:10,12		20669:16 20679:3	20742:18,19	volgende 20669:25
20684:24 20685:14		20717:22 20721:6	20743:12,13 20747:6	20719:16 20726:5
20685:16 20686:16		understood 20637:7	20747:9 20761:9,10	20766:16
20686:25 20687:1,16		20638:2,6 20658:14	verwysing 20673:5	volgens 20683:11
20689:4,25 20714:2		20664:15 20676:1,7	20744:5,6	20697:18 20701:4
20730:7 20746:25		20679:7 20686:19	vicinity 20696:25	volgorde 20744:14
20747:2 20751:20,25		20759:19	20677:14	voluntarily 20663:7
undiagnosed 20748:21				

voor 20669:1 20744:3 20744:14 20748:13	waartoe 20701:16	way 20656:17 20700:16 20700:24 20704:24 20716:19 20722:15 20728:10 20754:20 20756:23	went 20661:12 20663:4 20666:10 20687:3 20693:13 20707:12 20733:3,10 20735:24 20736:2 20746:14	20667:22 20675:12 20675:20 20688:23 20688:24 20696:3,4 20700:10 20717:4 20726:17,23
vooraf 20670:17	waarvan 20670:15 20714:17	wage 20730:7	weren't 20674:16	20737:12 20745:25
voorbeld 20718:13	wages 20672:19	walked 20729:3	werk 20710:24 20712:8 20712:10,13 20714:9	20746:23 20752:11 20752:12,20 20753:5
voorbeldde 20718:11	wall 20708:21	wanneer 20677:20	we'll 20640:24 20641:2 20642:2 20690:16	20753:5,8 20757:20 20761:25
voorkom 20747:19	wanneer 20677:20	weakness 20643:20 20644:1	won't 20638:23	
voorsien 20748:16	20701:4 20727:13	weaknesses 20643:18	20639:15 20643:8	
voortgegaan 20712:9	20742:21 20744:18	weapons 20658:19 20662:5,23 20666:19	20644:3 20690:8	
voorval 20669:1,2	20766:10,18	20666:23 20669:17 20670:12 20674:4,20	20695:22	
voorvalle 20668:24 20697:8 20735:3	want 20640:8 20641:21 20641:23 20645:21 20647:6 20653:2,11 20653:13 20654:4,7 20656:24 20657:10 20659:21 20661:21 20664:10 20666:19 20672:18,19	20680:9,19 20683:1 20683:15 20687:19 20689:7,17,20 20696:23 20728:15 20729:6	woord 20715:22 20734:1	
vorentoe 20730:11	wedersyds 20711:20	wedersydse 20712:15	woordeboek 20718:10	
vorige 20657:5 20729:25	Wednesday 20722:21 20725:1,7,10,20,23 20731:14 20732:1,8	Wednesday 20722:21	woordje 20763:3	
vraag 20650:15,17 20657:24 20678:14 20693:6,7 20711:7,15 20755:10	week 20649:3 20718:20	weekend 20694:17 20716:5 20767:14 20768:8	word 20643:21,22,24 20659:8,17 20674:12	
vraag 20664:11 20669:23 20738:25 20738:25	weens 20677:22 20684:17 20730:10	weens 20677:22	20675:5 20677:4	
vrae 20646:14 20748:8	weer 20650:10 20679:16 20711:14 20739:8 20745:2 20755:2,10 20761:6	weer 20650:10	whilst 20652:1	
vreesame 20720:22	weereens 20714:7 20763:2	weereens 20714:7	20678:3,6 20680:14	
Vrydag 20670:16 20679:13,14	wednesday 20711:20	wees 20660:5,15 20714:11 20715:18	20682:2 20683:6	
vyf 20673:20 20679:15	weekend 20694:17 20716:5 20767:14 20768:8	wees 20660:5,15 20724:4 20734:8 20738:9 20744:14 20752:6 20766:14	20682:4 20698:9,10	
W				
waar 20645:23 20650:25 20651:1,15 20651:20,21 20657:6 20657:8,8 20659:8 20661:4,5 20666:14 20669:4 20670:2,3,4 20671:2,3 20680:13 20681:3 20697:12,13 20697:17 20701:6,12 20701:19,20,21 20706:18 20707:3,19 20709:9 20712:3,13 20715:2,9,17,22,23 20715:25 20719:5 20720:11,13,17 20729:23 20730:1 20736:14 20737:18 20742:19 20744:3,12 20747:7,15,16 20751:6 20761:12,15 20763:6	wanted 20652:24 20655:13 20660:9 20663:10 20680:10 20721:12 20722:23 20723:13,15 20729:2 20735:10 20740:10	wanted 20652:24 20655:13 20660:9 20663:10 20680:10 20721:12 20726:15	what's 20657:21 20667:21	20705:18 20759:3,4
waargeneem 20761:5	wants 20656:21 20716:20 20726:15	wapens 20675:1,4 20680:13 20683:8,12 20729:24 20736:20	who'd 20682:10,13 20758:15	20717:5,5,14,14,22
waarna 20660:21 20670:4 20673:2 20676:16 20677:7 20679:20 20680:25 20725:15 20728:23 20737:10 20739:9 20740:4 20742:19 20747:6	warning 20689:15 20763:16	wants 20656:21 20716:20 20726:15	Wie 20706:25 wil 20650:2 20657:12	20721:6 20733:5,6
waarnatoe 20763:5	wasn't 20643:4 20652:25 20687:2 20714:4 20735:8 20738:14 20740:24 20749:15 20761:22	wapens 20675:1,4 20680:13 20683:8,12 20729:24 20736:20	weet 20642:10 20645:11,20	20734:2,4 20736:6
waarom 20730:2 20735:3,5 20763:7	waste 20646:17 20647:8 20720:3 20762:12	waste 20646:17 20647:8 20720:3 20762:12	will 20657:14 20660:4 20662:11 20669:8,9	20737:9 20744:15
waarop 20676:25 20697:7 20710:17 20712:1 20718:22 20736:20 20744:15 20745:7	wasted 20647:9 20648:8 20663:15	wasted 20647:9 20648:8 20663:15	wires 20762:21 wisest 20749:12	20746:19 20748:9
ARCHIVE FOR JUSTICE				

wrongly	20649:13	20761:3	20710:5,6,8	20714:22	19	20721:9	20763:21	20765:7,16
wys	20659:15	1-6	20755:21,22	14de	20669:4,25	19th	20672:12	20765:18,20
20662:11	20663:19	10	20727:5	20739:5,6	20684:5	20724:23	20766:6	20768:1
20697:7	20706:17		20742:20		20729:25		600	20737:19
20711:21		10am	20738:5,13,22	14th	20645:3	20670:9	20738:7	20739:23
wyse	20710:17		20744:9		20678:1	20682:25	63	20721:23
		10:15	20680:2		20685:15	20690:13		20728:24
X			20724:11	20725:10	20692:11,24			2
X	20716:18,20		20725:20	20726:9	20702:21	20716:7	2	20677:11
Xhosa	20641:18		20731:14	20732:4,7	20724:22	20725:4,8	20721:11	20726:8
	20645:12		10:15am	20732:1	20726:24		20725:15,22	20726:8
Y		10:20	20728:5	14:00	20732:17		20728:11	20747:1,7
Y	20716:19		20729:16	14:05	20733:1		200	20681:6,10
yea	20639:16,16	10:25	20741:4	145	20653:22	20660:21	2012	20696:21
year	20730:7		20742:10,18	15de	20720:12	20725:5	2014	20637:1
yellow	20762:5	10:44	20738:23		20725:15	20729:12	22	20739:20
yesterday	20637:19	10:44:16	20764:18	15th	20645:4	20708:10	23	20653:5
	20643:17	20693:14	20768:1		20721:8	20722:22		20657:25
you'd	20716:5	10:51	20690:19		20724:1,11,24		20658:2	20685:22,24
you'll	20643:6	10:54:16	20767:25		20725:7,11	20728:2	20688:23,24	20696:4
	20676:6	20677:10	10:55		20731:14	20732:1,8	20697:7	
	20691:10	20692:19	10:55:58		20734:23	20735:16	24	20637:1
	20696:19	20710:1	20756:9		20736:4,10		20662:15	
	20728:5,8	20732:17	20761:19	15:32:32		15:34:14		27
	20733:2	20751:8	100%	20765:24		20765:24		20677:9
	20752:1,24	20755:14	20713:1	15:35				
	20762:19	20764:24	20715:1					
you're	20637:9		20743:11	152				
	20639:25	20640:3,5	103	20652:12	20653:4			
	20647:23	20648:8	20653:15					
	20657:21	20668:2	11de	20673:22				
	20679:4	20685:24	11:11	20704:23				
	20686:8,13	20690:17	11:20	20740:19				
	20690:20	20695:14	20741:1	20743:16				
	20697:22	20698:3	20761:12,20					
	20705:25	20708:7	20762:17,18	20765:3				
	20717:4,8,13		20765:6,8	20768:1				
	20722:19	20723:4	11:20:42	20764:21				
	20724:8	20746:4	11:22	20764:7				
	20748:22	20749:8,20	11:22:24	20764:21				
you've	20642:6		11:30	20718:23				
	20645:6	20653:17	20729:15	20718:23				
	20659:3	20664:4	11:50	20732:1				
	20691:2,21,22		110%	20710:12				
	20711:9	20739:1	20711:13					
	20740:16	20746:4	11126	20652:13				
	20747:20	20756:4	20653:4,9,10,11					
	20757:7,8	20760:14	20656:4	20657:5,19				
	20760:15	20768:14	11127	20658:6				
Z			117	20724:10				
zoom	20705:19		118	20722:25	20723:1			
	20706:17		20724:10	20725:9				
Zyl	20651:22		20726:9	20731:3,13				
0			20731:23					
000	20673:13	12	20655:11	20697:24	12de	20697:9	17434	20709:23
09:16	20637:2							
09:36	20651:25	12:24						
	20666:11		12:44	20746:3				
1			13	20750:22				
1	20641:16	20709:11	13th	20645:3	20664:1,5			
	20732:13	20733:2,8	20664:25	20665:18				
	20734:9	20739:23	20669:15	20671:19				
			20674:3	20690:11				
			20702:21,21					
			14	20660:5,21	20695:5			
			20695:11,14,18,22,24					